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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1884.

ART. I.—THE RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO THE WANTS OF MODERN TIMES.

IS the Church of England showing herself able and ready to meet the wants of the people, and is her response to a very evident revival of religious feeling and sentiment such as to justify the position she holds as the Church of the nation? These questions come continuously and prominently before the minds of devout and thoughtful men, who desire and pray that the Christian character of the nation may be firmly and fully maintained, and that the English Church may prove to be yet more than ever the power and influence which God will use and honour in forming and deepening the religious and moral life of the people.

To arrive at an unbiassed judgment as to whether the Church is faithfully fulfilling her mission to the world, by devoutly and skilfully adapting herself to the characteristic wants of modern times, we should endeavour to ascertain with as much accuracy and completeness as possible, what are the methods which are being used to bring the great masses of the people under the healing and life-giving influences of the Gospel.

Those who have carefully watched the growth of the Church during the last quarter of a century, cannot fail to have marked the rapid development of almost every kind of machinery for dealing with the peculiar and anxious responsibilities laid upon her. Granting with thankfulness, however, that this is true, we have still to face the question as to how far these manifold organizations may be vitalized with an increase of power, and to what extent they have so far seemed to succeed, or to fail through the supply or lack of those who personally consecrate their life wholly, or in part, to extend the Kingdom of Christ among their fellows.

It is certainly not one of the least hopeful pledges for the growing usefulness of the Church of England, that so much prominence is being given to the extreme importance and value of personal service, and that those who administer the special funds of the Bishops of London, Rochester, St. Albans, and Bedford, beside many others, devote so large a proportion of their resources to the maintenance of additional clergy, and lay-assistants.

The necessities of the case are urgent. Tens of thousands are being born to live and die in spiritual ignorance; they lie at the doorstep of the Church; and as we pass by, we see as it were their open wounds. Their deep spiritual poverty is as a brother's blood crying to us from the ground; and it is only by the lips of living men, through the ministry of devoted lives, that these outcast and neglected masses can be rescued from their spiritual degradation.

In touching upon the subject of living agencies, we naturally turn to the statistics bearing upon the supply of candidates for Holy Orders. The following figures abstracted from the "Official Year-Book" indicate the number of deacons ordained in each diocese of England and Wales, during the years 1872 to 1882 inclusive:

1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882
582	634	667	610	632	701	665	677	679	713	729

From this table it will be seen, that the deacons ordained in 1882 exceeded those of 1872 by 147, and that throughout the whole period of eleven years there has been a steady increase. Encouraging as this is, it must yet be admitted that the supply is greatly inadequate to the demand, and that the lack of devout, and well-educated men, obviously and seriously cramps the power of the Church effectually to minister to the people.

As it is the aim of this paper to deal mainly with the facts of the Church's work, it would be beside our purpose to inquire at any length, into the causes which may account for the deficiency in the number of candidates for Holy Orders. We would rather ask, is there any easy remedy for the lack so widely regretted, and if so, how can we best give it effect?

A very evident reason for the insufficiency of the supply may be found, not so much in the want of men, as in their inability to provide themselves with the needful education.

It is stated by the committee of the Additional Curates Society administering the Ordination Candidates' Exhibition Fund, that from the commencement of its work, nine years ago, 718 applications have been received from young men, all more or less suitable, and desirous of seeking Holy Orders.

Owing to the limited funds at the disposal of the committee, only 227 applications out of this number have been responded to; how many then, have certainly been lost to the active service of the Church! Here, at once, is a reason and a remedy for the lack of candidates. The right men may be found, but their own partial means to obtain the required training, must be subsidized by the ready, and generous assistance of the Church.

For it must be remembered, that the channels of help once available through the Universities are no longer within reach, or but very partially so, of poor men; the sons of the wealthy, who have enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education, necessarily overcome the sons of poorer men in the strife of modern competition. Exhibitions and scholarships, which men of moderate attainments were once able to gain, are now beyond their reach. The Church suffers accordingly. The remedy at hand is to strengthen promptly and materially the organizations, both general and diocesan, which exist for the purpose of seeking out and assisting really worthy men, who give promise of success in the ministry of the Church, if their proper education can be secured.

There are five societies of a general character, seeking to carry out this most practical, and urgent work with more or less success. A like provision is made in the Dioceses of Canterbury, Exeter, Carlisle, and Llandaff, the Council of the East London Fund working to some extent with the same object. Again: several of the more recently founded Theological Colleges—as, for instance, Ely, Truro, and Leeds Clergy School—offer their help to men of small means. But taking full account of all the machinery in existence, it is neither in its proportions, nor value of sufficient power to meet the needs of the case. It is evident, therefore, that by a wider recognition of this branch of Church work, and a far more general appropriation of money for this special purpose, very much may be done to supply what is wanting, and thus secure the devotion of many valuable lives in the ministry of the Church.

In the Diocese of Llandaff it is one of the expressly recognised objects of the Church Extension Society, to contribute to the expenses of those, who are unable to defray the entire cost of their education for Holy Orders. If each diocese gave a like prominence to this object, might it not suggest a new channel for the liberality of many, and immensely benefit the Church in the supply of a want from which at this time we so greatly suffer?

Now though, as we must admit, the Church loses through the unequal supply, she has gained immensely of late from thoroughness in theological, and pastoral training, and we may

also add in the spiritual life, and power of those who have offered themselves for Holy Orders. If then, the men are better equipped for their work, though still fewer in number than they should be, the advantage is proportionately greater to the Church and people than in years past. A glance at the facts carefully and authoritatively stated in the "Official Year-Book," with reference to our Theological Colleges, will completely confirm this general assertion.

The foundation and successful working of no less than seven entirely new Theological Schools within the last fifteen years is not one of the least remarkable signs of modern Church growth. It is interesting and most satisfactory to mark from statistics which the "Year-Book" furnishes, how extensively these Divinity Schools are now used by those who seek to follow up their University education, by a systematic, and prolonged course of theological study. The significance and importance of this fact is evident as affording a guarantee that the standard of education among the clergy, upon which their influence so largely depends, will be fully maintained.

It has often been said with regret that so many have taken Holy Orders with but a very partial acquaintance of pastoral work in its practical nature. If this be true of the past, there is less reason for it now. At every Theological College, instruction in pastoral work is recognised as an essential part of training. At Ely, Truro, Lincoln, Gloucester, Wells, and Lichfield, the students are more or less attached as lay-helpers to certain parishes or districts, in which they have the opportunity of visiting the sick, conducting classes, and in many other ways assisting the clergy. Those who wish to see this course of education fully exemplified and admirably carried out, should make themselves acquainted with the inner life and daily routine of the Leeds Clergy School, as it is shortly described in the "Official Year-Book" of 1883. In this case the students occupy three afternoons weekly in district-visiting, give addresses and cottage lectures, attend confirmation classes conducted by experienced clergy in the town, and systematically receive instruction from the Vicar of Leeds in the various departments of pastoral work: surely this is a great step in advance, and affords the most hopeful assurance that the younger clergy will gain immensely in ministerial fitness, and so exert a deeper and wider influence upon the Church at large.

Passing from this subject to a somewhat kindred one, we may mark with much thankfulness the efforts now so universally made to stimulate the spiritual life of the clergy by bringing them together for quiet devotional exercise. It matters little, indeed, by what name such gatherings are called, nor is it needful to insist that they should be at all

times, and in every place conducted after the same model, or be distrusted if they are not; it is enough if the object in each case be the same, and be steadily kept in view.

The increasing pressure of parochial work, the constant handling and supervision of mere secular things, does and must involve a strain upon the clergy, with a consequent injury to their spiritual life. It becomes, therefore, most desirable, if not absolutely essential, that some opportunity of retirement should occasionally offer itself that they may be alone in self-examination and communion with God. It is not possible to state fully to what extent such opportunities as these have been made use of, but a reference to the records of the "Official Year-Book" will show not only that "retreats" and "quiet days" are being very generally adopted, but that a very large number of the clergy habitually resort to them; considerably over a thousand attended these gatherings last year.

It is not unnatural that, in the greater number of instances, the Ember seasons should be selected, as they suggest a fitting occasion for intercession on behalf of those who are receiving, as well as those who have received Holy Orders. A more systematic and prayerful observance of Ember Days will surely give the promise of a fuller blessing resting upon the Church. In some instances (as in the Diocese of St. Albans) the laity have been invited to join with the clergy in their intercessions. Services have been held from year to year in different centres, and thus attention has been more widely drawn throughout the diocese to the wisdom and value of the appointment of such seasons.

Before leaving the subject of living agencies, it seems right to allude to the necessity and importance of officially recognising and employing the active work of the laity in the service of the Church.

It is evident that the clergy, by themselves alone, are utterly unable to reach the masses of the people; and this inability continually increases with the enormous and rapid growth of population. The committees of the Church Pastoral Aid, and the Additional Curates Societies, are continually reporting that they receive applications for curate grants from clergy left entirely alone, in parishes where the population varies from 5,000 to 14,000, and the fact that each society has at least 300 or 400 applications of this kind, which they are unable through want of funds to assist, is an evidence that such instances are not exceptional.

Then, too, it must be remembered that the population of London is increasing at the rate of 38,000 every year; in other words, four or five parishes are added to the responsibilities of the Church in the diocese. In that portion of the Diocese of

St. Albans known as the Deanery of Barking, the growth of the population has been almost unexampled; in 1861 it was 73,550, and rose in 1882 to 245,000; in the South London portion of the Diocese of Rochester the population rose from 967,692 in 1871 to 1,265,578 in 1882.

With such facts before us, it is self-evident that yet more vigorous efforts should be made to secure a considerable increase of clerical help. Nevertheless, it is hopeless to expect that such an increase will ever be compassed in sufficient measure to meet the demand. This lack of clergy, therefore, must of necessity be supplemented by a very general use and official recognition of lay-help. This necessity has been very pointedly recognised by recent discussions in the Houses of Convocation in both provinces; and though there is a perfect agreement as to the desirability of a more general use of the services of the laity, the precise form which it shall hereafter assume is not yet agreed upon.[1]

If arguments are needed to establish the urgent importance and value of lay co-operation, they are abundantly furnished by the very successful working of the London Lay-Helpers' Association, which has vigorously applied itself for many years past to assist the clergy in the manifold branches of the parochial system. The object, and work of this association are so well known that explanation is here unnecessary; but a reference to the annual report will show with what practical power it carries on its work as a handmaid of the Church.

Following the example of London, lay-helpers' associations have been formed in the dioceses of Rochester, Lichfield, Bath and Wells, and Durham, and in each case the organization is proving itself vigorous and bearing fruit. It is impossible at present to measure by statistics the actual extent to which the assistance of the laity is being secured through the agency of these diocesan associations, but it may be safely affirmed that the number of members is proportionately very large.

A most interesting feature in the work of the London Lay-Helpers' Association is the provision it has been making for some years past for annually bringing the readers together for spiritual edification, instruction, and mutual intercourse. During three weeks of last year the buildings of Selwyn College, Cambridge, were, by the kindness of the Principal, thrown open for this purpose. Twenty-nine readers availed

[1] By way of illustrating the interest so widely felt throughout the Church in this matter it may be useful to refer to the resolutions of recent Conferences in dioceses where at present (with the exception of London and Lichfield) the scheme has not yet assumed a practical shape: Chester, Chichester, Lichfield, London, Manchester, Norwich, Hereford ("Official Year-Book," 1884, p. 95).

themselves of this opportunity, and seventeen continued in residence throughout each week; the arrangements were under the direction of Chancellor Leeke. The general routine of each day embraced opportunities for public and private prayer, instruction, and exhortation, counsel upon matters of common interest, and the strengthening of mutual friendships. The same course was followed at Oxford two years previously, with like success.

In further illustration of the efforts now being made to stimulate and direct the zeal of lay-workers, and to assist them in realizing the common nature of their work, it is extremely interesting to refer to several diocesan gatherings taking place last year, which from their tone and character, as well as from the large numbers attending them, bore very remarkable testimony to the ever-increasing activity which is so evident a characteristic of the Church in this age. At Newcastle more than two thousand Church-workers gathered together on All Saints' Day for a service in the cathedral church, and the large number of working-men present was a subject of common and thankful observation. The Diocese of Lichfield has organized a union of Church-workers with the object of binding them together, to advance the life of holiness, work, and prayer. Over one thousand communicants attended a special service in the cathedral last year. Organizations with a like object in view exist in Canterbury and Truro.

These efforts to draw the faithful working laity together, and the encouragement which they have received, must tend to exert a powerful influence throughout the Church.

From the subject of living agencies, and the means adopted to give them spiritual, and intellectual efficiency, we would now turn to another branch of work, and mark the practical and generous development of the resources of the Church in the rapid multiplication of new parishes, and the very extraordinary growth of church-building, and restoration, during the last five-and-twenty years.

In tracing the progress of church-extension in the erection of new churches, and the enlargement, and restoration of others, it may be well that our review should embrace a somewhat longer period.

In 1875 Lord Hampton presented to Parliament a return of monies expended upon the building, and restoration of cathedrals, and churches from the year 1840 to 1874 inclusive. From the summary of this Parliamentary statement, furnished in the "Official Year-Book," it will be seen that the sum of £25,548,703[1] was spent within the given period. In arriving

[1] "Official Year Book," 1884, p. 544.

at this result, however, no account was taken of work executed under a cost of less than £500, so that the total sum did not by any means fully represent the complete outlay; and it should be further remembered that a considerable number of parishes made no response to the inquiry.

In the absence of any machinery for systematically tabulating such results, it is not possible to state what has been spent since the year 1874 to the present time. An effort, however, was made last year, by the Official Year-Book Committee, to ascertain what sum had been expended during the year 1882 upon the building, enlargement, and restoration of churches, all amounts under £100 being excluded. The result of this inquiry, now given in detail, has established the fact that a sum considerably over a million (£1,061,602) was spent in the given year; and it must be allowed that such an outlay, representing a devout enthusiasm for the well-being and usefulness of the Church, is a very remarkable testimony to her activity, and to the hold which she still has upon the affections of the English people.

Passing from this general survey, it may be observed how readily each diocese is accepting the responsibility which the needs of a growing population thrusts upon it, by the efforts which it makes in every possible direction for the extension of the Church in its own peculiar localities.

Nowadays a Bishop happily has but to represent a clear case of need, and it finds, sooner or later, active and generous support. The Bishop of Rochester asked for £50,000 to erect ten additional churches in his diocese, and almost within one year the entire sum was contributed. The work of the Bishop of London's Fund, and that of the Bishop of Bedford, is too well known to need any comment. The Bishop of St. Albans' Fund raised and expended the sum of £15,000 last year, for church-extension in the densely populated district commonly known as "*London over the Border.*" The Bishop of Durham is obtaining the cordial support of the diocese in a new church-extension scheme. The Bishop of Newcastle has recently submitted to his diocese a proposal of a like kind, involving an estimated cost of £100,000, and in a comparatively short time £27,000 is contributed. The Bishop of Llandaff marks the commencement of his work, by making an urgent appeal to the Churchmen of his diocese, for funds to provide a large increase of church-accommodation. In six months, without any wide or general solicitation, twelve subscriptions of £1,000 each have been offered, eight more of £500, in addition to £5,000 more in smaller amounts.

Beyond these exceptional efforts to deal with more urgent wants, it should not be forgotten that every diocese has its own

Church-Extension Society, making grants to assist voluntary offerings of a more or less private character. The actual amount raised by any individual Society, in a particular year, may not seem large; but then it must be remembered that the very existence and object of the Society is a continual witness to the necessity of further efforts, and a very powerful influence in largely drawing forth the liberality of others in response to the claims which are continually brought before them. In illustrating this practical result, reference may be made, for instance, to the Diocese of Carlisle. In this case, the Diocesan Society raised £48,973 between the years 1862 and 1882, and was the means of eliciting during the same period a sum of £248,826 from public and private sources. The Diocese of Oxford, through its Church-Building Society, raised and expended the sum of £40,841 between the years 1847 and 1882, and this sum was responded to by voluntary offerings to the amount of £800,000. These are simple illustrations of exactly the same results produced in other dioceses.

Canon Sumner has recently compiled for the "Official Year-Book" a statement, representing the growth of church-extension in the Diocese of Winchester. From this Report we find that a total sum of £2,883,268 was spent during the years 1820 to 1882, and that this sum became the means of adding 309 entirely new churches to the diocese, not dealing at all with the matter of restoration. The progress of the Church in the Diocese of Chester is extremely interesting, as will be shown from the following extract from a Report very lately compiled by Canon Hume, of Liverpool:

About 1834 a great church-building revival took place in the Diocese of Chester. A Diocesan Society was founded, which is said to have been the first in England; at all events, it has probably greater results to show than any other. Bishop Sumner, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, was nineteen years and a half connected with the diocese; and during that period he consecrated an average of one church per month during the whole of his incumbency. On one occasion he consecrated ten new churches during ten consecutive days! The details of his work are as follows:

New churches consecrated, and new districts formed .	233
Additional accommodation, in sittings or kneelings . .	194,745
Increase of clergy	361
New Church of England schools added	671

The formation of New Districts, under the several Church Building Acts, affords a very clear proof of the unceasing efforts which are being made to secure the extension of the parochial system, and so to provide for careful and pastoral supervision.

In the year 1880, Sir John Mowbray moved for a return of

New Parishes constituted under the Church-Building Acts, from October, 1863, to 1880. The details of this return have been carefully summarized by the editor of the "Official Year-Book," and show how every diocese is more, or less sharing in the multiplied energy of this age.

The formation of so many parishes within a comparatively short period is significant, not only as pointing to the growth of the Church, but as affording some sure guarantee for the more permanent, and individual direction, and encouragement of that religious emotion, and enthusiasm, which is now so widely kindled by special agencies, both within, and without, the Church. The spiritual life of the people needs not only to be aroused, but maintained; this can alone be done by those who in pastoral work devote their lives to a personal care of individual souls, instructing them in the way of the Lord more perfectly, thus sealing and giving stability to feelings too apt so quickly to pass away.

It will not, indeed, be questioned that the secret of the Church's influence, and of her hold upon the people, lies in the existence, development, and faithful use of the parochial system. There are some who tell us that the system is breaking down, or that it is evidently weaker than in days past; but in the hope of showing that this is not so, the committee of the "Official Year-Book" has very wisely introduced a section illustrating the kind of work which is widely and continuously being carried out in town and country parishes alike.

Certain incumbents representing different schools of thought and practice in the Church were invited to describe in detail the work of their parishes throughout the past year, dealing briefly with all the agencies they were employing for the spiritual, moral, and temporal welfare of their flocks. The records given are deeply interesting, and bear witness to an activity and practical skill almost unheard of before, in bringing the influence of a higher life, fruitful in the spirit, and work of charity, to bear upon the wants of the people. A glance at the facts which have been recorded, must induce and strengthen the conviction, that the parochial system is gaining, rather than losing strength. Whilst we are referring to this subject, it will not be untimely to point out how largely the Church has happily ceased to receive injury, and suffer reproach, from a non-resident clergy. About three years ago a return was made to Parliament purporting to represent the facts with regard to the number of clergy holding benefices, but not personally serving the cures. When this return was made more widely known by insertion in the "Official Year-Book," its accuracy was immediately challenged by several of the Bishops and others in authority. Upon inquiry it was

found that in this Parliamentary paper every incumbent who was not actually living in the glebe-house, or who, from unavoidable circumstances, could not reside within the immediate limits of the parish, was returned as non-resident. Consequently the real facts were most seriously misrepresented, for by far the larger proportion of the clergy reported to be non-resident were living adjacent to their parishes, and actively serving their cures, though from the reasons given they were unable to reside upon the spot. The editor of the "Official Year-Book," by communication with the Diocesan Registrars, has corrected these statements, and the facts as they are now given may be relied upon.

From the corrections supplied by this table,[1] it is satisfactory to observe how comparatively few of the parochial clergy are now non-resident, in the sense of being personally unable to discharge the responsibilities of their cures, and that thus a reproach resting on the Church in former days, is now very generally removed.

A further opportunity will be afforded for dwelling upon other branches of Church work not yet touched upon. Enough, however, has been said to show that the Church of England is endeavouring devoutly, and prayerfully, to apply herself to the great responsibility of guiding the future destiny, and welfare of the English people under the light, and influence of the Gospel of Christ. There is naturally much to wish for, and still many defects to correct, but there are yet evident witnesses of the presence and favour of God working mightily through our Church, manifesting itself in a deepened sense of the solemnity of our trust, a more earnest devotion to work, a stronger faith, and courage in facing great difficulties threatening to impede our way, in a broader charity towards all who are striving, though by different means, to accomplish the highest ends, and in a fuller and clearer comprehension of wise, and practical methods for adapting the ministry of the Church to the peculiar wants of this generation.

ART. II.—SYMPATHY AS A QUALIFICATION IN WORK FOR CHRIST.[2]

IT is well for any man required to work, that he should realize his situation—stand and survey the field of his operations, know the resources on which he may draw, and understand

[1] "Official Year Book," 1884, p. 563.

[2] This paper with a few verbal alterations is the Charge delivered in St. Saviour's, Southwark, at the visitation of the clergy and churchwardens on the 15th of May, 1884.

the purposes for which his work ought to be done. And the Christian man needs specially to be wise and thoughtful. He is dealing with immortal souls, living amongst very precious opportunities, standing in prominent position while a great conflict is going on between truth and error, the Church and the world, Christ and the enemy of mankind. So he is bound to consider whether anything is to be found in himself to disqualify him for his work, to range against him any whom he ought to attract and influence for good, or to withhold from him the presence and the blessing of God, without which no real good can come. And the subject of human sympathy, Christian sympathy as a factor in Christian work, deserves attention, and the discussion of it may be helpful in this day of controversy and conflict amongst Christian men.

It may be stated thus: To feel "*as a man,*" is but part of that "simplicity and godly sincerity" which make a man natural, and secure for him at the hands of other men the ready acknowledgment that he is a true man, honestly expressing what he knows and feels to be true. There is a great charm in this transparency of Christian character. Men soon see the inner coruscations and flashings of the light divine, which mark the real gems formed in the laboratory of grace, made to adorn the Redeemer's crown. The man who only echoes the opinions and experiences of other men, cannot have the force and the fervour which belong to the originating mind. It is the experiencing heart which indicates the man who is an original in character and history, by reason of the mighty working of God's grace upon his own soul. And the world is keenly conscious of want of reality in any man who recommends what he has never tasted, and who pleads with others before he has become persuaded himself.

So also to "*feel for a man*" is an essential element in that outgoing unselfishness which characterizes the mission both of Christ and Christlike men. The primary idea of Christian work is that a man saved by grace has a world of happy enjoyment within, and a world of happy labour outside himself. It carries the notion of a brother pleading with sinners about God, and pleading with God about sinners; and men soon see the glow of a genuine love, heart-work yearning in pity, brimming full of zeal, forgetting self in thought about God and good.

But "to *feel with a man,*" taking a seat on his own level, looking with him from his own point of view, talking, feeling, acting as a brother who tries to understand before he undertakes to advise or help—this is what I mean by sympathy, this is what men may try to learn about, so that in their work they may be seen to be not servile, not severe, not selfish, but

men of a generous spirit, and of an honest endeavour to do their duty in the sight of God and men. It is on this point that I ask to be permitted to offer a thought or two for mutual edification.

There must be sympathy with the Master. Union with the Lord Jesus Christ, the result of Christ's grace and love towards us, is the secret of our Christianity. No man, in any saving sense, is a Christian without that. And communion with the Lord Jesus Christ; the expression and evidence of our gratitude and love towards Christ is the secret of our Christian work. No Christian man will be an efficient Christian worker without that. And that means not only the subjection of every thought to the obedience of Christ, and the consecration of every power to the service and the glory of Christ; but it means also the examination of every opportunity in the light of the mind of Christ, and from the standpoint of the purpose of Christ, and in the consciousness of the ever-present power of Christ. Faith projects a man's individuality into the presence of the Lord Jesus; and the man of God will "sit with Christ in heavenly places." It lifts the man up out of the region of the human, and sets him before the throne of the divine. The Christian refers every matter to Christ. He takes souls, questions, plans, purposes, obstacles, weaknesses, wants, weariness, and lays them before his Master. So he is in harmony with heaven, even while he is toiling, struggling, fainting, upon earth. The Saviour "went about doing good." He was "about His Father's business;" and the guiding principle of the saved sinner will be "to do good unto all men," and to "glorify God in our bodies and our spirits which are His." Christians are part of a great system, in which the Almighty is carrying out the purposes of His own will. And so long as they are in contact with, in sympathy with, the Lord Jesus Christ, they can not be slothful, need not be fearful; for to feel, and think, and walk, and work with our eye on the Master, and the Master's eye on us, is the thing which puts honour and power and pleasure into everything we do.

In like manner, for an efficient labour, *there must be sympathy with the souls of men.* Many an honest worker has failed from want of knowledge of the materials on which he has expended labour. We must study men, know them as they know themselves, see them when they put off the unrealities and externalisms which cause men to seem, but not to be, so much alike. Cases of conscience must be studied, and careful dissection of human character must come out of a trained skill. Symptoms and specifics are to be understood as part of the knowledge for a physician of soul as well as body. A diligent study of God's Word, so as to realize by its

sacred biography what the friends and enemies of God have been found to be in nature, and have been made to be under grace—this is a primary matter by which workers are educated for their labours among men. And the careful examination of our own souls, with all the evasions and concealments which may have beguiled ourselves and perplexed others, and the experience which a holy skill in dealing with different characters as the work amongst men opens out—such things need to be cultivated if we would be "wise to win souls." The Church requires the ripened wisdom of all earnest men; and "not a novice" becomes more and more a necessary feature in all who are to be "able ministers of the New Testament."

The subject branches out into wonderful varieties of thought and action; but each one should endeavour to enter into the interesting details. Take, for instance, the matter of sympathy with men in their doubts. It is not wise or right to class all doubters amongst disdainful opponents of Christ and His Church and Gospel. There are many honest minds in which a doubt is a torture, not a delight; and it is not enough to fulminate anathemas against such. The case is not to be met by the mere reiteration of our own beliefs. Men, when they are treated thus, feel themselves to be misunderstood and misjudged. The wise believer in Christ must conceal nothing, withdraw nothing, undervalue nothing, of that which God has taught by His Spirit and in His Word. But he must learn to sit down by the side of his perplexed brother, and try to get at the secret thing which interposes between his soul and Christ. There is a history in unbelief—sometimes in the harsher aspects of self-assertion and self-conceit—but at other times there is a touching sight of men who are drifting into the darkness out of the light, who yet are struggling to get into light out of darkness. And there is a kind of philosophy in unbelief, as when some dominant influences explain and account for the mental and moral obliquities under which men choose the evil and refuse the good. We all should seek to be well read in these records of the world of thought and conscience. For a wise word, well timed and well ordered, has often helped an anxious soul out of its difficulties. And an unskilful instructor, who shrinks from the closer contact, may miss the great opportunity out of which real victory often comes. Scepticism has gained credit for penetration, or power, or persuasiveness, because it has been ingeniously novel, or attractively daring, or loudly boastful, or persistently positive, about matters that are said to be certain, and can be shown to be fictitious and false. What the servants of Christ ought to show is, that they have considered the objections, and can hold up their heads in the presence of the most acute

opponents, because they have tried the truth and found it true—have met the difficulties and found them no hindrance to their own walk of faith. Then it will be found that, under the spell of a real sympathy, the inner humanities assert themselves; and people who looked stern, and seemed hard, and felt cold, are discovered to have more the spirit of friend than foe, more the character of an earnest thinker than of an ardent impugner of a truth, because it is too holy for a man to wish it to be true, seeing that his own life is a moral falsehood and an intellectual fraud.

In another direction the like value of Christian sympathy will be seen when men are dealing with a sinner in reference to his sin. There is a hard, rough hand which some have laid upon the ungodly, and it makes them shrink from the touch and turn round roughly in anger against the intrusion. That hand represents Law; and the soft hand represents Love. You will not force men into forgiveness. You must not represent the gospel of the grace of God as if its purpose was to crush and to condemn. The truth must be told that God hates sin, because His wisdom knows it to be injurious to man, as well as insulting to His own government, which is meant to be just and good. But God's love is to be the primary subject, love for the sinner whom He longs to welcome to the home of happiness, both as a son and as a saint. The world may cast out a reprobate; but the Church cannot. The Christian follows the wanderer, makes him the gracious offering of a present full salvation, points to the open door of hope and the broad thoroughfare of escape, and helps him to flee from the wrath to come, and lay hold on eternal life. A servant of God may be required to utter a sharp and severe rebuke; but he should let it be seen, by tone and manner, that it is a grief to him to do it; and that it is in very love that he must find fault. It is the fault-finding spirit which grates so harshly upon the soul. We need not upbraid a man who has long ago and often upbraided himself. If we have learned religion in the schools, we must practise it in the lanes and thoroughfares of life. If we have found good for our own souls in the closet, or in the sanctuary, we must take it with us to the housetop, and tell all whom we can reach that it is equally good for them. Sympathy with sinners in their sorrows, in their struggles, in their mistakes, in their failures, this must be an ever-present element in the work of any man who shall truly represent his Master, and rightly recommend His message.

There is another position from which this subject may be examined with peculiar interest now—*there must be sympathy with the truth as it is in Jesus.*

One of the very greatest dangers of the day is a modern dislike of doctrine. We are nothing if we have not some distinctive message to deliver, as God has given it, and because God has given it to us. "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?" We shall never convince others while we are not convinced ourselves. So it is essential to our Christian work that we have a very clear conviction about the Christian faith. To have only a half-hearted confidence in the trustworthiness of the written Word, will issue in our throwing little power into our use of "the sword of the Spirit." But to have full sympathy with the revelation given, fills a man with a holy enthusiasm, by which he works on and holds forth the living truth, which he does not question and cannot doubt.

And more than that; the members of our own Church of England, so worthy of our love, need to be conspicuous for loyalty and sympathy towards the testimony which their forefathers have left about the truth as it is in Jesus. Her articles and formularies are to be held most dear by all her servants and her children. Secret yearnings after some other community; hidden preferences for doings and thinkings which she has put aside; hesitation, when she has been plain-spoken; or tentative advance in directions which she has warned her followers to avoid, and to stand firm on the old ways—these will weaken work and deaden men's confidence in the workers. There is no unhallowed narrowness in our mother's counsels. There is no hazy uncertainty about her meaning in the documents she has put into the people's hands. In no section of the universal Church is legitimate freedom more conspicuous than with us; but in this age of controversy and change we are bound to be faithful, not to some mere opinion of our own, not to the cry of a party or the challenge of some leader among men, but to the natural, obvious, honest interpretation which our historical Church has given of the terms and conditions under which we hold membership or ministry in the Church of England section of the universal Church of Christ. Mind, conscience, heart, testimony must be in harmony with the written Word of God and the living Church of God, as both are faithfully explained and represented in the National Church to which it is our privilege to belong. If movement is needful, in the direction of new modes of thinking or acting, we must move as a body, with authority in front of us, as God by His grace and truth may lead us on. But unauthorized novelties, in whatever way they may take their course, are dangerous at all times, and full of danger now. We have to tell poor sinners how salvation is to be found; and it is a wise thing to put the simple truth first and foremost, leaving the disputed matters

to wait for their settlement after the salvation work has been advanced beyond the point at which souls come short of the glory of God. The business of us all, the business of the whole Church, in this age of ungodliness and ignorance of things divine, must be more and more of an evangelistic and missionary type. It is a time of ingathering into the Church of Christ, and the process of arrangement may be left for more peaceful days. And one great resolve should fill all men's souls, that they are to be out upon the mountains, seeking for the wanderers, bringing the wounded ones home into the fold.

And this leads to the last particular, viz, *there must be sympathy with others engaged in the same service.*

The great work of the Gospel runs through the ages, over the world, and unto all the races and generations of mankind. And narrowness, littleness, selfishness, accord but little with the genius and the scope of the work which Christians have in hand. In one age there may be differences among brethren, and difficulties or discouragements which seem to stop or shake their action. But sympathy puts a man in contact with all the ages. He distinguishes between the set of the stream and the seemingly contrary ripples upon its surface. The ebbing tide reminds him of the full flood which will come back to say that the sea is not going back from its victories. The Church of God is like one of our own grand old cathedrals, one building marked by the varied labours of many heads and hands. Individual Christians are grouped round their particular centres; but the grand fact is to be kept in mind that all the centres and their circles are parts of one system, of which the pivot is the Lord Jesus Christ. If we only think about congregational and parochial interests, and if the outer world sees that we are caring most about our own organizations and personal credit or influence, they will see that our work has a stunted appearance and a suspiciously selfish look. And so whatever binds us together in an outspoken manliness, both concerning truth and error, and with an honest tenderness for our Master's honour more than our individual credit—that should be constantly, conscientiously kept in mind. Sympathy with other minds, so that we may find out what they really think and mean—sympathy with other situations, so that we may take in the circumstances and surroundings which lead to decisions which we might never have taken—sympathy with motives which may be as pure as our own—such things are of primary importance, when men look one another in the face.

But if men will assume that all are dishonest who differ from themselves, that every system must be unreasonable

which they have not adopted, peace must depart and charity will be trodden under men's feet. And while the brethren bite and devour one another, the world looks coldly on, and men will say, "When Christians have settled their quarrels, and not before, we will proceed to a consideration of the claims of Christ." Let us all pray, and strive, and unite, so that every Christian man, ordained or unordained, may have more things in common—sympathy with the Saviour whose servants they all are—sympathy with souls, for which they can all care—sympathy with the Gospel, into which they are all bound to look—and sympathy in work, which is the honour, the privilege, the happiness of being employed, under grace, in leading other beings to God and glory everlasting. This vast South London of ours contains every element to keep us busy—size of population, sorrows, sins, enemies to all that is holy and true and good; and we, with our limited powers and shortening lifetime, must not turn our hands against the brethren, but lifting them up to our Father, and stretching them out to our poor perishing fellow-creatures all around, let us bear in mind that we never more truly represent our Master and His Gospel, than when we are working for peace, labouring out of love, turning the soft look and tone and temper to win one another's confidences, and calling out their sympathy by showing how much we feel.

JOHN RICHARDSON.

ART. III.—EMIGRATION AND THE POORER CLASSES.

1. *The Expansion of England.* Professor SEELEY. Macmillan and Co.
2. *Colonists' Handbooks.* Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
3. *State Emigration; a reply to Lord Derby.* Mr. ALFRED SIMMONS, 84, Palace Chambers, S.W.
4. *Why Sit we here till we Die?* The Report of East End Emigration Fund.
5. London Colonization Aid Society.
6. *Justice:* the Organ of the Social Democracy.

"HISTORY," says Professor Seeley, in his interesting and fascinating lectures—"history should pursue a practical object. That is, it should not merely gratify the reader's curiosity about the past, but modify his views of the present, and his forecast of the future. The interest of English history ought therefore to deepen steadily to the close, and, since the future grows out of the past, the history of the past of England ought to give rise to a prophecy concerning her future . . . The English State, then, in what direction, and towards what goal,

has that been advancing? The words which jump to our lips in answer are—Liberty, Democracy! They are words which want a great deal of defining . . . If we stand aloof a little, and follow with our eyes the progress of the English State, we shall be much more struck by another change, which is not only far greater, but even more conspicuous, though it has always been less discussed, partly because it has proceeded more gradually, partly because it excited less opposition. I mean the simple, obvious fact of the extension of the English name into other countries of the globe, the foundation of Greater Britain.

"There is something very characteristic" continues the Professor, "in the indifference which we show towards this mighty phenomenon of the diffusion of our race, and the expansion of our State. We seem, as it were, to have conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind. While we were doing it—that is, in the eighteenth century—we did not allow it to affect our imaginations, or in any degree to change our ways of thinking; nor have we even now ceased to think of ourselves as simply a race inhabiting an island off the northern coast of the Continent of Europe. We constantly betray by our mode of speech that we do not reckon the colonies as really belonging to us; thus, if we are asked what the English population is, it does not occur to us to reckon in the population of Canada and Australia."

These words are undeniably true. Even yet we scarcely understand the marvellous growth of our Colonial Empire. We have not yet ceased to regard our colonies as possessions which indeed we hold for the present, but may at any time lose; instead of looking upon them as integral portions of England, and as destined to occupy a very important place in the future history of our country.

There are two facts which have, perhaps, tended to make the public mind slow to recognise the value of our colonies. First, because the prodigious increase of our home population is comparatively modern, and we have hardly yet begun to realize its importance; nor has the question how far this increase may continue ever before pressed for an answer so urgently as it does to-day. Second, because it is only in recent times that the means of communication have been developed so as to bring the most remote parts of the empire within easy reach, and so as to open up enormous tracts of territory which had formerly been practically inaccessible even to the colonist. Home necessities had not been so urgent, and the boundless possibilities of our distant territories had not become familiar; and so the public interest had not been aroused, nor the public mind awakened.

We may hope, indeed, that this condition of ignorance and apathy is to a certain extent passing away; but if even amongst educated persons there has been hitherto no clear recognition of these facts, or of their importance, we can hardly be surprised at the absolute indifference which seems to pervade the working-classes upon the subject. And yet what facts could be more startling or more suggestive than these which Professor Seeley records—that there are nearly ten millions of English subjects of English blood, in British colonies and outside of England, and that this population, large as it is, is distributed over such an enormous area that in Canada, for instance, the density is not much more than one to the square mile, whereas in England it is two hundred and ninety-one to the square mile?

If anyone is inclined to ask what is the good of our colonies? surely facts like these supply the answer. To quote Professor Seeley once more: "They are lands for the landless, prosperity and wealth for those in straitened circumstances. This is a very simple view, and yet it is much overlooked, as if somehow it were too simple to be understood. History affords many examples of nations cramped for want of room; but we may be sure that never was any nation half so cramped in olden times as our nation is now. We continually speak of our country as crowded, and, since the rate of increase of population is tolerably constant, we sometimes ask with alarm, what will be its condition half a century hence? The territory is a fixed quantity, we have but 120,000 square miles; it is crowded already, and yet the population doubles in some seventy years. What will become of us? Now here is a curious example of our habit of leaving our colonial possessions out of account. What! our country is small? A poor 120,000 square miles? I find the fact to be very different. The territory governed by the Queen is of almost boundless extent. It may be that the mother-country of this great empire is crowded, but in order to relieve the pressure, it is not necessary to incur great risks, or undergo great hardships; it is only necessary to take possession of boundless territories in Canada, South Africa, or Australia, where already our language is spoken, our religion professed, and our laws established. If there is pauperism in Wiltshire and Dorsetshire, this is but complementary to unowned wealth in Australia; on the one side there are men without property, on the other there is property waiting for men. And yet we do not allow these two facts to come together in our minds, but brood anxiously, and almost despairingly, over the problem of pauperism; and when colonies are mentioned we ask, What is the good of colonies?"

It may be interesting to our readers if we try to answer this

question from the results of our own experience, and show how precious an inheritance to the poor of this country are the boundless fields and goodly lands belonging to England beyond the seas. Our practical acquaintance with this subject dates from that period of severe East-End distress which followed upon the visitation of cholera, and the financial crisis due to the failure of Messrs. Overend and Gurney, by which thousands of men were thrown out of employment. No one who had to pass through that experience is likely ever to forget it. Numbers of able-bodied men, labourers and mechanics, nominally at work in the stoneyard of the parish, which was not large enough to hold a tenth part of them, patrolled the principal streets day after day, with famine and despair written in every feature; for men out of work means starving families at home. The Board of Guardians were paralyzed, and no one seemed to know what ought to be done or could be done. Meetings of men were held to urge their need of help. Relief funds were established at the Mansion House and elsewhere; and thousands of pounds were expended by the benevolent public, in simply keeping away starvation from the unemployed.

It was at this period, in the spring of 1867, that the Emigration question came to the front. The writer well remembers how, at that time, a friend arrived in Poplar, with the proposal to send twenty single men to New South Wales, free, if they could be ready in a week. He went about from place to place where the unemployed were most likely to be found; but hardly expecting that he would be able to find any men willing to expatriate themselves at so short a notice. To his surprise, the men were found, the guardians saw them properly clothed, and they were despatched to seek their fortunes under happier circumstances. But from that moment our life became an intolerable burden. From early morning until late at night our house was besieged with would-be emigrants—to all of whom the answer must needs be given, that the means of emigration were exhausted. It was quite certain that a desire had been awakened, and it had been shown that there was no unwillingness on the part of the poor to be transported to the colonies. But this was by no means the only difficulty to be met. First, it must be ascertained whether the colonies would be willing to receive such emigrants. Boundless as the resources of the colonies appear to be, it must be remembered that any sudden strain or pressure might easily overtax the power of the machinery for the absorption and distribution of labour. Moreover, though most of the colonies have been ready to receive the emigrants who came at their own expense, it was quite another thing when emigrants were to be sent out

at the expense of the guardians or of charitable funds. What guarantee could the Colonial Government have that proper pains would be taken in the selection, and that they would not be flooded with the helpless refuse of London pauperism?

Then, again, suppose this difficulty overcome, would the emigrants whom East London could provide be of such a character as to do well in the colony? It was at least conceivable that a man who had been long accustomed to London work and town trades, could not be easily adapted to altered conditions of life in our colonies. And, as a matter of fact, there has been no objection more frequently urged against emigration than this. But at the period of which we are writing the objection was much more serious than it is now. Because, in the present day, we are able to show that hundreds and thousands of such persons have, as a matter of fact, been sent to the colonies, and in spite of the traditional helplessness of the London labourer—which, after all, is very little else than tradition and prejudice—have done well. But in those days the difficulty was a very serious one; there was very little in the way of experience to fall back upon, and it required a strong belief in one's fellow-men to enable one to disregard the very plausible objection, that for men like these it was impossible to succeed.

Lastly, there was the inevitable money difficulty. Even to Canada, the most available outlet, men could not be sent for nothing. An ordinary family, at the rate of £6 a head, would cost from £25 to £30; and how was this money to be procured? Obviously not from the candidates for emigration themselves. As a working-man wrote a few weeks ago, "If a man is in work, and has the few pounds necessary to go, he is inclined to let well alone. If he is out of work, he lingers too long, expecting that something will turn up. It is only when worn out and heart-sad with hunting about after bread and butter, he turns to the fields afar which he cannot reach." In truth, the advantages of emigration are so little appreciated by our working people, that, instead of pressing forward eagerly in times of prosperity, it is not until no other resource is left—not until every shilling has been spent, that he thinks of going away: and then of course he is helpless, and cannot move. As the Report of the East-End Emigration Fund rightly says, "A man does not seek the relief of emigration until every means has been tried—until the patience and hope of himself and his friends have been utterly exhausted—until funds and furniture and clothes, and everything that can be turned into food has been absorbed, and nothing is left but the hope of emigration or utter and absolute despair. This constitutes the real difficulty of the position; for men come to our funds as a last resort, when nothing else is left, and we are called

upon to meet the wants of the helpless and the destitute, to whom it is as hard to raise 30s. as to raise £30, both being equally impossible. At our last meeting, a bright and intelligent young man being told that we would provide half the fare for his family if he could raise £5 to pay the rest, said very simply, 'Ah, that is quite impossible. I have been out of work many weeks, and neither my family nor myself have had anything to eat all day!'"

But would not the colonies themselves assist? Yes, certainly; and in many of the colonies most liberal aid is given. But even with this aid the cost per head would seldom fall below the amount required for a passage to Canada, mentioned above. And where the colonies help, they very naturally exercise the privilege of selecting those whom they assist. It was hardly to be expected that, with all England before them, they should be driven to choose the helpless and hopeless London poor—that very class of emigrant which every colony affects to despise. The Boards of Guardians indeed were empowered to give liberal assistance towards pauper emigrants; and the Poor Law Board at that time was quite prepared to grant additional facilities for dealing with the question. But Boards of Guardians are not, as a rule, eager to spend money to such an extent as to affect the rates; and if they did, human nature is strong even in the Guardians of the Poor; and they would be pretty sure to select as their assisted emigrants, not the men who would be most likely to succeed in the colony, but the men of whom they were most anxious to be free, and would be glad never to see again. Now this is just the kind of emigrant which would be most unacceptable to the colony; and indeed any body of emigrants tainted with Poor Law assistance would be looked upon with so much suspicion that there would be every prospect of their failure. For no emigrant could hope to be really successful unless he were cordially welcomed and the arms of the colony thrown open to receive him.

Well then, if all these sources of assistance were closed, could our own Government do nothing? State-aided emigration is no new demand of to-day. Years ago there was an appeal made to the Government, and, curiously enough, it was to Mr. Gladstone that the deputation went, and upon Mr. Gladstone fell the duty of discouraging any hopes that might have been entertained that the State would interfere.

Driven back from all these possible sources of help, we had to rely upon the old-fashioned but simple method of a Committee and an appeal for charitable funds. The benevolent public liberally responded, and a very large sum in all was collected. From that time forward the work went on, and

most absorbing and engrossing work it was, until, after some four years, between 5,000 and 6,000 people in all had been assisted to the colonies, mainly to Canada; and it was proved to demonstration, beyond all possibility of dispute, that an East-End working-man was not the helpless creature that he had been painted. Rescued from his wretched surroundings, inspired with new hope, delivered from all fear of pauperism and distress, he became a new man—he rose to the possibilities of the situation before him, and lived to thrive and to be thankful for the change.

It would be a long tale if we were to attempt to tell half the interesting incidents of that eventful time. What Committees!—what discussions!—what objections!—what advice!—what pathetic stories of want and suffering!—what tearful partings!—what happy stories from the other side of the Atlantic!—what excitement and business! Our mind grows dizzy as we endeavour to recall all the experiences of one of the most active periods of a busy life.

The first work, of course, was to select the emigrants. How hard it was to make the choice! How difficult to resist the earnest entreaties of those who were thought ineligible! What a work to conduct the inquiries into character, and to supplement the deficiencies of wardrobe and to rigidly exclude the regular London idler, the drunkard, and the vagabond, who would not only do himself no good, but would do the cause of emigration great harm by the discredit which he would bring upon it! How hard to have to preach, again and again, the same old sermon: that emigration was of no use except to the sober and industrious, that England was the very best country in the world for the idle and the drunkard! There were two fundamental rules which helped us over many difficulties. First, that we would only send out families; not single men or single women, except with their parents—and not married men who wanted to go out beforehand and prepare the home for their families. More than once it happened that a young man who applied to be sent out, was found to possess a sweetheart whom he was unwilling to leave. As a single man he could not be assisted; but he had only to turn his sweetheart into a wife, and the two became a family eligible for aid. We believe that many a young couple obtained in this way a fair start in life which they would have had to wait many years to secure in England. The other invariable rule was that the representatives of the Canadian Government in England should see and approve every emigrant. This was a needful precaution, in order to save the Committee from any charge brought against us in Canada of carelessness in the selection, or of sweeping

off the refuse of the East-End. But even so, we did not altogether escape the effects of the extreme jealousy and suspicion of the Canadian officials. At one time a batch of emigrants, prepared to start, was suddenly stopped by the threat addressed to the ship-owners, that unless each was found with sufficient money on landing to proceed to his destination, the ship would not be allowed to land them. Happily, the Finance-Minister of Canada arrived in England just at this crisis, and, on his own personal responsibility, allowed the emigrants to proceed by a later ship.

Sometimes our perplexities were increased by the benevolent enthusiasm of the friends of emigration. On one occasion, on visiting the ship to despatch a party of emigrants, Mrs. Kitto was struck by the quiet and contented way in which the children of some cabin-passengers were playing with their toys. This was a striking contrast to the scene amongst the emigrants whose children, not being thus provided, and affected by the general excitement and turmoil at leaving and settling down, were fractious and crying and getting in everyone's way. Thereupon Mrs. Kitto wrote a short letter to the *Times*, relating the circumstance, and appealing for toys for the poor children of the emigrants. For days and weeks after, toys poured down upon us in a torrent. Everything that a child could want, and many things that no child could possibly need—old toys, broken and battered with long use; new toys, fresh from the warehouse; toys by post, toys by carrier, toys by railway—until at last the stream became so great that the Post-office had to send a special bag by special messenger to the Parsonage, and the Parcels-delivery a special van. The next ship despatched was well supplied with toys, and the effect was not a little curious. The children were contented enough. Every kind of unmusical instrument that a perverted ingenuity ever invented for the torture of mankind seemed to have been sent; and if the children were satisfied with the performance, the adults were driven to distraction with a noise, in comparison with which even bag-pipes would be melodious. How thankful we were that we had not to make the passage to Quebec in that ship!

All the while letters were coming back to the relatives of those first sent out, enough to make a working-man's mouth water:—"This is a good place for a man to live," wrote one; "there is no talk of hunger or want here. If you could by any means send John, I know that I could get him work. I am rather lonesome without anyone belonging to me; but I have no thoughts of London, and I would like to have all my friends out of it. I am quite a different man to what I was when I left England." Another writes: "Sam is working in a tan-

yard, earning 6 dollars a week. We had a bad winter here, but we were not cold or hungry; we had plenty to eat and drink, and a good fire. There is a great prospect of work here, and I would want you and your three boys out here if you can come yourself: or if you can't, I hope I will soon be able to send for you." Another writes: "I started to work the Monday after I arrived, and have been to work ever since, earning 2½ dollars a day. It costs us from 7 to 8 dollars a week to live; and one of the little ones said, the other day, 'Why, mother, we have Sunday dinners every day here!'" Again:

> Some part of the winter I have been chopping wood, but, thank God, we have not wanted for any one thing. I have now in the house three or four bushels of potatoes, and a sack of flour, and 38 lb. of pork, so you see we do not want. I only wish you were here to help us eat it.
>
> I had only been in Toronto four hours before I got a job at 5s. a day. I thought that pretty good for a start; now I get 6s. a day. There is plenty of work for carpenters; bricklayers are getting 10s. a day; stonemasons, blacksmiths, all are wanted. The greatest demand is for farm-labourers; but anyone can get work, and I have not seen a beggar since I have been here.

These few extracts will suffice to show that one important object of the emigration was successfully accomplished, and that men were removed from a state of forlorn and hopeless misery in the East-End of London, to a condition of content and prosperity in Canada.

We do not pretend to say that this emigration was carried out on a scale sufficiently large to produce any material influence upon the labour-market of this country, or to solve the problem presented by the enormous increase of our town population: but it was enough to show (1) that there was abundant room in Canada for all whom we might be able to send; (2) that the ordinary East London working-man was not hopelessly unfitted for colonial life; and (3) that emigration is an effectual means of relief for the unemployed poor of our own country. And this experience of former years has an important bearing upon the difficulties of the present day. At that time the distress was purely local, and due in great measure to local circumstances. Universal testimony goes to show that at the present time there is a widespread distress due to the long-continued depression throughout the country, in agriculture and in trade. Now, it is notorious that in the agricultural districts the tendency of population is to diminish rather than to increase, and the result is that the whole of the enormous growth of our home-population is concentrated in the towns. This, perhaps, would be no great matter for regret if the trade of this country increased in proportion; but as Lord Derby correctly says: "The volume of our capital and our business does not increase correspondingly with the popu-

lation."[1] The consequence is, that the wave of depression which is affecting so largely the interests of our country has fallen like a blight upon many amongst the working-classes; and again the question of emigration becomes a prominent one as of old.

In many respects, however, the prospect at the present time is even more promising than it was fifteen or eighteen years ago. At that time the great North-West Manitoba—the Land of Promise, as it has been called—had not been opened to colonial enterprise. Now, the railway across the continent is making rapid progress, and is every day stretching out to districts which were before practically inaccessible. For all men who have been engaged in agriculture, and who are prepared to endure the inevitable roughnesses of a new country and the length of a Canadian winter, the prospect seems most inviting; but we have never recommended men from our East London emigrants who have families to venture so far, but have rather sought to supply the labour-market of the nearer Canadian provinces, which have themselves been greatly depleted by the rush to the North-West.

Then, again, in the present day, information about the colonies is much more easily obtained and much more widely diffused. In addition to the information supplied by the various colonial agents and by the land companies, much of which may perhaps be regarded with a certain amount of suspicion, as coming from those who are interested parties, the Christian Knowledge Society has done a good work in publishing a series of small handbooks, giving an immense amount of most valuable and reliable information at the smallest possible cost. No one ought to go to any of the colonies without being supplied with this easy guide. In addition to other useful information, the clergy will find lists of their brethren in the various colonies to whom emigrants may be commended for pastoral oversight and guidance.

And once more, the facilities for reaching the colonies are greatly increased. The Canadian Government at this day is fully alive to the importance of the question, and is giving not only counsel and advice, but pecuniary assistance, so that the actual cost of transit from London to Quebec is not more than £3 or £3 10s. to selected applicants. It is marvellous that it should be possible to accomplish so much at so small a cost. We believe, also, that there is even a warmer welcome accorded to emigrants now, and that the machinery of the Government in Canada works much more smoothly. The agents at the ports of arrival are always ready to give advice and counsel

[1] "State Emigration," p. 6.

and assistance to the new arrivals. The East-End Emigration Fund is in most cordial relations with the Canadian authorities both in England and in the colony. This fund is to some extent a revival of the work of fifteen years ago, although, alas! on a much smaller scale. During last year about 500 persons in all were sent away by its aid, and it has already despatched a considerable number during the present spring. It is very wonderful how history repeats itself. The letters now received are almost a counterpart of those sent years ago. Take the following from the Report, as an example:

> Canada is bright, and there is plenty of work if you want it, at good wages. I myself got work at my own trade the same morning I landed, and I could have got two other jobs if I had a mind to take them. If you know anyone that thinks of coming out, tell them not to fear, for there is plenty of work; and what will there be in the summer, and at good money too! I am having 18 cents an hour, and that's in the winter, and the work is not harder here than it is in the old country, for I have not worked so hard yet.

Every Thursday evening a meeting of would-be emigrants is held at Mr. Charrington's Hall, in the Mile-End Road, which he has kindly placed at the disposal of the committee, and information is given to all comers by gentlemen who are skilled in the work. Very interesting meetings these are, and most important as tending to remove many of the prejudices which lie in the path.

When some relative brings a letter from a settled emigrant, and such experiences as those recounted above are read out to the assembly, what an eager, hungry look of longing passes over the faces of the hearers, so many of whom are having hard times enough here at home!

"But surely it is a very foolish thing to make efforts like these, in order to send out the strength and wealth of the country?" we can fancy someone ask. "Surely it is a very short-sighted policy to send away our best workmen, who before long will be wanted here, as soon as trade revives!" The friends of emigration are impaled upon the horns of a dilemma. Either they are sending out the poorest and the most helpless and incapable, and, if so, the emigrants will be of no use in the colony, or they are helping the sober and the honest and the industrious, and in that case they are robbing the mother-country of the sinews of its strength.

The answer, of course, is obvious. We do not desire to advise the emigration of the helpless and incapable, unless there is some evidence to show that this condition arises only from the pressure of outward circumstances, and not from the deficiencies of a deteriorated and worthless moral character. And as to sending out the best workmen, it is only in very

rare instances that the best workmen will wish to go. Whatever be the condition of the labour-market at home, the best men are almost certain to secure employment; and that being so, the pressure of need does not stimulate the desire for emigration. And if they do go, they do not obtain or require assistance from charitable funds. But, if a man is unemployed he is a hindrance instead of a help to the community in which he lives. No idle man, whether his idleness is voluntary or enforced, can be a useful member of society. Under the paralyzing influence of idleness a man degenerates in character and becomes a learner in the school which leads to pauperism and crime. Remove the man to the colony in which his energies can be employed, and he becomes a producer as well as a consumer; and under the healthy and wholesome influence of work, his whole material position and moral character improve. Can this process be fairly called in question as enriching the colony at the expense of the mother-country? If England sends out to the most distant parts of the world those of her sons whom she cannot profitably employ at home, is not England the richer for the change? And, after all, are we to regard the colonies as though they were aliens in race and opposed in interest? Are they not an integral part of the same great empire to which we all belong? Surely it is the most mischievous policy to urge that we ought to keep men idling, starving, degenerating here, in the hope that at some future time there may be a chance of temporary employment! It is impossible to deny the force of the appeal which Mr. A. Simmons makes.[1] "Here," he says, "are thousands of idle hands. There, are millions of acres of fertile but idle lands. The two pant to be brought into association; but an ocean divides them. We have the money; we have the ships: we have all the machinery and power necessary; but we decline to use or apply them. The unemployed and the helpless declare that they want to go. Our retort is, that we may want them here. So here they remain, in their squalor and rags and misery—in case 'we may want them.' We have great and glorious possessions abroad; but instead of peopling them and creating fresh markets for ourselves, we coop up our surplus population in idleness, and set off to build better houses for poor souls who cannot go to live in them, because their pockets are empty. We can all sympathize with and help in the cry for the better housing of the poor; but at the best that is a partial remedy. Emigration provides a permanent and complete escape from poverty for those who accept it. It is a boon to those who go, a benefit to those who stay at

[1] "State Aid Emigration," p. 16.

home, and an advantage to the colonies where they are received. Conducted on a State-directed, joint home and colonial footing, it will assist in welding together more firmly the interests and affections of the people in the different sections of the empire. All this is admitted, but the help necessary to secure so much positive good is withheld. As one who is intimately acquainted with the feelings and sentiments of the poorest classes, both in London and in the provinces, I emphatically assert that help cannot be withheld much longer without creating a serious danger to the community."

We have only space very briefly to refer to the determined opposition shown to the cause of emigration by the "Democratic Federation for the Nationalization of Land." Agents from this society have thought it worth while to attend emigration meetings in order to disturb them, and to air their peculiar opinions.

"Why should the working-classes be driven to emigration?" cried one so-called working-man. "Why don't you send out the useless and idle classes above the working-men? Why don't you send out the bishops?" with a very pointed look at the chairman, who happened to be a clergyman. The answer was easy, and was promptly given: "Our aim is only to try to assist those who want to emigrate, and who cannot move from want of funds. As for the bishops, when they apply for assistance we shall be prepared to consider the application; but so far as we know, no one amongst them has applied." *Justice*, the organ of this federation, has an extraordinary article intended to show that the energy shown in the work of emigration is part of a subtle scheme on the part of land speculators to increase the value of land in Canada at the expense of this country, and speaks of the attitude of the clergy in the following terms:[1]

> The position taken up by the clergy on this question, more particularly those of the Established Church, is one open to the severest censure. As a body, they have made common cause with the confiscating classes against the national rights of their oppressed fellow-citizens. Before the tyrants they are dumb, whilst what influence they possess is used to benumb the senses of the unfortunate victims of our social and political slavery.

Perhaps when the Democratic Federation has succeeded in abolishing the landlords and the capitalists, and the bishops and the clergy, and has accomplished its object in the nationalization of land, it may also be successful in making this island bigger, or its population smaller. In the meantime, there is no reason to suppose that there will be any lack of

[1] *Justice*, April 5, 1884.

willing applicants who are ready to take the chance of success in the colonies rather than wait here while the Democratic Federation is putting the world straight generally, and carrying out schemes of which, after all, it must be allowed, that no one can tell how they will answer until they have been tried.

Let the generous British public be assured that no greater boon can be conferred upon the community, or upon the individual, than to enable him to change despair into hope, and poverty for the promise of plenty; and however large may be the extent of British benevolence, we will undertake to say that it will not be large enough to meet the urgent necessities of the case, or to fulfil the desires of every would-be emigrant.

JOHN F. KITTO.

ART. IV.—THE EXTENDED DIACONATE.

THE Reverend Canon Garratt has written to us as follows:

Those who have desired to see the Diaconate, the first of the three Orders which arose in the Church, made once again a reality, cannot feel too thankful for the resolution proposed by the Bishop of Winchester, and carried unanimously in the Upper House of the Southern Convocation, and agreed to by the Convocation of the Northern Province, which affirms the whole principle contended for. What remains now is the carrying out that principle into practice.

It is well to consider some of those difficulties which naturally present themselves to thoughtful minds. That in every plan affecting the Ministry there will be difficulties is inevitable; and all that can reasonably be expected is the proof that the difficulties created by a change will not be greater than those which actually exist, or will be compensated by the advantages to be gained.

The first difficulty which presents itself is this: A considerable number of Deacons will, in all probability, find themselves, after being ordained, unsuited to the work, and, not being dependent on it for subsistence, will relinquish it. But "the history and habit and fixed ideas of the Church," as it is well expressed by Canon Bernard, in the last number of THE CHURCHMAN, preclude the laying aside the office. Now, I do not think it necessary to enter on the question of the indelibility of Holy Orders, in order to solve the difficulty. I will assume that the Deacon "has received the character for life." Surely it does not follow from that that it is either right or wise to compel him, by making it his only means of subsistence, to the actual exercise of an office for which he finds himself unfit. So far from the facility with which a self-supporting Deacon can cease from the exercise of his office being an objection to the scheme, it seems to me one of its greatest advantages. Deeply as we may regret that one who has put his hand to the plough should look back, and whatever may be the personal injury to his own spiritual interests of such a step, surely, since he is "not fit for the kingdom of God"—that is, for carrying on God's work in the office he has undertaken—it is reason for thankfulness that his worldly interests do not make his exercise of it a

necessity. And if the principle should be, as I think it ought to be, fully carried out, and the "title" to ordination as Deacon should, in all cases, be the means of self-support, instead of, as it is now, an ecclesiastical stipend, the result would be that no one would be compelled to exercise his office as a Deacon, or go on to the Presbyterate, in order to earn a living. The Jewish priest, though he could not, being descended from Aaron, cease being a priest, need not exercise his office. The worst indignity that could befall him was having through poverty to say, "Put me into one of the Priests' offices that I may eat a piece of bread." The Jewish Rabbi, in our Lord's time, that he might not be dependent on the goodwill of his disciples, and might be prepared for all emergencies, had to learn a trade, the benefit of which regulation St. Paul experienced at Corinth. It is strange that any fixed idea in the Church as to the indelibility of Deacon's Orders, however true, should make it necessary for a Deacon who is unfit for ministerial work to continue to exercise his office, or be ordained Presbyter. That was not true either of the Jewish Priest or Jewish Rabbi. Yet such is the difficulty which besets our present plan, and would be removed by that proposed.

This leads us to another objection—the increased responsibility supposed to be thrown on the Bishops. If the increased responsibility is that of superintending a larger body of clergy, it is surely the very increase of responsibility which every Bishop must be longing for. It may, as has been well said, afford fresh work of the greatest importance for Archdeacons. At all events, it is to the Bishop only like the added responsibility to a general of being supplied with a larger army. But if by the added responsibility is meant a greater difficulty in the matter of ordination, except so far as the mere question of added numbers is concerned in which increased responsibility is clear gain, the objection is far greater on the present system than it would be if the Diaconate were extended. For in the first place, as far as the ordination of Deacons is concerned, it would surely be a diminution of actual responsibility that the ordination should not carry with it temporal consequences, and should therefore be really a probation for higher orders, and capable, I do not say of abrogation, for I express no opinion as to the theoretical indelibility of orders, but of practical relinquishment in case of unfitness. And with respect to the ordination of Priests, it would enable a Bishop to dismiss altogether the embarrassing question which must now continually occur, how far it is right or just to withhold from a Deacon, who has, by being ordained, shut himself out from nearly every other path in life, that further ordination which is necessary almost to his own subsistence, and certainly to that of a wife and children. It was doubtless the consciousness of this difficulty which made Bishop Blomfield stern in requiring Deacons to proceed to the order of Presbyter at the close of their first year. Feeling that he had no moral right, and perhaps no legal power to shut the door upon a candidate, sufficiently learned, unexceptionally moral, not accused of heresy, and yet possibly utterly unsuited, by inconsistent tastes and temperament and by a want of spiritual qualifications, for the highest of all work, it was his natural desire to avoid as much as possible a lengthened probation which could have but one result. I believe the fear has been felt, if not expressed, that the supposed legal difficulty to which I have purposely only alluded might be aggravated, or the chance of its occurrence be increased, by an increased number of Deacons. It would be so, things remaining as they are; but it would be absolutely removed because the ground of it would cease if the being ordained Priest were not under ordinary circumstances, in a temporal point of view, beneficial; and therefore the ordination, being a merely spiritual advancement, not a matter into which secular courts could intrude. In every point of view, except

that of numbers, which is, of course, the very thing to be desired, the Extended Diaconate would diminish embarrassing questions, and that responsibility arising from a conflict between what is morally just and what is for the good of souls, which cannot but now weigh heavily on the Bishop. I can conceive nothing more embarrassing to a conscientious mind than having to require a probation which is not a real probation, and a second examination which can practically have in the end but one result. And all this would be avoided.

The most serious objection, if it were a valid one, is the fear that it may diminish the standard of qualifications for the Priesthood. It appears to me that the result would be the very opposite. In the first place, the necessity for a great enlargement of the Presbyterate would be avoided. The single Presbyter would be able, assisted by numerous Deacons, to extend his work over a larger area and a greater population. And it is evident that the smaller the number of Presbyters, compared with that of Deacons, the more easy would it be to keep up or even greatly raise the standard of requirements. The same result would follow from the fact that the Deacon would be more likely to be a loser temporally than a gainer by entering a higher Ministry. I apprehend that there would be very few Presbyter-Curates. The Deacon would not be ordained Presbyter until about to become the Incumbent of a parish, and even then most likely with a loss of income.

It would be easier than it is now to insist on higher qualifications when refusal to ordain inflicted no temporal loss, and when not to be ordained Priest out of a large number of Deacons would be no more remarkable than not to be consecrated Bishop out of a large number of Priests. The whole of a man's qualifications would be well known; and even before a formal examination, his learning, his aptness to teach, his power of preaching, his moral and spiritual character, would all be open to observation. And if the Archdeacon had committed to him by the Bishop a special oversight of Deacons, he would be able, with much more satisfaction than can often be possible at present, to answer the solemn words addressed to him at the Ordination of Priests. There would then be a singular appropriateness in the form prescribed for the presentation of the candidate by the Archdeacon. He is instructed to present them in these words: "Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons present to be admitted to the order of Priesthood." The Bishop says: "Take heed that the persons whom ye present unto us be apt and meet, for their learning and godly conversation, to exercise their ministry duly, to the honour of God and the edifying of His Church." To which the Archdeacon is directed to answer, "I have inquired of them, and also examined them, and think them so to be."

But if the plan is to be a success, it is absolutely necessary that it should have free play. It will not succeed if it is introduced piecemeal, or subject to legal restrictions affecting certain classes of society. The removal of the present disabilities, which would prevent the very men we most want to see ordained Deacons from undertaking the office, is a prior condition to any successful putting in practice of the great principle affirmed by the whole Episcopate. Nothing is so urgent at the present moment as the formation of a society or committee, composed of men of all parties in the Church, agreed on this subject, for obtaining the removal of these disabilities, and bringing the subject before the laity, a large proportion of whom have never heard of the scheme or have an imperfect acquaintance with its purpose. I know that this is the opinion of such men as Canon Jackson of Leeds, the father, it may be said, of the movement. I believe that in the north something of this kind is being done. But unless those interested in the matter in the south bestir themselves,

the greatest opportunity for giving a fresh life to our ecclesiastical arrangements perhaps ever granted us will pass away—the lost high-tide will ebb, and possibly never flow again while we can use it.

SAMUEL GARRATT.

Ipswich, June 2nd.

ART. V.—"THE DOCTRINE OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES."

FROM the Reverend Alfred Plummer, D.D., Master of University College, Durham, we have received the following note on "The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles:"

Writer after writer on this most interesting document, which is perhaps the greatest windfall that the Christian scholar has been blessed with during the present generation, has declared that it contains little or no trace of any knowledge of the writings of St. John. Thus Professor Wordsworth, in the welcome paper in which he introduced the work to many Englishmen in the *Guardian* of March 19, 1884, concludes his paper by discussing the probable place and date of the treatise. On the former point he says: "Northern Syria and proconsular Asia both seem to be excluded by the less developed character of the ministry as here described, and *the absence of any clear traces of the teaching of St. John.*" Archdeacon Farrar, in the *Expositor* for May (p. 378), writes: "There is almost as total an absence of the technical terms of Pauline as of *Johannine theology.*" And again (p. 392): "There is no decisive reference to St. Mark or to *any of the writings* of St. John." A reviewer in the *Record*, quoted in the *Durham Diocesan Magazine* for June, expresses a similar opinion: "We have no decisive references to the Pauline or *Johannine writings;*" but with more qualification than the writers previously quoted, he adds that "there are not wanting interesting coincidences with the language of both." The object of the present note is to show that the coincidences with the writings of St. John are such as to render it probable that the author or compiler of this treatise had either directly or indirectly a knowledge of those writings or of the oral teaching of the Apostle.

Professor Swainson, in one of the earliest notices of the document which appeared in England (letter in THE CHURCHMAN, dated February 23rd), expresses no opinion on this point. In the more complete account of the treatise which is expected, will appear (it may be hoped) an estimate of the evidence now offered for consideration. So far as the present writer is aware, the first notice of the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles" in England was from the pen of the Rev. A. Robertson, Principal of Hatfield Hall, in the *Durham University Journal* of February; and that also leaves this point untouched.

In chapter X., in speaking of the Eucharist, the "Doctrine" states as follows: "And after the reception (*τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι*) thus give thanks: "*We give thanks to Thee, Holy Father, for Thy Holy Name.*" (1) The address "Holy Father" (*Πάτερ ἅγιε*) occurs John xvii. 11, in Christ's Eucharistic Prayer, and nowhere else in the New Testament. The passage goes on: "*for Thy Holy Name, which Thou hast enshrined in our hearts.*" (2) The word for "enshrined" (*κατεσκήνωσας*) literally means "madest to tabernacle," and possibly may be a reminiscence of John i. 14, "tabernacled among us" (*ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν*). Compare Rev. vii. 15; xxi. 3. More probably, however, the thought of the Divine Name being enshrined in the heart at the reception of the heavenly feast is suggested

by Rev. ii. 17: "To him will I give of the hidden manna, and I will give him a white stone, and upon the stone a new name written."

A few lines further on in this chapter we have: "*Thou, Master Almighty, didst create all things.*" (3) With the exception of the quotation from the LXX. in 2 Cor. vi. 18, the epithet "Almighty" or "All-sovereign" (*παντοκράτωρ*) occurs only in the Apocalypse, and there nine times. No doubt such an epithet would, at an early period, become one of general use in the Church; but if this treatise was written in the first century, and possibly while St. John was still alive (as there is good reason for believing), then there is no improbability in supposing that the source of the epithet in this case is the Apocalypse. And for "Master" (*δεσπότης*) compare Rev. vi. 10.

Again, in the same chapter, we read: "*Remember, O Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it with Thy love.*" (4) These last words (*τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου*) look very like a reproduction of 1 John iv. 18: "He that feareth is not made perfect in love" (*οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ*).

A few lines further on we have, "*Let grace come, and let this world pass away.*" (5) This latter petition (*παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος*) will remind everyone of 1 John ii. 17: "And the world is passing away" (*καὶ ὁ κόσμος παράγεται*). Comp. 1 Cor. vii. 31.

This act of thanksgiving concludes thus: "*If any be holy, let him come: if he be not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen.*" (6) This looks like a combination of Rev. xxii. 11 with Rev. xxii. 17. "*He that is holy*, let him be made holy still" with "He that is athirst, *let him come.*"

Early in the next chapter we have: "But if the teacher himself turn and teach another doctrine to destroy this, hearken not unto him." (7) This is almost identical in meaning with 2 John 10: "If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this doctrine, receive him not into your house;" and the *διδάσκῃ ἄλλην διδαχήν* of the one passage is not very far off from the *ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει* of the other.

A little further on we have what looks like another echo of the First Epistle of St. John: "But every proved and true prophet" (*πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δεδοκιμασμένος, ἀληθινός*). (8) With this, comp. 1 John iv. 1: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits" (*δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα*). And the word for "true," or "genuine," is one of which St. John is specially fond, as in "the true Bread," "the true Vine," "the true Light," etc.

In Chapter xiv. we have (9) for "Lord's Day" the very word which is used Rev. i. 10 (*κυριακή*) and (excepting 1 Cor. xi. 20) nowhere else in the New Testament. But here *κυριακή* is already a substantive.

Perhaps not one of these nine examples can be called decisive, although the fourth is so close as to be probable. But taken together they establish good reason for believing that the writer of the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles" was acquainted with the teaching of St. John, either oral or written.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

ART. VI.—SION COLLEGE, LONDON.

THE civic area of London is becoming more and more a mere site for the "plant" of mercantile machinery, or a vast warren of warehouses and offices. The demand for these is so eager as to elbow everything else off the ground. Thus the

descendants of those sturdy citizens who shouted "To your tents, O Israel" in the ears of King Charles, and "High Church and Sacheverell" in those of Queen Anne, now live (with probably mitigated sentiments) in expensive villas many miles away from the starting-point and terminus of John Gilpin's famous ride. The very churches which remain have not an inch of margin left them anywhere, and stand at anything but ease amid the collision of ponderous vans and loaded omnibuses; and their stones must echo the *stantis convicia mandræ* from without much oftener than the tones of prayer or voice of preacher from within. Thus Sion College, it seems, has given notice that it is about to quit, to sell off its site, and as soon as Parliamentary preliminaries can be adjusted, which, to be sure, leaves a sufficient margin for very leisurely preparation, to soar away to a new site on the Thames Embankment.[1]

This valuable institution, to which the admirers of its past usefulness may well wish a long lease of improved efficiency and enhanced interest, has the name of a "college," but is, in fact, as its latest historian, the present librarian, explains, nothing else but a civic guild, or, as known to modern speech, a "City company;" not of merchants, however—unless of such as "buy the truth and sell it not," but of clergy. The term *collegium*, applicable in its classic sense to any corporation, may indeed cover both. Its founder was a certain Dr. Thomas White, who, subsequently a divine of large preferments and bounteous heart, was a freshman at Oxford when the College of St. John Baptist therein, then newly founded by another (Sir) "Thomas White"—for the name has left its mark on our collegiate institutions[2]—had just completed its first decade of existence in 1566. Its members were originally the clergy of the City and suburban parishes, and are now all those of the vastly more numerous parishes into which those suburbs have been broken up. Founded in 1626, it has thus

[1] While this is passing through the press a notice reaches the writer that the farewell meeting within the walls of the present Sion College has been advertised.

[2] It is a curious question whether the two men of the same name and surname, as given above, "Thomas White" or "Whyte," were allied by blood. Sir Thomas founded St. John's College, Oxford, with the larger share of the benefits of its foundation reserved to Merchant Taylors' School, which he, as a member of the Court of that company, helped to found shortly after; but he reserved also a small share of those benefits for the Bristol Grammar School. *Dr.* Thomas founded a hospital at Bristol, gave the appointment of a large number of the Sion College almsmen to the Merchant Taylors' Company, and when founding a Professorship at Oxford, made the President of Sir Thomas' foundation, viz. St John's College, one of the electors to it. These strong mutual sympathies suggest a closer tie, which the identity of name somewhat strengthens; but there is no conclusive evidence.

more than completed two and a half centuries without changing its original seat, or the character and uses of its trust. To it, however, the founder annexed an almshouse, the site of which knows it no more. The intense fixedness of the Church and her ministers, their pursuits and occupations, while everything changes in this versatile world about them, is aptly illustrated by the history of the sister institution. Though "the poor never cease out of the land," they seem to cease from out of the City of London. The almsmen of Dr. White's foundation were to be chosen from a City company, from two City parishes, and from one other in Bristol, the founder's birthplace. After dragging on for two centuries and a half in indigence and discomfort, which sometimes closely bordered on, or even touched, actual starvation, the last generation of almsmen found a release from intramural durance. The discipline which the founder had projected had long become impossible, the objects of his bounty "were left in ever-growing isolation" by "the whole population of the City, poor as well as rich, drifting away into the suburbs;" while they stood some chance of being gradually buried alive, since the deposit of external artificial soil which traffic ever goes on piling up, had sunk the floor of their cells three or four feet below the pavement-level of the adjacent streets. Besides which, the cells of twenty infirm and mostly aged men, ranged, as they for a long time were, below the library, were a standing danger to its valuable treasures. So miserable was the entire pittance which the founder's bounty was able to afford, that they constantly became chargeable to their respective parishes for the bare necessaries of life. In one instance, all provision actually failed, and in December, 1743, one of them was found starved to death in his room. To the present librarian belongs the credit, when President of the College, of carrying through a humane scheme of improvement, although involving the local abandonment of the original design. By this the almsmen were allowed to live on pensions among their own friends and relatives; and, once the site surrendered, a vast accession to the fund for their maintenance was by its "unearned increment" of value immediately secured. Their number, accordingly, is now doubled, and instead of a wretched lodging and a pittance of £3 or £4 annually, each enjoys freedom and about £35 a year.

A few words regarding the founder may here be allowed. Born, as above stated, at Bristol, but of a Bedfordshire family, and reared at Oxford, he became a noted preacher, when the "pulpit drum ecclesiastic" was an instrument relatively of greater energy and effectiveness than it has ever been since. Having become a City incumbent, Prebend of St. Paul's and

Canon of Oxford, and shortly after of Windsor, he must be allowed a "pluralist" in a rather strong sense of the word. It does not appear that he was ever married; and as he founded, besides Sion College, the Temple Hospital in his native city, a Lectureship of Divinity at St. Paul's Cathedral, and another of Moral Philosophy at Oxford, we may assume that the bulk of his property, whether inherited or accumulated from the above benefices, went in these benefactions. Thus he returned amply in charity what he took in revenue, and if all or most pluralists had been like him, the sect might have flourished in honour to this day. In 1877 the tardy justice of a monument was rendered to his memory by a tablet with medallion portrait in the church of St. Dunstan in the West, of which he was some time vicar. His object in founding Sion College was no doubt to give a rallying-point to clerical opinion, and some concentration to the lawful influence of the clergy of the diocese in Church government. Probably he may have regarded with distrust the extent to which "prelacy" had extinguished their rights, and have sought to provide some fulcrum of resistance to its excesses. At any rate, he made the Bishop of London visitor of the College—a clear proof that he did not side with the powerful current then running (1626) towards the overthrow of Episcopacy. At the same time, by thus organizing the leading clergy of the diocese into a guild, he enabled them to support their bishop more effectually in things lawful, while he provided also the opportunity of making their voice heard in diocesan administration; and, thus benefiting by his bounty, they were to be at the same time his almoners for the poorer folk of the alms-house attached.

The analogy to a guild is closely traceable in the officers of the College, a president, two deans, and four assistants, corresponding to the master, wardens, and court of assistants in several civic companies, *e.g.*, that of Merchant Taylors, with which Dr. Thomas White seems to have had close relations. The "fellows" of the College, being London incumbents, are its liverymen, while the freemen are represented by the lecturers and curates, and the former by free vote elect the aforesaid officers annually; and, once elected, these govern without control or appeal, unless to the visitor. This supremacy, disputed in 1855, was then settled absolutely in their favour by the late Bishop Blomfield, aided by counsel's opinion, and has since been unquestioned.

To form the clergy of London into a corporation of this kind was indeed to follow the lead of those to whom they had been in things ecclesiastical accustomed to give it, viz., the parish clerks. These last had had their guild ever since the seventeenth year of King Henry III., and were reincorporated

by Royal Charter under Charles I., with charge of reporting all christenings and burials, and with a printing press set up in their Common Hall to provide for the due appearance of the Bills of Mortality. Their earlier annals show solemn gatherings at the "Clerken Well," from them supposed to take its name. There, on what was once a village green with a pleasant spring, on the north side of London, but long since involved and lost in the concentric rings of brick and mortar which mark its enormous growth, the parish clerks would meet in tuneful "Eistedfodd," and celebrate the "miracle-plays" or mysteries, to delight the civic mind, which were for several mediæval centuries the sole form of dramatic culture. Thus the "minor order" were several ages before the major in obtaining incorporation and showing its fruits. Possibly the new start made by these humbler ministrants in the same sovereign's reign may have even prompted Dr. White to conceive the similar incorporation of their parochial masters. However that may be, the College realizes in existing fact the idea of its origin, while all the surrounding exemplars have slid away therefrom under the relaxing influences of commercial plutocracy. No member of the present Coopers' Company need ever have hammered a tub; no "Fishmonger" need know sole from turbot, unless with sauce at a civic banquet. But every member of Sion College must be a working member of the clerical company which incorporates him, and pursue his calling within local limits. From the moment that he shifts his position to outside the civic ring, Sion College knows him only as a stranger. The legal status for these arrangements was finally acquired by charter of incorporation from Charles II., 1664, which recites an earlier charter of Charles I., 1630. But beyond this, the date of its actual foundation as a college, the site has an earlier history of much interest.

Looking back just a century, we find it, and the tenements upon it, passing into the possession of a Sir John Williams, keeper of the King's jewels, who bought it cheap of the Crown. Into the clutch of the Crown it came as a religious house at the monastic dissolution, having till then been known as "Elsing's Spital," so called from a William Elsing, who, two centuries earlier still, to wit in 1331, endowed it as a hospital for a hundred sick poor, with a special preference to the palsied and the blind, under the management of a warden and four secular clergy, and a few years later transferred it to that of a body of Augustinian Canons. The latter rule embodied largely the offices of the Church in the daily life of the inmates; with a remarkable anticipative provision, that this should so last only until other ceremonial should be duly settled by authority. This appeal to the spirit of the Refor-

mation was powerless to save it from the King. But when for more than two centuries it had been dedicated to uses of piety and charity, it became in 1530 a plundered wreck; then the abode of a Court minion, in which state its entire buildings, with a large quantity of the more perishable treasure consigned to them, were, in 1541, burned down in a single night.

To pass on, however, to its collegiate life and uses: Latin sermons *ad clerum*, to be preached every quarter by four doctors, ensured by a fee to the preacher, and a dinner in solemn state to him and the congregation, besides the grand annual sermon by the president and dinner on Founder's Day, were the rule. The College might be heraldically blazoned as bearing in the chief a sermon and dinner proper with four quarterly of the same. But finances sank, as rents were irregular; the dinners could not be afforded, and with them the sermons, save the presidential one, disappeared. Finances have improved with better times and amended administration, but the Latin sermon has not revived; and it seems doubtful whether even a dinner would tempt the modern successors of King Charles's divines and citizens either to preach or listen to one.

The College had scarcely seen a dozen annual elections, when the Great Rebellion broke loose upon it. Then came ejections and intrusions by the strong hand of violence; and Sion College was the spoil of the dominant faction, whose triumph was symbolized by a copy of the "Solemn League and Covenant," hung in a sumptuous frame in the Common Hall. About that time, the then president, one Cornelius Burgess, not long since a chaplain of King Charles I., plays the well-known part of the "Vicar of Bray," obtaining handsome preferment, even to the Deanery of Paul's—*Saint* Paul's, then, no longer—or what was left of the same in the politico-military scramble of the Cromwellian ascendency. Then came a troop of Parliamentary soldiers, claiming quarters in the College and routing out officials and students with "tuck of drum." The students thus dislodged paid rent for rooms no more; the financial crisis became acute as soon as this, the last plank of solvency, was wrenched from the grasp of the governors. The soldiers were not particular about *meum* and *tuum*. Books of divinity, beyond the Bible itself, they looked upon either as abominations akin to prelacy and popery, or as useful store of fuel in quarters somewhat damp. Remonstrances were addressed to the Protector, who ordered the soldiers' withdrawal, and compensation for their outrages; the latter order remaining a dead letter. The College was near actual bankruptcy, the almsmen were screwed to beggary and bareness; but the persons in charge, being of course Puritans of an

advanced stamp, managed to stave off actual death from the institution, although a torpid slumber of chronic uselessness, caused by utter impecuniosity, prevailed. Presbyterianism was the State religion, then Independency. But the College had, ere this, reached that form of the latter which arises from having nothing whereon to depend. Then accrued to the shelves of the library the "Records" and divers publications of the "Provincial Assembly"—a full scanty set-off against the spoil and havoc of the faithful Ironsides. Then came the reaction; and England reeled back again to royalty and revelry. Conformity became the fashion, and only the stiff-necked ones held out. The men who had shown their great moderation by becoming Puritans under Cromwellian auspices, gave fresh proof of it by redoubled loyalty to Church and Crown at the Restoration.

And then, on this scene of royalist revival, displacement and replacement, came shortly down the Great Plague of London, and raged fiercely in the parishes of which the Fellows of Sion College were the pastors. In the neighbouring parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate, the register of burials has many sensational pages. As you turn its leaves you seem to hear the death-bell tolling and the dead-cart rumbling, and the familiar cry, "Bring out your dead." First we find an increase of deaths merely, but apparently from common causes, which here are registered with a care not often found. Then "fever" begins to rule; the pace of mortality quickens, and "*spotted* fever" appears. Then comes the ominous word "plague," at first singly, then by twos and threes. At length all diseases disappear, and seem to determine in the awful visitation. Last of all, after pages of "plague" and "plague" only, comes a dismal blank yawning in the unfilled volume, like the neighbouring plague-pit in the ground; more expressive of human impotency to struggle with the dominant bane than all the notices that had preceded. Living industry could not keep pace with that of death; or the registrar himself was dead, or fled. The arrear, once left, was never overtaken. The chasm in the register remains to this day; and tells, by its abrupt and long-drawn silence, the tale of terror more eloquently than could words. How it fared with the poor alms-brethren of Sion we know not. They are mere lost items in the grand-total of havoc. Many a smitten shepherd, many a scattered flock, had the City in those fearful weeks of August and September, 1665, to show. The alternatives of heroic charity and helpless selfishness, with all the carrion-bird passions that swarm upon a scene of carcases, were there.

Then came the Great Fire, and burnt the remnant out.

Down went Library and Common Hall, and students' quarters and almsmen's cells before the blaze. A large portion of the books, however, found asylum in the neighbouring Charterhouse. St. Alphage's Church, close by, escaped the flames, and sheltered the almsfolk bodily from becoming fuel to them. Then came public-spirited efforts to retrieve the disaster. The subscription-list is filled with peers and bishops side by side with aldermen and merchants, and the cream of London's civic worthies. On it stand such well-known names as Dr. Sancroft, then Dean of St. Paul's; Stillingfleet, Canon-residentiary; and Samuel Pepys, Esquire, Secretary to the Admiralty, who gave £20—the largest individual donation being £100: in all, £1,561 was raised. But a heavy building-debt was left when the repairs were done. Heavy fines, to meet this burden, were taken from leasing tenants, while rents were cut down in proportion. The College had to live on its capital, and subsided soon by consequence into a struggle for very life. To judge of the sacrifice entailed, we are told that the reserved rents now amounted to a little over £11 on the entire property, the far smaller portion of which before the fire had yielded over £106. Supplementary subscriptions, with indifferent success, save from the dignified clergy, were set on foot. At last, about 1735, the leases, granted so ruinously after the fire, fell in; and more than a century of financial equilibrium gladdened successive administrators. At the end of that time, in 1845, a rash step was taken by rebuilding the Almshouse without adequate funds, and the College was again half-strangled in a mortgage. Not long after its completion, it was discovered that the age of almshouses was past, and a new departure followed, which has been described above. The almsmen were released to live where they would, their larger emoluments now making them welcome guests among their kinsfolk. It must have seemed like a gaol-delivery of "poor debtors;" only, for "debts cancelled" read "pensions raised." But it is a pity the discovery was not made a little sooner.

It follows from these facts that no part of the buildings is older than 1666; indeed, the restoration was not complete till 1688. But again, in 1800, the surveyor reported widespread unsoundness. The Court, with business-like energy, made an inspection for themselves, but found the case worse even than his statement, and were amazed "that the roof (of the library) had not fallen in long before." Again, in 1815, the walls and roof of the Common Hall were all renewed.

As regards the fulfilment of the founder's object, the Library, which at first subsisted upon benefactions, then acquired a title to every book published at Stationer's Hall, then com-

muted this for about £1 a day, is, if we omit the almsmen now provided for elsewhere, probably the most substantial and useful part of his benefaction. The following remarks fell from the late Lord Campbell, when a case relating to the sometime librarian[1] was before him, and seem to embody a just tribute to this branch of the institution:

> The Corporation of Sion College is one of the most venerable institutions of the country, the Library being very splendid, and one that has been of great service both to literature and to science. It is most excellent, and I think the public are indebted to the governors of Sion College in seeing that the public have the full benefit of that noble Library.

The clergy of London who wish to study can here do so with fair advantage of undisturbed retirement; while the present writer can testify to the literary hospitality extended to visitors from remote quarters, on the formality being complied with of the inscription of a name in a book kept for that purpose. Wise administration has added a newspaper-table, well filled with current journals and serials, as also a constant supply of "circulating" volumes. In the Hall monthly evening meetings are held during at least half the year, where persons who have something to say to the clergy, whether on subjects specially clerical or general, are invited to say it. Such addresses have been given by the late Dean Stanley, the present Deans of Llandaff and Exeter, Mr. Beresford Hope, Professors Huxley and Tyndall, and various others. Petitions or addresses which interest the clerical mind often lie here for signature, and many such, on various occasions of congratulation or alarm, are extant among the archives. Among the literary rarities of the Library a York Breviary, very scarce, is highly valued; there is a fine Sarum Missal, a Psalter (known as "pulcherrimum," from its richly ornamented calligraphy) a whole copy of Wyclif's Bible, several Caxtons, and various interesting collections of pamphlets, tracts, etc. Although private benefactions have been rarer since public rights accrued to the Library, they have not disappeared; one of the most recently considerable being that of the late Rev. W. Scott, president in 1858, sometime editor of the *Christian Remembrancer*, and a leading spirit of the *Saturday Review*. He presented in all two hundred and seventy-five volumes to Sion College. Among the students whom the institution has fostered, perhaps the only one of general celebrity is Fuller, the Church historian. Of earlier benefactors, Nathaniel Torperley, a man of scientific note

[1] The librarian had rearranged the books, making the old catalogue useless, while its successor hung fire. On these and other grounds of dissatisfaction his removal was called for, and this suit arose in consequence.

before the rise of the Royal Society, a friend of Hariot the mathematician, and Walter Travers, Hooker's celebrated antagonist at the Temple Church, as also Viscountess Camden, may be named.

As regards the further end supposed above—that of giving the London clergy any organic union in respect of their special rights and duties—there would be more to be said if they had ever shown a disposition to avail themselves of it. They might have shown this by some endeavour to guide the mind of the diocese, or influence by moral weight its chief administrator. Their failure to do this is the more remarkable when we remember how largely municipal liberty has been indebted to lay corporations of the same kind for its advances. The clergy of the City of London have not more than the rest of the Anglican clergy, but not less, lost all synodical instincts. This, however, is no reflection on the founder of Sion College.

As regards eminence reached by members of the College, its first two presidents became bishops, one of them John Hacket, a divine of some note. Further, the College scores, before the end of the seventeenth century, eight presidents made bishops, six deans, five archdeacons, two masters of colleges, besides an unrecorded number of canons. Its earlier records are meagre and fragmentary, and continue so until the eighteenth century has closed. Then a man of remarkable powers of business appears as librarian, viz., Robert Watts, in whose narratives continuity, completeness and conciseness are conspicuous. The present librarian, the Rev. W. H. Milman, has had a long and useful tenure of office. To his energy when president, the College was mainly indebted for the detachment of the almsmen, and the local extinction of the almshouse. Its combination in one foundation with the College was a clumsy arrangement from the first, and was in various ways, as we have seen, nearly the death of the latter; but it was in the spirit of the age which a quarter of a century earlier led Thomas Sutton to tie up in one tether the even more incongruous elements of a hospital for aged men and a school for boys. These two have since been cut adrift from each other, to the lasting benefit of both, especially of the boys. The next, and probably greatest, event in the history of Sion College, will be its abandonment of its present site. May Mr. Milman, triumphing over Parliamentary and other "obstruction," live to see it realized, guide the useful growth of the College in a more extended sphere, and hang up the rusty key of old Sion on the librarian's desk as a trophy! It would be unfair to conclude this article without acknowledging its indebtedness to his monograph on the subject.

HENRY HAYMAN.

Art. VII.—CURIOSITIES OF CLERICAL EXPERIENCE. No. I.

AN EPISODE IN THE PAROCHIAL LIFE OF A LONDON CLERGYMAN.

THE concerns of human life are so varied and entangled, and subject to such rapid and complicated changes, that inexperienced persons can form no adequate idea of the curious complications to be met with in the everyday history of society. Lawyers have an opportunity of knowing a good deal of what goes on behind the scenes, doctors still more; but clergymen, in large London parishes of a mixed population of rich and poor, have the greatest facilities of all. The sensational novel-writer owes much of his success to the semblance of reality which pervades the scenes he so graphically depicts. But the vicissitudes of families and individuals which the plain, unvarnished narrative of their experience could unfold, would exceed anything that the wildest conjectures of romance have ever conceived. The old saying, that fact is stranger than fiction, finds an apt and ample illustration in real life. The most fertile ingenuity of the most brilliant novelist could never imagine anything so apparently extravagant and unnatural as the episodes in many a dismal story of private adventure. The laws, the circumstances, the events of human life, the stir that is incessantly around us, as "the sound of many waters,"—in fact, all that taken together makes the great tide of social influences drift with the experience of mortal creatures, constitute a never-failing source of interest to anyone whose position in society enables him to discern the ever-shifting scenery of social existence. Of all cities in the world London offers the widest field for such observation. There every nationality on earth has its representative. It is the safest asylum on the surface of the globe for refugees from every quarter. The political exile finds himself secure from the secret machinations and espionage of the foreign police in his native country; the man who has seen "better days," and from the pressure of contracted means has had to drop out of the ranks of society, can nowhere so thoroughly enjoy the privilege of obscurity; "the lone woman," who may have made a false step, and over whose pathway a chill, withering shade hangs like a cloud of doom, gratefully accepts the silence and the secrecy of the overgrown metropolis, where she ceases to be the subject of censorious criticism and unsympathetic comment; the people who are living for mere appearances in the provinces, or in some remote country place, can conceal their real poverty amid the solitudes of the great City; in a word, all of every class who, from whatever cause, desire

complete protection against intrusion, find in this modern Babylon a refuge from the fierce light of social gossip and impertinent curiosity.

London is the greatest wilderness in the world. There is a loneliness about it to be found nowhere else. Amid its impenetrable seclusion, a man may lead the life of a hermit with greater security from interruption than if he were to retire to the deserts of Arabia, or to the gloomy recesses of some primæval forest. The misanthrope, or the decayed gentleman, or the religious fanatic, or the close-fisted miser, may each and all pass their lives in some back-street or dingy square, "the world forgetting, by the world forgot." Amid the hum and bustle, the gladness, and the splendour of the living tide which flows around them, these solitary specimens of humanity can move along in the strictest *incognito*, seeing, but not seen.

The "stricken deer" of society take refuge in the grateful shelter of the big city. Whether the arrow that pierces them be tipped with the poison of sin, or with the bitterness of sorrow, they find a peaceful solitude in the vast "continuity of shade" which the London wilderness throws over them. There are, or at least there were in my time, secluded villas in the region of St. John's Wood, and what formerly used to be called "the wilds of Brompton," where a person could live in the most perfect isolation, cut off from all communication with the outer world. The lonely occupant of such "a messuage or tenement" led a life of solitary confinement. An air of mystery surrounded him. He or she, or he and she, lived in inaccessible retirement. Sometimes the "bijou residence," as it is called in the phraseology of the house-agent, stood by itself, in its own grounds, not very extensive, surrounded by walls conveniently high, so as to exclude neighbourly inquisitiveness. The outer gate, communicating with the street, generally had a small square opening, fortified with an iron grating, through which the tenant held intercourse with any stray visitor or passing stranger who might have mistaken the house. These little excitements, at long intervals, were the only breaks in the continuity of the mysterious solitude and silence that reigned within. These voluntary exiles were not by any means unhappy. To them these obscure retreats from the pitiless world which they so much despised were havens of rest. This, however, was not so in every case. Some—and the majority it is to be feared—found such hermitages well adapted for the Bohemian lives which their occupiers carried on. "Birds of prey" also made them their places of refuge. Adventurers of every description concealed themselves from public observation there. Altogether, the residents in those villas of refuge formed the most heterogeneous class of people that could anywhere be found in the

suburbs of any city upon earth. There were many of those "self-contained" houses in which very respectable people lived—worthy members of society—who preferred them for purposes of air, and health, and comparative freedom of action, to the houses in the continuous regularity of a street. But, as is the case in London society generally, they knew none of their own neighbours, and none of their neighbours knew them. Even in the streets the people in one house knew nothing, and cared less, about the people next door to them. Like solitary stones of witness, these "dwellers in Mesopotamia" had no connection with each other, and were as much isolated as if they were living at the back of the blue mountains.

This being the state of things, it is easy to perceive that whenever circumstances led the clergyman of such a parish to pay a visit—I was one of the curates—he had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with some strange episodes in the history of these people. But, for that matter, every house has its skeleton; and it was the articulation of its joints in the presence of the family, when it was brought forth from the proverbial "cupboard," that supplied interesting facts connected with the curiosities of clerical experience.

There have been some—there always will be—who, so far from courting the charm of solitude as a choice, are, from circumstances, forced to adopt it. Such persons are terribly depressed. The loneliness in the midst of crowds is more difficult to endure than that of the solitude of the forest or the prairie. The constant sense of being within the sound of human voices to which no response can be made, and of confronting human faces in which can be read only the vacancy of estrangement, produces that indescribable feeling of heart-sickness so lowering in its effects upon the animal spirits. The friendly visit of a clergyman to such a family or individual is like news from a far country. To know some one amid the crowd is a boon to those doomed to such exclusive solitude. Were it not for the sympathy of the parochial clergy in such a city as London, there are many who would find life hardly worth living. There are others who, on the other hand, would regard a clerical visit as anything but agreeable. They would be as miserable under the bare idea of clerical inspection as the mouse that built its nest in the cat's ear. And, of course, no clergyman need repeat a visit to any house where his presence would be unwelcome, so that the occupants have it entirely in their own power to receive or to reject the only sure and certain friend to whom they could look for a word of hope to cheer them in their loneliness.

The following episode in my clerical experience may, in some measure, serve to illustrate the curious complications,

and entanglements of social life, which may occasionally be met with in the metropolis.

The interval of time which has elapsed since the event here described took place has so entirely obliterated every trace of the family who are the chief subjects of this sketch, that, except in my own case, their very names are forgotten. No member of the family is now living; and if there were, they could not obtain the slightest clue to their relationship from anything that may be written in these pages.

One Sunday afternoon, in the year 1854, a complete stranger called at my house, and left a message with the servant to the effect that there was a lady lying very ill in a certain street in the parish, mentioning at the same time the number of the house, and that it would be conferring a great favour upon the person who left the message, if the clergyman were to go there. It was particularly requested that no allusion should be made to the fact that anyone suggested that the clergyman should visit the lady in question. I went, as requested, next day at eleven o'clock. The house stood in a side street, near the Regent's Park. It was pleasantly situated, and, in appearance, was above the average. It was one of those residences which contained five bedrooms, two sitting-rooms, and servants' room. It presented an air of comfort, as if the tenants were persons enjoying the surroundings of competent means. As I passed the window, I saw a lady reclining on a sofa in the window, which was partly open to admit fresh air, the weather being very sultry. The door was opened by a young lady, about four-and-twenty, good-looking, and neatly dressed. She hesitated as to giving me admission, and keeping the door partly open, she inquired courteously enough what was the object of my visit. Having explained briefly that I was the curate of the parish, and that my sole object was to know if I could be of any use to the invalid lady, who might, perhaps, be glad to be visited by a clergyman, I was admitted into the hall. Closing the door of the dining-room very gently, she said in a low and almost inaudible voice, that her sister was a very great invalid—that it was very kind on my part to call—but that, as her sister had not expected me, it would not be desirable, in her weak state, to have a stranger introduced to her without first apprising her of the matter, and therefore, she would be much obliged if I would call next day at the same hour.

Punctually at the appointed time I presented myself at the house, next day. The door was opened by the same person as before. When I got inside, I was informed that the invalid lady would be very glad to see me, and, without further preface, I was at once shown into the drawing-room, and introduced to her. She was about eight-and-twenty years of age

— sad, worn, and wan — far advanced in consumption; had evidently been very handsome, and even still, in spite of the ravages of disease, the remains of her former beauty were not obliterated. She lay on the same sofa on which I had seen her the day before as I passed by her house. On seeing me she assumed an appearance of cheerfulness, and, in a few and formal words, she thanked me for calling. Being very feeble, the sight of a stranger flurried her a little, and she became a little excited. On such occasions there is nothing so unpleasant for both parties as the suspense of an awkward pause. Accordingly, in order to avoid it, I began immediately by saying that, if quite agreeable to her, I should be glad to call every day, or every second day, as she pleased, if my visits would not bore her; that my doing so might tend to break up the monotony of a sick-room, and perhaps cheer up her mind. My remarks had the desired effect of putting her at her ease; and, after thanking me, she said that she would be glad to see me whenever I found it convenient to call. In reply to a remark of mine, as to the probability of her having been long confined to her room, she said, "Yes, for the last three months, or thereabouts. My doctor tells me that I cannot recover. I am suffering now from dropsy; and at times I am in much pain. My sister is my only companion during the day, as my husband has to go to his place of business."

Knowing nothing of the antecedents of the family—not even their names, and not daring to intrude so far as to ask—I was in entire ignorance of their circumstances or social position. After a little further conversation of a somewhat desultory character, I waited a fitting opportunity to ask if she would wish me to read a few verses of the Bible with her. To this she assented, but with some slight hesitation. Assuming that she had an ordinary acquaintance with the Scriptures, I inquired if she would like me to read about our Lord's allusion to the lifting up of the brazen serpent, by Moses, in the wilderness, as recorded in the third chapter of St. John's Gospel. She said, "I cannot say that I remember it. In fact, I know hardly anything about the Bible: I have not read it for years. My life has been very chequered, and my health has been very precarious." I proceeded to read the passage referred to in the conversation which Christ held with Nicodemus. I then briefly explained the circumstances recorded in the book of Numbers—the fiery serpents, the murmuring of the people, their punishment, and the Divine remedy for their complete restoration. To all this she listened with attention; and, having finished my remarks, I inquired if there was anything she would like to ask me upon the sub-

ject. "No," she said; "I know I am very ignorant, but I hope God will make allowance for it and for my sins; they are very many. I don't care to live; but I am not fit to die. My life has been a sad one; and my greatest misfortune is that I ever was born."

The tone of voice in which the lady spoke, her look of sadness, and the broken accents in which she gave utterance to her depression of spirits, very plainly indicated that she had a hard experience of sorrow. After a short prayer I left, and promised that I should call again next day. Her sister, who was present all the time, preceded me to the hall, when she said, "Ah! sir, you don't know what a sufferer my sister has been. Her life has been full of trials: at present, neither she nor I can tell you much about it. She may, perhaps, tell you later on, when she knows you better."

Next day, same hour, I called again. The invalid was on the sofa, as before. The more I looked at her face, the more plainly it told a tale of something more than physical suffering. Care, long continued, had traced its lineaments upon her features. After I had taken my seat, she said, in a feeble, faltering tone of voice, that she had mentioned to her husband my having called, and also my promise to call again. And then she added, "Your remarks about religion I repeated to him; and as I did so, being very weak, I could not help crying when I thought how soon I have to appear before God, and how utterly unfit I am to go into His presence. My husband was annoyed, and he said he would write and ask you not to come again. I state this because you may receive a letter from him in the course of the day." I told her at once, that, as her husband did not wish me to go to her house, I had no option in the matter, though I much regretted his decision. I said I should like to call on him.

"Yes," she said, "I wish very much you could do so, because I am certain he does not understand that my crying did not arise from anything that you said to me, but because my heart was very sad when I remember what I have gone through in the past, and think of the unknown future before me. I dare not speak to my husband about religion—he does not believe in it, and he never goes either to church or chapel. My life has been clouded, and it was the recollection of this that depressed me—not your words. Still, he will have it that it was your talking to me about religion, and all that, which made me fret. Do, please, call upon him this evening."

It was easy enough to notice that there was some family secret—some mystery of sorrow in her past experience of which I as yet knew nothing. I had no right to ask. My duty was to try and cheer the invalid, and if she felt disposed

to communicate anything to me—"any weighty matter" with which her conscience might be burdened—that was her affair; but I do not think it is the part of any clergyman to inquire or to pry into any family or individual secrets. Seeing that she was much depressed, I asked her if I might leave with her a published sermon, entitled "A Cure for Care," preached by one of the most gifted pulpit orators of his day, from whose lips I first heard the simple and intelligent story of the Redemption. I allude to the late Lord Bishop of Cork, familiarly but affectionately known by the young men who attended his public ministry in Dublin, before he was elevated to the Bench, as "John Gregg." To what an opening world of new ideas he was the means of introducing my mind! I remember to this day, with all the vividness of detail, the first sermon I ever heard him preach. It was from Gal. iii. 10-13. That sermon riveted my attention. The man, his manner, and the matter, all combined powerfully to impress upon my mind the subject, which he handled with extraordinary ability and clearness. It was the first time in my life that I ever heard the plain, simple Gospel. And I have never forgotten it or him. Peace to his memory, and honour to his grave! I always had some of his published sermons by me, and on the present occasion I selected the one already referred to, for this sick lady. The subject was admirably adapted to her case. The language was simple, and the thoughts were weighty. Anyone could understand it. No one under the pressure of corroding care could read it without a sense of relief. It was like oil on a troubled sea.

The invalid gladly accepted the sermon, and I left, after promising again that I would call the same evening to see her husband. Meanwhile, in the afternoon I received a letter from him, in which he stated that "he did not want anyone to talk about religion to his wife—that he had *his* ideas on the subject, and that he could read the Prayer-book to her, if she wanted him to do so—that her mind had been disturbed by what I said to her, and that he never knew her to have been depressed before." The latter assertion was very far from the truth, but it suited him to say so. He concluded his letter by "thanking me for having called, but he did not wish me to have any further conversations with the invalid upon religious topics." When one receives such a letter, the best way of replying to it is—*in person.* There is something too cold about pen, ink, and paper. They lack the electrical influence of the human face and voice. Like the weird sisters on the blasted heath, they often brew a caldron of mischief. And, therefore, in many instances it is far better to talk face to face than through the chilling and formal medium of paper-work. With this view, I called the same evening to see the writer. He

himself opened the door, and on seeing me was somewhat taken aback.

"Didn't you receive a letter from me, sir?"

"Yes, sir, and I have come for the purpose of replying to it."

"But, sir, it required no answer, except your doing what I stated—viz., not to visit here any more."

"Exactly so, but I feel persuaded you are under a mistake when you talk of religion making your wife sad. All I did was to read a few verses of the Bible, and pray with her."

"Yes, I know, and I am much obliged to you so far as your good intentions are concerned. But I am of opinion that all this talking to sick persons about religion is very bad, and it makes them feel unhappy. I don't believe in priests or parsons, in church or chapel."

"In that case, sir, you have, I presume, no fear of death?"

"None whatever; I should die this moment without the least fear of any hereafter. I don't believe in any future existence after death."

"I have often noticed that men are very brave when death is far away, but the same men I have observed to be anything but calm when death comes to their bedside. Even if your view of the case be right, death is an awful termination to a man's hopes. What would be the use of honour and virtue if there were no future life, where these moral principles should have a wider scope."

"I simply state my belief—I don't want to argue. The good and the bad both die alike, and pass into annihilation at death. That's my creed, and you can't make me alter it."

"This is not the time or place for that discussion. If you will allow me, I shall be happy to enter into detail with you on that point some other time; but what I wish now to impress upon you is, that it was not my talking about religion to your wife that made her unhappy. The fact is, I found her very much depressed, and if my remarks tended to add to her depression, she would not have requested me to repeat my visit."

"With that I have nothing to do. All I know is, she had been crying before I came home, and on inquiry I heard you had been to visit her as a clergyman. You parsons have a way of talking about death that would drive the very devil himself into a fit of the blues."

"That is only your opinion, based on nothing but your imagination. I make you a very fair offer. Allow me, just for once, to visit your wife again in your presence, and do me the justice of deciding on the merits of the case, whether anything I may say can have any effect but that of cheering her mind. Her sister has been present on the only two occasions I have been here. Ask her what she thinks."

"I decline any such experiment. I have no faith in Bibles, or church, or parsons, or priests, and I don't want to be bored. If my wife wants me to read to her, I can do so without your aid."

After this curt expression of opinion I left the house. The lady's husband was not a man of prepossessing appearance. He looked to be about thirty-five years of age, small in stature, strongly built, sallow complexion, of an irritable and nervous temperament, and not exhibiting the manner or the bearing of a gentleman. I could see, from incidental remarks, that he was afraid, not so much that his wife should hear from me anything about religion, as that I should hear from her anything connected with their family history. This was the real ground of his objection to my visiting her. He had kept her in complete seclusion. Not a creature but her sister and one other lady—an elderly and kindhearted woman—ever visited the house.

Some four or five days passed since my interview with the lady's husband, when, to my surprise, I received a letter from him to the effect that, as his wife was very anxious to see me, he withdrew his objection, and I might call whenever I liked.

I went, next day, at eleven o'clock. The short interval that had elapsed since I saw the invalid showed a marked increase in her symptoms, and it was manifest that she had but a short time to live. She was very glad to see me, and almost her first words were an apology for her husband's brusqueness of manner in his interview with me. She was now unable to sit up, and therefore a bed was made for her in the other part of her dining-room, which was separated by folding-doors from the front portion. She told me she had read the sermon with great pleasure, and it had done her an immense amount of good. "But," she said, "I fear it is too late for me now to turn over a new leaf." I assured her that religion was not so much a matter of time, as of fact; that the merits of our Redeemer were not affected by our applying to Him sooner or later. Sin, like the poison of the fiery serpents, had infected our moral nature, and the sovereign and only remedy for our sins was "looking unto Jesus" as the Israelites looked upon the brazen serpent. After some minutes she seemed calm and peaceful—she took in the ideas implied in the passages of Scripture referred to; and then, changing the conversation, she said that she had something on her mind, and it would relieve her to tell me all about it. The sum and substance of what she said was as follows: Her husband was the proprietor of a gambling-house at the West End—he seldom came home till about three o'clock in the morning. After his dinner at seven o'clock, he left for "his place of business,"

and she saw him no more till somewhat late on the following day. He first met her at her father's house in the country. She was then seventeen years of age. He represented himself as a gentleman living in London, at the West End. Her father also was taken in by the plausible demeanour of her husband. They were married, quite privately, in London, as it was the special request of her husband, and her father made no objection. They went to live first of all at a villa in St. John's Wood. She was left almost all day to herself; her husband left about eight o'clock in the evening, to attend, as he said, to "his place of business." His wife, being a mere child almost, was easily deceived. In reply to inquiries as to his friends, he said he had quarrelled with his relations, and that, having no time for visiting, his acquaintances dropped off one by one. But at last, one day, seeing a letter addressed to her husband, and marked "strictly private," she could not resist the temptation of opening it, and for the first time since she had known her husband, she discovered, to her intense mortification, that she was a gambler's wife in the worst sense of the word. She was dreadfully cut up by this unlooked-for information, and went to her room, and there had a regular good fit of crying. On her husband's return, he saw the opened letter in the dining-room; he became frantic with rage, went to her room, and, finding it locked, burst it open. Seeing his wife bewildered with excess of grief and despair, he became more quiet. He asked her what was the cause of her depression. "That letter in your hand," was her reply. "I now see what your 'place of business' means. You have deceived me and my father, and I can never again regard you with the same feelings that I had before I made this discovery." Her husband told her that she was very foolish, that she knew nothing about the matter. "Very well, then," she said; "let me accompany you this evening to your so-called place of business, and we can soon decide whether I am wrong or not." This home-thrust made her husband furious, and he left the house in a rage. Her father was dead, so, also, was her mother. She had not a friend, except her sister, on earth. The life of four years' entire isolation from the world had soured her disposition and undermined her health. From that date she became melancholy; life had lost its zest, and she had nothing left to live for. Gradually disease of the lungs set in, and, after trying many places of health-resort, she finally went to live in the street where I first saw her. "You don't know, sir," she said to me, "how utterly powerless a woman is in the hands of a husband who chooses to treat her with indifference, but who supplies her with money and everything she requires for her wants." Her sister had just a bare sufficiency to live

upon, and, having no home of her own, she generally resided at a boarding-house at the seaside. She alone knew the facts of the case.

After I heard this narrative of woe, I left, promising to call next day.

I called, but the invalid was not there. She had gone, during the night, to the place where "the weary are at rest." Peacefully she passed away, about one o'clock in the morning, having been unconscious for about two hours before her death. Her husband returned from his "place of business" three hours afterwards. On going into the dining-room, he saw the lonely watcher by her sister's body, and for a moment or two, as his sister-in-law stated, he seemed to feel his position and its surroundings, and, with a long look of pain at the face of his dead wife, whom he had so grossly deceived, he retired, as usual, to his room.

In a few days a very simple funeral took place. A hearse with two horses, and one mourning-coach containing two persons, the husband and the deceased wife's sister, conveyed away the mortal remains of the poor heart-broken woman. The house was shut up, the furniture removed, and, in a few months, new occupants entered into possession. The husband went on with his "professional" occupation as if nothing had occurred. The sister-in-law died soon after, and the husband, I understood, followed both to that land where the righteous reaction of retributive providence metes out the just reward for those unrepented deeds of secret wrongs for which no human law provides any remedy.

G. W. WELDON
(Vicar of Bickley).

Reviews.

Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome. By R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
The One Offering. By M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. London: Bell and Sons.
The Church Quarterly Review, No. 26. January, 1882.
The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: an Eirenicon. By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. Parker and Co.

(*Concluded.*)

WE think, then, that the contention of those who would make τοῦτο ποιεῖτε to mean "*sacrifice this*," has been sufficiently disposed of.

But then, taking the words in their natural meaning—Will they not gather, it may be asked, a sacrificial signification from what Christ Himself did at that Passover table? Here we are brought to another question—Did Christ sacrificially offer Himself to the Father in His own Supper?

That He did is argued from the use of the present participles, "given for you," "shed for you," *διδόμενον*, *ἐκχυνόμενον*, as if "now being given, now being shed." Again we cannot but express our grief not less than our surprise that this argument has found an advocate in Mr. Sadler. He has ventured to say, "It was there and then given in sacrifice in the sense of being there and then surrendered at the time when He blessed and brake; and His Blood was then '*being* shed,' for it was then surrendered to be shed.[1] This was the solemn time at which He offered Himself" (p. 23).

In answer to this argument it may suffice to quote the words of an eminently learned and unbiased Romanist—"Porro prout *κλώμενον* et *διδόμενον* reddo per paulo post futurum (s'en va estre donné) quemadmodum quod Marc. ix. 31, legitur *παραδίδοται* est *μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι*. Matth. xvii. 22, et Matth. xx. 22, *βαπτίζομαι* significat *μέλλω βαπτίζεσθαι*, ex proxime præcedente, *μέλλω πίνειν*.[2] Imo hoc ipsum nostrum præsens Vetus Interpres reddit per futurum, ut per præsens: et legitur etiam in futuro in Canone Missæ effundetur, vel fundetur Luc. xxii. 20." (Picherellus, "De Missa," p. 138.) "Quod autem Christus in Cœna Deo sacrificaverit, jusseritque ut hoc exemplo in remissionem peccatorum sacrificaremus, nullibi legitur." (Ibid., p. 134). Those who require further evidence may be referred to Morton "On the Eucharist," B. vi. ch. i. pp. 394-97; or to Albertinus, "De Eucharistia," pp. 74, 76, 78, 119.[3]

---

[1] No doubt in purport and design the Blood was shed, and the Lamb slain and offered, then (perhaps specially) and long before; but the question is, Was Christ then by any sacrificial act or deed, or in any strictly sacrificial sense, there offered to the Father? As to some obscure testimonies of Fathers, Waterland says that they "at most prove only that our Lord *devoted* Himself in the Eucharist or elsewhere, *before* His passion, to be an *expiatory sacrifice* on the cross." (Works, vol. v., pp. 168.) See pp. 170, 171, 174, and vol. iv. pp. 752, 753. See also Goode, "Rule of Faith," vol. ii. p. 406. It has been very well said: "No sacrifice was offered by Christ at the institution of the Supper in the Upper Chamber. It was no place of sacrifice. There was no altar of sacrifice. It was an hour unlawful for sacrifice. The posture as they reclined at meat was no posture of sacrifice. And Christ offered no words of sacrifice, beyond the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which are the only sacrifices that the Church of England offers in the celebration of the Lord's Supper." (Dr. Stephens' Argument in Bennet case, p. 222.) Compare Mr. Milton's "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 42. See also Jewell's Works, P. S. Harding and Thess., p. 714.

[2] So Cajetan: "Eadem ratione quâ illi evangelistæ futuram in cruce effusionem sanguinis significaverunt in præsenti *effunditur*, eadem ratione Paulus futuram in cruce fractionem carnis Christi significat in præsenti, dicendo *frangitur* . . . præsens enim grammatice non est instans, sed quoddam confusum præsens." (In Pauli Epist. 1 Cor. xi. fo. 72, 1540.)

[3] Waterland says: "The plea from *hoc facite*, when first set up, was abundantly answered by a very learned Romanist . . . who wrote about 1562, and died in 1590. Protestants also have often confuted it; and the Papists themselves, several of them, have long ago given it up. The other boasted plea, drawn from the use of the *present tense*, in the words of the institution, has been so often refuted and exposed, that I cannot think it needful to call that matter over again, in an age of so much light and learning." (Works, vol. v. p. 162.) See also Willett's "Synopsis Papismi," vol. v. p. 349, and Bp. Bull's Works, vol. ii. p. 254, Oxford, 1846.

We may, however, very well connect with the present tense of the words of institution the teaching that the "res sacramenti" of the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ as in the condition of death—"not Christ's Body as now it is, but as then it was, when it was offered, rent, and slain, and sacrificed for us. . . . We are in this action not only carried up to Christ (*Sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering. . . He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ

It may, indeed, very well be that there was that, in the *doing* of our blessed Lord at that Sacred Supper in that Upper Chamber, which was intended to give to our "*doing this*" as He did—a Godward tendency.

For when, with the elements in His hands (and with uplifted eyes, as the Liturgies[1] attest), He blessed and gave thanks, the Blessing was undoubtedly a blessing *of God;* and the form of thanksgiving which He used was probably after this sort, "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, who hast sanctified us with Thy commandments, and made the fruits of the earth," and "Blessed art Thou, O Lord God, King of the world, who hast created the fruit of the vine."[2] Moreover, it may be, perhaps, that to this was added a memorial of the Passover Sacrifice, with the prayer, "Remember us, O Lord, on this day for our good."[3]

But, however this may be, there will certainly be nothing here to warrant us in giving to the words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε anything like a strictly sacrificial signification.

But we have yet to deal with the argument from the word ἀνάμνησις. Does this term involve the idea of a sacrificial memorial to be offered in the Eucharist to the Father?

That we do in the service of the Eucharist plead before God the one atoning sacrifice of Christ, therein commemorated, is what the Fathers certainly taught, and what we, it must be hoped, shall never deny. How could Christians continue a perpetual memory of that His precious death, and fail to do this? In doing this we do not doubt that we are doing that which is according to the mind of Him Who ordained this Sacrament as a memorial of His passion. Surely the whole service is a remembering *before God.* And *something*, no doubt, may be said in favour of connecting the idea of a sacrificial memorial before God with the words εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.[4] Yet it is certain that the use of this word for any

---

offered is it; thither we must look. To the Serpent lift up, thither we must repair, even *ad cadaver.*" (Andrewes's "Sermons," vol. ii. pp. 301, 302, A. C. L. See also Vogan's "True Doctrine of the Eucharist," pp. 131, 361-64.)

[1] The Liturgies of St. James and St. Basil add καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ. (See Neale's "Tetralogia L.," p. 133, and Daniel's "Codex Lit.," tom. iv. p. 429.)

[2] See Lightfoot, "Temple Service," ix. p. 161, as quoted by Milton in "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 62. With this we may very well compare Justin Martyr's account of the Eucharist (Dial., § 41), and especially the fragment of Irenæus in which he says: "We offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks unto Him for having commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our food." (Frag. xxxviii. Ed. Ben.) See Blunt's "Early Fathers," pp. 446-49. Mr. Milton has well observed ("Eucharist Illustrated," p. 60) that the order of the celebration of the Passover by our Lord forms the framework of all early Liturgies.

[3] See Archdeacon Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service," vol. ii. pp. 290, 291. But Mr. Milton, we think, is right in regarding this as more probably being of old a part of the Temple Service. (See "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 70.)

[4] The argument in favour of this view is very fairly stated by Mr. Sadler in "The Church and the Age," p. 280: "The word is used twice in the Septuagint, and in each case refers to a solemn ecclesiastical commemoration before God, the reference to the Godward character of the memorial being very express. In Numb. x. 10 reference is made to the blowing of the trumpets over the burnt offerings, 'that they may be to you a memorial before your God,' ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν. But by far the most remarkable and suggestive of the two cases is that in Lev. xxiv. 7, 8. Translated according to the Septuagint we read: 'And ye shall put on a row (of loaves, as the shewbread) pure frankincense and salt, and they shall be for loaves for a memorial (ἀνάμνησιν) set before the the Lord (ἔναντι Κυρίου) continually in the face of the children of Israel for an everlasting covenant.'"

Mr. Willis observes that the word occurs also in the titles of Ps. xxxviii. and lxix. (lxx.).

such purpose, in the Septuagint, is (at most) rare and exceptional rather than usual;[1] and that if our blessed Lord had intended to convey this idea, He would more probably (to say the least) have used the word *μνημόσυνον* —which is the technical term in familiar use for this purpose[2]—as when it is said to Cornelius, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial (*μνημόσυνον*) before God." And it is certain also that nothing at all like a universal *consensus* of Patristic interpretation can fairly be alleged for any such sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις* here.[3]

It is, however, to be noted that what appears to be the true sense of the Hebrew in Lev. xxiv. 7 applies the words "for a memorial" not to the bread, but to the frankincense (see the "Speaker's Commentary" *in loc.*), and that Numb. x. 10, as compared with the preceding verse (*καὶ ἀναμνησθήσεσθε ἐναντι Κυρίου*) is best understood with the usual and natural sense of *ἀνάμνησις*. And it is very material to observe, that whereas in both these instances (as Mr. Sadler observes) the Godward character of the *ἀνάμνησις* is *very expressly stated*, there is an entire absence of any such statement in the words of institution.

Is there any example to be found anywhere of the word *ἀνάμνησις* without such an addition as *ἐναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ* being used in the sense which Mr. Sadler contends for?

Bishop Wren's view that the expression *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* "does most properly signify, 'To put me in mind of you'" (see Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations of Common Prayer," p. 81) seems to be quite independent of this sense of *ἀναμνήσις*. But Bishop Sanderson's exposition is preferable. (Ibid., pp. 23, 24.)

[1] Canon Trevor (in whose manual there is much to be commended) seems to have fallen into the error of regarding *ἀνάμνησις* as "the technical name of that part of the meat-offering, or peace-offering, which represented the whole before God." ("Sacrifice and Participation of the Holy Eucharist," p. 129.)

[2] Satisfactory evidence of this will be found, we think, in the following passages:

Lev. ii. 2. *καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον· θυσία ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας τῷ Κυριῳ.* This is said of the meat-offering.

Lev. ii. 9. *ἀφελεῖ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας το μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπιθήσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ το θυσιαστήριον.*

Lev. ii. 16. *Καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς . . . κάρπωμά ἐστι Κυρίῳ.* This is said of the Minchah of Firstfruits.

Lev. v. 12. *τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς ἐπιθήσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων Κυρίῳ· ἁμαρτία ἐστί.* This is said of the trespass-offering of flour.

Lev. vi. 15. *Καὶ ἀνοίσει ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κάρπωμα ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς τῷ Κυρίῳ.* This is said of the meat-offering.

Numb. v. 15. *ἔστι γὰρ θυσία ζηλοτυπίας, θυσία μνημοσύνου, ἀναμιμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν.* Of the trial of jealousy.

Numb. v. 18. *Καὶ δώσει ἐπὶ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ μνημοσύνου, τὴν θυσίαν τῆς ζηλοτυπίας.*

Numb. v. 26. *Καὶ δράξεται ὁ ἱερεὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.*

Isa. lxvi. 3. *ὁ ἐιδοὺς λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον, ὡς βλάσφημος.*

Tobit. xii. 13. *προσήγαγον τὸ μνημόσυνον τῆς προσευχῆς ὑμῶν.*

Ecclus. xxxviii. 11. *δὸς ἐυωδίαν καὶ μνημόσυνον σεμιδάλεως.*

Ecclus. xlv. 21. *καὶ εὐωδίαν εἰς μνημόσυνον.*

Ecclus. l. 19. *εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐναντι ὑψίστου.*

Compare also Exod. xxviii. 23 (29) *καὶ λήψεται Ἀαρὼν τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ . . . μνημόσυνον ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ* (with v. 12). This is said of the breastplate.

And Exod. xxx. 16. *Καὶ ἔσται τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ μνημόσυνον ἔναντι Κυρίου, ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν.* This is said of the half-shekel offering.

[3] Dr. Malan says: "Philo, who wrote at Alexandria in Apostolic times, and may have known there St. Mark and St. Luke, finds no 'memorial' in *ἀνάμνησις*." ("Two Holy Sacraments," p. 173.) When St. Paul (Heb. x. 3) speaks of the *ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν*, he uses the word in the sense of remembrance of sins past; but assuredly (as Dr. Malan observes) "not 'in order to remind God of them,' an

Theodoret understands our Lord's words as pointing to a memorial whose aim and object it is that *we* may be reminded and *our* minds affected by the contemplation of the sufferings thus represented. He says: τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ὁ Δεσπότης προσέταξε, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν· ἵνα τῇ θεωρίᾳ τὸν τύπον τῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν γεγενημένων ἀναμιμνησκώμεθα παθημάτων, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν εὐεργέτην ἀγάπην πυρσεύσωμεν, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν προσμένωμεν τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν. (In Ep. Heb., cap. viii. tom. iii. pp. 594-95, edit. Schulze.)[1]

Other ancient Fathers appear to have taken the same view, which is also supported by the language of the Liturgies.[2] And indeed we are

---

expression utterly unintelligible." ("The Holy Sacraments," pp. 176, 177.) In this sense certainly St. Chrysostom understood St. Paul's words. (See Ibid., p. 178.) And in view of the context, it seems most natural to understand the *ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν* as standing in apposition with the *συνείδησις ἁμαρτιῶν* of the preceding verse.

[1] So also the author of the treatise "De Baptismo," which has been attributed to St. Basil the Great, who, after quoting the words of the institution with the Apostle's comment, 1 Cor. xi. 26, adds: τί οὖν ὠφελεῖ τα ῥήματα ταῦτα; ἵνα ἐσθίοντές τε καὶ πίνοντες, ἀεὶ μνημονεύωμεν τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος καὶ ἐγερθέντος . . . ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, δηλονότι εἰς ἀνεξάλειπτου μνήμην τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος. (Lib. i. cap. iii. § 2. Op. edit. Garnier, 1722, tom. ii., Append., pp. 650, 651.)

St. Chrysostom, too, compares this *ἀνάμνησις* of Christ with the keeping a commemoration of a deceased relative: ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν υἱοῦ ἢ ἀδελφοῦ τετελευτηκότος ἀνάμνησιν ἐποίεις. (See Op., tom. x. p. 246, edit. Montfaucon, 1732.)

Compare Sedulius Scotus: "Suam memoriam nobis reliquit, quemadmodum si quis peregre proficiscens, aliquod pignus ei quem diligit derelinquat, ut quoties cunque illud viderit, possit ejus beneficia et amicitia recordari." (In 1 Cor. xi. in Bibliotheca Max. Patr. Lugd. 1677, tom. vi. p. 545.) So another Commentary (perhaps the work of Remigius of Auxerre): "Relinquens Dominus hoc sacramentum . . . ut illud infingeret cordibus et memoriæ eorum, egit more cujuscunque hominis, qui appropinquans morti aliquod munus pretiosum dimittit alicui amicorum suorum in memoriam suam, inquiens; accipite hoc munus . . . et tene illud . . . in memoriam mei, ut quotiescunque illud videris, recorderis mei." (In Bibliotheca Max. Patr. Lugd. 1677, tom. viii. p. 971.)

So also Christian Druthmar: "Sicut si aliquis peregre proficiscens dilectoribus suis quoddam vinculum dilectionis relinquit . . . ita Deus præcepit agi a nobis, transferens spiritualiter corpus in panem vinum in sanguinem, ut per hæc duo memoremus quæ fecit pro nohis de corpore et sanguine suo, et non simus ingrati tam amantissimæ Charitati." (In Mat. Evang., fo. lxxxiv. edit. 1514.)

St. Chrysostom seems to have understood "in remembrance of me" . . . "till He come" as running parallel with the command concerning the Passover that "this day" should be "for a memorial . . . throughout your generations" (Exod. xii. 14): Καθάπερ Μωσῆς φησι τοῦτο μνημόσυνον ὑμῖν αἰώνιον· οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς, εἰς ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν ἕως ἂν παραγένωμαι. . . . Ὥσπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσυδαίων, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἐγκατέδησε τὸ μνημόσυνον τῷ μυστηρίῳ. (Op. ed. Montfaucon, tom. vii. pp. 782, 783; Hom. lxxxii. in Mat.)

In this Chrysostom has been followed by Bishop Patrick ("Mensa Mystica," ch. i. p. 6, edit. 1717), who (while contending for the commemoration before God, pp. 12-14) gives no sacrificial sense to *ἀνάμνησις* (p. 4), and interprets καταγγελλετε in its natural sense (pp. 8, 12). See also Bp. Andrewes "Sermons," vol. ii. p. 300, A. C. L.

[2] For, not only is the obedience to our Lord's word expressed by *μεμνημένοι* (as in the "Liturgy of St. James"—see Neale's "Tetralogia," p. 137), but the remembrance is made to include not only the sacrifice, but the resurrection and other particulars. (See also the "Liturgy of St. Chrysostom," p. 136.) Compare the Coptic "Liturgy of St. Basil": "Quotiescumque manducabitis ex hoc pane, et bibetis ex hoc calice, mortem meam annunciabitis et resurrectionem meam confitebimini, *meique memores* eritis donec veniam." (In Renaudot, tom. i. p. 15. See also p. 217, tom. ii. pp. 228, 235.)

not aware that any sufficient evidence has yet been alleged, or that any good evidence from Christian antiquity can be alleged, which can be said at all distinctly to support that sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις* here, which, till some authority is forthcoming for its support, we must take the liberty of regarding as a novelty of interpretation.

It remains that we inquire concerning St. Paul's language in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians (ch. xi. 26), "Ye do show the Lord's Death till He come:" does it, or does it not imply a sacrificial offering of Christ's death to the Father?

Mr. Sadler says: "To ascertain the scope of this word (*καταγγέλλετε*) we must be guided by what is said in other places respecting the design of the Holy Communion, as to whether we are to understand this 'showing' to be 'before God,' or 'before men,' or 'before both.' That St. Paul means that it is the design of this ordinance to preach Christ is simply incredible for this reason—that the proclaiming of the death of Christ in such an ordinance is exceedingly indirect, the ordinance itself requiring to be explained and preached about before it can be understood in the least degree" (p. 99).[1]

Yet, without assigning to this sacrament the office of preaching the Gospel to the heathen, it is assuredly conceivable that it may very effectually cause that Jesus Christ may be set forth as Crucified before the eyes of God's faithful people, may bear powerful witness to them of the sufferings and death of the Redeemer, may teach and preach[2] to their hearts the love of Christ which passeth knowledge—how when they were yet sinners Christ died for them; and thus may be one great and divinely-appointed means of proclaiming—on and on, down the whole history of the Christian Church, from generation to generation, and from age to age, the grand and glorious truth, "God made Him to be

---

Compare Assemann, Cod. L. lib. iv. p. 163. It is difficult to believe that the word *μεμνημένοι* would ever have been chosen to express the idea of making a sacrificial memorial before God. It may, doubtless, in connexion with the context, and in prayer to God, not unnaturally connote the idea of Godward commemoration, which some Liturgies more distinctly express. (See Mede, book ii. ch. ix. Works, p. 377; and compare Waterland, Works, vol. iv. pp. 486-87); but can hardly be said very naturally to contain it.

In connexion with these testimonies from the Liturgies should be noted the account of the Eucharistic Service as furnished by Justin Martyr in his "Apology" (p. 83, edit. Ben. 1742, § 67), who, after giving the history of the institution from the Gospels (in which he quotes our Lord's words as *εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου*, which Mr. Scudamore regards as the formula which would most correctly express "to excite your remembrance of Me," N. E., p. 626), adds: *Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμιμνήσκομεν.* And with this should be compared the Pfaffian Fragment of Irenæus: "*Οἱ οὖν ταύτας τὰς προσφορὰς ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγοντες . . . πνευματικῶς λειτουργοῦντες τῆς σοφίας υἱοὶ κληθήσονται.*" Irenæus, Fragm. edit. Migne, No. xxxvi. Opera, c. 1253.)

[1] Incautious and misleading words (as we cannot but think), pointing in somewhat the same direction, have sometimes been used by Divines of high esteem in the Church of England.

[2] The Ambrosian Liturgy seems certainly to interpret the Apostle's language of "preaching": "Commanding also and saying to them, These things as oft as ye shall do, ye shall do them in memorial of Me: ye shall *preach* My Death, ye shall announce My Resurrection, ye shall hope for My Advent, till again I come to you from heaven." (See Professor Ince's Second Letter to Bramley, p. 8.)

So in Mar Abd Yeshua's "Creed of the Nestorians": "Seeing that it was impossible that His identical sacrifice upon the cross for the salvation of all could be *showed forth*, in every place, throughout all ages, and *to all men*, just as it was, without any alteration, He beheld with an eye of mercy, and in wisdom and compassion thus ordained, 'In the night in which He was betrayed . . . He took bread,' etc." (See Badger's "Nestorians," vol. i. pp. 176, 409.)

sin for us Who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him;" that so, one generation should praise His works unto another, and declare His power; that so, the memorial of His abundant kindness should be showed, and men should sing of His righteousness.

And if the ordinance of Christ can do this, and has been ordained to do this, and still more, if its celebration was intended to be accompanied (as from the Liturgies we know well it was in fact accompanied) by an oral annunciation[1] such as should effectually secure its doing this, then what possible or conceivable necessity can there be to justify us in allowing ourselves to be driven to the extraordinary predicament of having to fasten on the word καταγγέλλετε a sacrificial sense?[2]

We are not, of course, questioning or disputing the truth that in this ordinance, the showing forth or announcing of Christ's death is solemnly made, and intended to be made, before the angels of heaven and before the throne of God. But we do question whether to teach us this was the design of the Apostle's words; and what we do dispute is that the language of St. Paul can fairly be understood as pointing directly to any Godward act of oblation, or in anywise supporting the teaching that the aim and end of the Eucharist is sacrificially to show forth the Lord's death to the Father.

Let any one of our readers look at the meaning of this word as used by heathen writers. Then let him examine every place where it is used in the New Testament (we do not think that it is found in the LXX. at all),[3] and then let him say whether anything short of a doing violence to language can make the Apostle's word mean anything like presenting or offering in sacrifice the death of Christ to the Father. Supposing even the word καταγγέλλω to possess such ambiguities as might readily admit such a sense, is it conceivable that the Apostle would have chosen this word (seeing it has another obvious meaning) in preference to some other verb which might have clearly expressed the idea of sacrifice or offering, if this was the sense which he really desired to convey?

Was the Apostle at a loss for such a word? It is what no one will believe. But if not, it is impossible to suppose that he chose the word he did choose except on the supposition that he did not desire to express that idea at all.

And yet it must be acknowledged that when the Apostle was writing thus he had a very suitable occasion for expressing this idea, and strongly insisting on it, if indeed he thought it a leading truth to be insisted on.[4]

Indeed, it is scarcely conceivable that in this connexion St. Paul should not have desired to express it, if, in his view, the primary and prominent point in this showing forth of the Lord's death had been to

---

[1] This would answer to the "Haggadah," *i.e.*, the annunciation of Israel's Redemption in the Passover Feast. (See Milton's "Eucharist Illustrated," p. 61.)

[2] That Christians in the very act of thus showing forth the Lord's death should desire to plead its merits before God was almost a necessity. That this showing forth should connect itself with a liturgical commemoration before God was nothing but natural. It cannot argue any inherent sacrificial sense in the word itself.

[3] On the doubtful reading in Ps. xxxix. 6, see Schleusner *in voc.* καταγγέλλω.

[4] Surely the Apostle is here not only insisting on the very sacred character of the ordinance, but in these very words giving us, in part, his interpretation of the words of institution. Could he then have chosen such a word as καταγγέλλω to express his meaning, if he had understood the Saviour's words, or the main purpose of the ordinance, as pointing to a sacrifice which Christian priests were to offer to God? It seems to us that the Apostle's language affords a most forcible argument against any strictly sacrificial sense as belonging to any one of the words of our Lord enjoining the observance of the ordinance.

set it forth before God as a sacrificial offering or presentation to the Divine Majesty.

And this leads us to a very important observation with which we must conclude the present article. We have already expressed our opinion that in the Eucharist we may and must plead before God the One Sacrifice and oblation[1] of Christ once offered to make a perfect atonement for the sins of the world. This seems to us absolutely inseparable from the true view of the Sacrament as ordained for a continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ. It would surely be most strange and unnatural if Christians, met together in sacred service to commemorate that redeeming death according to their Lord's own institution, should not in fervent prayer plead the merits of that death for the obtaining of all the benefits of His Passion. And this *pleading* of that sacrifice may no doubt be called, and many times has been called (in ancient and modern times), an *offering*[2]—an offering, that is, in the sense of presenting to view that sacrifice, which, in the only true sacrificial sense of the word, has already once for all been offered, to make the one perfect oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. But it is an inquiry of weighty significance—very weighty in view of present controversies—whether this is the prominent and primary design of the ordinance of Christ.

If it were so indeed, would the writers of the New Testament—or, rather, would the Holy Spirit of God, by Whom they were inspired to write—have left the teaching of this truth wrapped up in dark sayings, to be, in after ages, laboriously drawn or spun out by learned and subtle arguments from uncertain analogies and doubtful or more than doubtful expressions?

If this were the main thing which Christian hearts were to be looking to in the Lord's Supper, is it possible that—as regards the teaching of Holy Scripture—it should have been left hidden under a bushel instead of being set on a candlestick, and placed on high that all might see it clearly?

No one, we believe, except under the strongest prejudice, will deny that the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist has not this clear and prominent place in the teaching of God's Word.[3]

And, if this be so, then we make bold to affirm that it will not be with-

---

[1] On this account St. Augustine regards baptism also as the offering of sacrifice: "Holocausto Dominicæ passionis, quod eo tempore offert quisque pro peccatis suis, quo ejusdem passionis fide dedicatur, et Christianorum fidelium nomine Baptizatus imbuitur." (Ad Rom. Expositio inchoata, § 19, Op. tom. iii. par. ii. c. 937, ed. Ben. 1680.) A little below this is spoken of as "holocaustum Domini, quod tunc pro unoquoque *offertur quodammodo*, cum ejus nomine in baptizando signatur."

[2] "Christ, I own, is in some sense offered up to God by every communicant in the Sacrament." (Payne, in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. vi. p. 255.)

"The sacrifice of the Cross, or Christ Himself, may be said to be offered in the Eucharist. But then it means only offered *to view*, or offered to Divine consideration: that is, *represented* before God, angels, and men, and *pleaded* before God as what we claim to: not offered again in *sacrifice*." (Waterland, Works, vol. v. p. 129, note.)

[3] In this we are very glad to find Mr. Sadler in agreement with us. He has very well said: "It is clear, then, that the Saviour primarily instituted the Eucharist as the means whereby His people are to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood. His first object must be ours, and we humbly trust that in the form of service which we have inherited, this first intention of our Master is fulfilled." ("The Church and the Age," p. 269.) In the able article from which we quote on "Liturgies and Ritual" there is so much that is really valuable and seasonable that we heartily wish we could express entire agreement with the whole of it.

out danger that we aim at giving it a place in our doctrinal system which Scripture has not given it.

View this Sacrament primarily as ordained to be a sacrifice, and then, we believe, this view will grow and lay hold on the ground of men's hearts, until (however we may seek to make the partaking a part of the sacrificial service) Communion will by degrees become a matter of very secondary, or only occasional importance ; and congregations will come not very unnaturally to behold and gaze and adore, but not to receive the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ ; that is, in other words, will come just to leave undone what Christ, in ordaining the Sacrament, appointed to be done.

This tendency has surely been seen in the history of the whole Christian Church. And is not the history of our own branch of that Church showing it too plainly even now ?

If, on the other hand, we regard the primary object of the Lord's Supper to be for the Communion or partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ, as given and shed for us (and we may confidently affirm that the Holy Scriptures justify us in so regarding it), then, though we may willingly still admit and allow the use of sacrificial language, we shall be thankful for the work of our Reformers in the decided steps they took in their way of dealing with our Churches and our Services, to give prominence to the aspect of the Lord's Supper as a Communion rather than as a Sacrifice.[1] Do we then deny that all Christian antiquity bears witness to the Eucharistic service, as the oblation of the redeemed Church of Christ ? We would not if we could. And certainly we could not if we would. It may be, that we need, some of us, to be reminded of this truth. But we are persuaded that the true view of this spiritual Sacrifice—of the service we herein render to God—is secondary and subservient to the true view of the gift which in these holy mysteries we receive at His hands. It is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as therein to be verily and indeed taken and received, which is to be the true object of our faith in this holy Sacrament. This certainly is the teaching we have received from our Reformers. On this point we cannot do better than quote the words of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in their Report on the case of Liddell *v.* Westerton : " When the same thing is signified, it may not be of much importance by what name it is called ;[2] but the distinction

---

[1] See some excellent remarks of Professor Mozley in "Lectures and other Theological Papers," p. 217.

[2] "It is called a *table* with reference to the Lord's Supper, and an *altar* on the score of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving there offered to God Almighty." (King Edward's Letter, A.D. 1550, quoted in Waterland, Works, vol. v. p. 269.)

"That very law which our Saviour was to abolish, did not so soon become unlawful to be observed as some imagine ; nor was it afterwards unlawful *so far*, that the very name of Altar, of Priest, of Sacrifice itself should be banished out of the world . . . the names themselves may (I hope) be retained without sin, in respect of that proportion which things established by our Saviour have unto them which by Him are abrogated. And so throughout all the writings of the ancient Fathers we see that the words which were do continue ; the only difference is, that whereas before they had a literal, they have now a metaphorical use." (Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," book iv. ch. xi. § 10 ; Works, edit. Keble, vol. i. p. 460.)

Whatever doubt there may be as to the time when the Communion-table first came to be called by the name *altar*, it seems certain that the frequent use of such language co-existed with the admission that Christians had no altars. (See Mede, Works, 383-392 ; L'Aroque, "Hist. of Eucharist," pp. 43-46 ; and Goode, "Rule of Faith," vol. ii. pp. 368, 369. Perkins, Works, vol. ii. p. 553. See also Origen, "Con. Celsum," lib. viii. § 17, p. 755 ; edit. Ben., and note there ; Op. ed. Migne, tom. i. c. 1539, *sqq.*)

"Christians have an altar, whereof all partake. And that altar is Christ our

between 'altar' and 'Communion-table,' is in itself essential, and deeply founded in the most important differences in matters of faith between Protestants and Romanists—namely, in the different notions of the nature of the Lord's Supper which prevailed in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, and those which were introduced by the Reformers. By the former it was considered as a Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Saviour. The altar was the place on which the Sacrifice was to be made; the elements were to be consecrated, and being so consecrated were treated as the Body and Blood of the Victim. The Reformers, on the other hand, considered the Holy Communion not as a Sacrifice, but as a feast, to be celebrated at the Lord's table; though as to the consecration of the elements, and the effect of this consecration, and several other points, they differed greatly among themselves. This distinction is well pointed out in Cudworth's 'Discourse concerning the True Notion of the Lord's Supper,' chap. v. p. 27: 'We see, then, how that theological controversy which hath cost so many disputes, whether the Lord's Supper be a Sacrifice, is already decided; for it is not "sacrificium," but "epulum;" not a sacrifice but a feast upon sacrifice; or else in other words, not "oblatio sacrificii," but, as Tertullian excellently speaks, "participatio sacrificii;"[1] not the offering of something up to God upon an altar, but the eating of something which comes from God's altar, and is set upon our tables. Neither was it ever known amongst the Jews or Heathens, that those tables on which they did eat their sacrifice should be called by the name of altars. . . . Therefore, he (St. Paul) must needs call the Communion by the name of the Lord's Table, *i.e.*, the table on which God's meat is eaten, not His altar on which it is offered.'"[2] (Brooke's "P. C. Judgments," pp. 66, 67).

We need not wonder (it could hardly have been otherwise) if Divines have followed who have considered that the caution of the Reformers was carried too far. No doubt they preferred to leave behind them what some will even regard perhaps as a liturgical loss, rather than to leave behind them anything like a doubtful testimony to the prominence in the Eucharist of the aspect of Communion over that of offering or sacrifice. Are not events in our own days tending to justify their wisdom and their caution?

Certainly we should be very slow to put our hands to the work of undermining their testimony, until there is no danger of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist again claiming for itself its former position of eminence and prominence. And they who now carefully scan the ecclesiastical horizon from the standpoint of Church of England doctrine, will hardly come to the conclusion that that time has yet arrived.

We are not so foolish as to deny that, from the first ages of Christianity, the Eucharist has always had a certain sacrificial character. Why should we hesitate to add that this character seems commonly to have been regarded as derived from the ordinance of Christ? We trust there are not many minds among us so warped by prejudice or blinded by bigotry as altogether to refuse to join in calling our whole Eucharistic Service "Our

---

Lord, Who is Altar, Priest, and Sacrifice, all in One. . . His table here below is a secondary altar in two views; first, on the score of our own sacrifices, of prayers, praises, souls, and bodies, which we offer up from thence; secondly, as it is the seat of the consecrated elements, that is, of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, of the Grand Sacrifice, symbolically represented and exhibited and spiritually there received." (Waterland, Works, vol. v. p. 269. See also p. 130, and vol. iv. p. 749.)

[1] See Tertullian, "De Oratione," § xiv.; Op. p. 136, edit. Rigaltius, 1689.

[2] Cudworth adds: "It is true, an altar is nothing but a table; but it is a table upon which God Himself eats, consuming the sacrifices by His holy Fire; but when the same meat is given from God unto us to eat of, the relation being changed, the place on which we eat is nothing but a table." (P. 28.)

Christian Sacrifice."[1] Only this we must insist upon, that its sacrificial character of old stood side by side with clear declarations and open avowals that Christians have no altars[2] and no victims, no sacrifices and no offerings of blood—that they serve their God with the spiritual sacrifices of the heart's prayer and praise, with which He is well pleased. And for ourselves we must insist upon this—that in this Church of England the Eucharist as "the Christian Sacrifice" must stand beside the truth that we have no altars and no masses, no hosts and no offerings of Christ, or of Christ's Sacred Body and Blood, for the living and the dead—no sacrifices save our true Eucharistic oblations with our spiritual sacrifices in commemorating the One Great Offering and Sacrifice of our Blessed Redeemer.

And we are persuaded that we are best carrying out the purpose of Christ's institution, and best following the example of Christians of old time, in regarding *that* as the primary end of the ordinance which is set before us in the words of the Apostle, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

Alice, Grand Duchess of Hesse, Princess of Great Britain and Ireland. Biographical Sketch and Letters. With Portraits. John Murray.

In the April *Quarterly Review* appeared an admirable article with the title "Two Royal Books," reviewing the Queen's new book, "More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands," and also the volume published last year in Darmstadt, "Alice, Gross-Herzogin von Hessen und bei Rhein, Prinzessin von Gross-Britannien und Irland." The *Quarterly* writer, with good taste and judgment, touched on the attractive features of these "Royal books," and gave some charming extracts from the Princess's letters to the Queen, an English edition of the German work being at the time in preparation. For the Darmstadt volume, of course, these letters were translated into German. In the volume before us, which has a preface by her Royal Highness Princess Christian, the letters are given in their original form. Princess Christian's touching preface, which adds largely to the interest of the work, has a winning simplicity and frankness. Its opening words record

---

[1] So Archbishop Sharp, whom Waterland pronounces "as judicious a Divine as any our Church has had," declares: "We offer up our alms; we offer up our prayers, our praises, and ourselves; and all these we offer up in virtue and consideration of Christ's Sacrifice, represented before us ['I would only add, *and before God.*' says Waterland, Works, vol. iv. p. 762] by way of remembrance or commemoration; nor can it be proved that the ancients did more than this: *this whole service was their* CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE, *and this is* OURS. But the Romanists have invented a new sacrifice, which Christ never instituted, which the Apostles never dreamt of, which the primitive Christians would have abhorred, and which we, if we will be followers of them, ought never to join in." (Works, vol. v. p. 197, Oxford, 1829; Sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23-25.)

[2] It must not be supposed that the force of such assertions can be altogether evacuated by the distinction (which will not be found to hold good universally) between *βωμός* and *θυσιαστήριον*. Origen ("Con. Celsum," viii. § 17) admits the charge of Celsus that Christians have no altars (*βωμοί*), and declares that the *soul* is the true Christian altar (*βωμός*). He could certainly not have written thus, if he had supposed that the Christian Church had its true *θυσιαστήρια* of stone or of wood.

"the great affection" with which Princess Alice "has ever been regarded in this country, and the universal feeling of sympathy shown at the time of her death."

"In these days, when the custom has become general of publishing biographies of all persons of note or distinction," continues Princess Helena, "it was thought advisable, in order that a true picture might be given of my sister, that a short sketch of her life should be prepared by some one who was personally known to her, and who appreciated the many beautiful features of her character. The choice fell upon a clergyman at Darmstadt, Dr. Sell." To help Dr. Sell in delineating the domestic side of her character, adds the Princess, "my mother selected for his guidance the extracts from my sister's letters to her, which appear in the present volume." And, without doubt, thoughtful persons who read these letters, selected by the Queen, will feel thankful to her Majesty for granting them, in this way, a closer insight into so "beautiful and unselfish" a life. As regards English readers, particularly, we may speak with confidence. For in these letters, the grace and realness of which all must admire, they will see with satisfaction how devoted Princess Alice "was to the land of her birth—how her heart ever turned to it with reverence and affection as the country which had done and was doing for Liberty and the advancement of mankind more than any other country in the world." How deep was her feeling in this respect, we read, was testified by a request which the Grand Duchess made to her husband, in anticipation of her death, that an English flag might be laid upon her coffin.

The divisions in the volume before us are, "Childhood and Girlhood, 1843-62;" "In her New Home, 1862-65;" "At Home and at Work, 1866-72:" "Trials, 1873-77;" and the closing chapter, 1878, together with concluding remarks and an appendix. There is a portrait of the Princess, 1860, after the well-known photograph; another portrait, 1878. Many passages in the memoir, as well as in the letters, invite quotation; but the book has been widely reviewed, and it deserves to be read, and preserved. Our quotations, accordingly, shall be brief.

At the age of seventeen the Princess met Prince Louis of Hesse; and the engagement took place a few months later, when he paid a second visit to Windsor. One day "after dinner," wrote the Queen, in her Majesty's Diary, "while talking to the gentlemen, I perceived Alice and Louis talking before the fireplace more earnestly than usual, and when I passed to go to the other room both came up to me, and Alice, in much agitation, said he had proposed to her, and he begged for my blessing. I could only squeeze his hand and say 'Certainly,' and that we would see him in our room later. . . . Alice came to our room, agitated, but quiet. Albert sent for Louis to his room: he went first to him, and then called Alice and me in. . . . Louis has a warm, noble heart. We embraced our dear Alice, and praised her much to him." This was on November 30th, 1860. On December 28th "our dear bridegroom," as the Prince Consort called the young Prince, left Windsor. In March, 1861, the Duchess of Kent died, and on this occasion, we are told, Princess Alice "showed the comfort and help she was fitted to be to her family in times of sorrow and anxiety." In the following December the

Prince Consort fell ill; and what a stay and comfort she was to the Queen during the course of that illness, and in the period following, was then well known, and has never been forgotten. The *Times* well said: "It is impossible to speak too highly of the strength of mind and self-sacrifice shown by Princess Alice during these dreadful days. Her Royal Highness has certainly understood that it was her duty to be the help and support of her mother in her great sorrow, and it was in a great measure due to her that the Queen has been able to bear with such wonderful resignation the irreparable loss that so suddenly and terribly befell her." The unanimous opinion of eye-witnesses as to what the Princess went through at that time is truly astonishing. "Herself [writes a friend] filled with intensest sorrow, she at once took into her own hands everything that was necessary in those first dark days of the destruction of that happy home. All communications from the Ministers and household passed through the Princess's hands to the Queen, then bowed down by grief. She endeavoured in every way possible, either verbally or by writing, to save her mother all trouble." In this connexion we may quote from letters written in later days. Thus, in 1864, she wrote:

March 14th.

MY OWN DEAR PRECIOUS MAMA,

These words are for the 16th, the first hard trial of our lives, where I was allowed to be with you. Do you recollect when all was over [death of the Duchess of Kent], and dear Papa led you to the sofa in the colonnade, and then took me *to you?* I took that as a sacred request from him to love, cherish, and comfort my darling Mother to all the extent of my weak powers. Other things have taken me from being constantly with you; but nothing has lessened my intense love for you, and longing to quiet every pain which touches you, and to fulfil, even in the distance, his request.'

In 1862, the Princess wrote to her Majesty as follows:

Take courage, dear Mama, and feel strong in the thought that you require all your moral and physical strength to continue the journey which brings you daily nearer to *Home* and to *him!* I know how weary you feel, how you long to rest your head on his dear shoulder, to have him to soothe your aching heart. You will find this rest again, and how blessed will it not be! Bear patiently and courageously your heavy burden, and it will lighten imperceptibly as you near him, and God's love and mercy will support you. Oh, could my feeble words bring you the least comfort! They come from a trusting, true, and loving heart, if from naught else.

In the same year, a few days later (23rd August), she gave this counsel: "Try and gather in the few bright things you have remaining and "cherish them, for though faint, yet they are types of that infinite joy "still to come. I am sure, dear Mama, the more you try to appreciate "and to find the good in that which God in His love has *left* you, the "more worthy you will daily become of that which is in store. That "earthly happiness you had is indeed gone for ever, but you must not "think that every ray of it has left you. You have the privilege, which "dear Papa knew so well how to value, in your exalted position, of doing "good and living for others, of carrying on his plans, his wishes, into "fulfilment; and as you go on doing your duty, this will, this must, I "feel sure, bring you peace and comfort. Forgive me, darling Mama, "if I speak so openly; but my love for you is such that I cannot be "silent, when I long so fervently to give you some slight comfort and "hope in your present life.

"I have known and watched your deep sorrow with a sympathizing, "though aching heart. Do not think that absence from you can still "that pain. My love for you is strong, is constant; I would like to "shelter you in my arms, to protect you from all future anxiety, to still "your aching longing! My own sweet Mama, you know I would give "my life for you, could I alter what you have to bear!"

"*Trust in God!* ever and constantly. In *my* life I feel that to be my "stay and my strength, and the feeling increases as the days go on. My "thoughts of the future are bright, and this always helps to make the "minor worries and sorrows of the present dissolve before the warm rays "of that light which is our guide."

Passages like these, and there are many such, may serve to remind a thoughtful Christian of the twofold meaning of παράκλησις, exhortation and encouragement. In Barnabas (Acts iv. 36) there was candour and courage to exhort, we may suppose, even while he was consoling.

The life of Princess Alice, a daughter of consolation, was one of manifold trial; it was full of sympathy for the sorrows and sufferings of others. Hers was truly "a *thoughtful* love"—to quote Mrs. Waring's sweet hymn—"through constant watching wise"; there was

> "A heart at leisure from itself
> To soothe and sympathize."

It is pleasing to read, in this connexion, the Princess's own words, concerning bereavement. Prince Louis's sister, who was "very unselfish," of a "gentle, humble spirit," was taken away. Princess Alice, referring to the grief of her parents-in-law, writes to the Queen (21st April, 1865): "As I have shared their joys, so with all my heart do I share their sorrow. You well understand this, darling Mama. From you I have inherited an ardent and sympathizing spirit, and feel the pain of those I love as though it were my own."

The death of her sister-in-law, in the year 1865, brought home to her the uncertainty of life and necessity of labour, self-denial, charity, and all those virtues which we ought to strive after. "Oh," she adds, "that I may die, having done my work, and not sinned with *Unterlassung des Guten* [omission to do what is good], the fault into which it is easiest to fall." Again, in the same year, on 30th December, she writes: "Each year brings us nearer to the *Wiedersehen* [re-union with the dead], though it is sad to think how one's glass is running out, and how little good goes with it, compared to the numberless blessings we receive. Time goes incredibly fast."

The picture of the Princess as a wife is full of charm. Henry Venn Elliott, of Brighton, a Christian who did not speak rashly, once said of the wife he so tenderly loved and deeply lamented, "God knows her faults, I do not." The picture presented in this volume reminds us of Mr. Elliott's remark. Certainly, as a wife, Princess Alice ranks among the gentlest and noblest. And not inferior is her picture as a mother, wise, loving, and devoted. The grand old poet speaks of a tender watchfulness over a sleeping child:

> ὡς ὅτε μήτηρ
> παιδὸς ἐέργει μυῖαν, ὀθ' ἡδέι λέξατο ὕπνῳ:

and Princess Alice shows herself among her children, as well as in a sick-chamber, a most attentive and accomplished nurse.

The very sad and distressing accident of May 18, 1873, when little Prince Fritz fell through a window on the pavement below, was followed by many experiences in the school of sorrow. "The horror of my darling's sudden death," she wrote, "at times torments me too much, particularly waking of a morning; but when I think he is at rest, free from the sorrow we are suffering, and from every evil to come, I feel quite resigned." The bereaved mother refers to a hymn by Miss Procter, an old favourite of ours, called *Friend Sorrow;* it expressed much of what she felt, at this time, about a deep grief. It may be a service to some of our readers, perhaps, to mention, that this hymn appears in "Legends and Lyrics." The opening lines are these:

> "Do not cheat thy Heart, and tell her,
> 'Grief will pass away;
> Hope for fairer times in future,
> And forget to-day.'"

It was known that for a period the Princess was under the influence of German scepticism; but it was also known that, after she had made a friend of God-sent sorrow, her faith, through grace, was again made quick. A memorandum, written by an intimate friend, has an especial interest: "After her son's death," we read, "I thought I observed a change in her feelings. Before that time she had often expressed openly her doubts as to the existence of God; had allowed herself to be led away by the free-thinking philosophical views of others. After Prince Fritz died, she never spoke in such a way again. She remained silent while a transformation was quietly going on within, of which I afterwards was made aware, under the influence of some hidden power. It seemed as if she did not then like to own the change that had come over her." Some time afterwards, however, she told her friend, in the most simple and touching manner, how the change had come about. "I could not listen to her story without tears. The Princess told me she owed it all to her child's death, and to the influence of a Scotch gentleman, a friend of the Grand Duke's, who was residing with his family at Darmstadt. 'I owe all to this kind friend,' she said, 'who exercised such a beneficial influence on my religious views; yet people say so much that is cruel and unjust of him, and of my acquaintance with him.' Another time she said, 'The whole edifice of philosophical conclusions which I had built up for myself I find to have no foundation whatever; nothing of it is left: it has crumbled away like dust. What should we be, what would become of us, if we had no faith, if we did not believe that there is a God Who rules the world and each single one of us? I feel the necessity of prayer; I love to sing hymns with my children, and we have each our favourite hymn.'" Such a statement, as we have said, has an interest of its own. But we thankfully quote an editorial note: "*This memorandum does not go far enough. The Princess returned to the faith in which she was reared, and died in it, a devout Christian.*"

The Princess's character, portrayed in this volume, a daughter, a wife, a mother, is, as we have remarked, singularly beautiful and instructive. It is hardly necessary to add that her Christian sympathy was by no means limited by "family" ties. In charitable works of various kinds, specially

among the sick and the poor, she took a hearty interest, endeavouring herself to follow the blessed steps of Him, her "comfort and support," Who went about doing good, and Whose true disciples are "the light" and "the salt" of an evil world.

The Life of Christ. By Dr. BERNHARD WEISS, Counsellor of the Consistory and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by J. W. Hope, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Vols. I. and II., 1883. Vol. III., 1884.

The rapidity with which one "Life of Christ" follows another, and one Commentary on the New Testament follows another, is proof positive that, whatever reasons there may be for stigmatizing the present age as one of scepticism and irreligion, yet the Gospel narrative shows no sign of failing in power to interest and attract. Utterly fragmentary as are the records of Christ's life and work on earth, no theologian or body of theologians has thus far been able to convince the world that the most has been made of them. The four Gospels, which scarcely contain as many words as would fill an ordinary newspaper, have been expanded again and again into biographies a thousand pages in length; and still the hearts of Christian students remain unsatisfied. We have scarcely digested one voluminous "Life of Christ," from the pen of some leading scholar, before we are invited to consider another from some one else whose claim to our attention cannot be gainsaid. In our own country, the works of Archdeacon Farrar, of Dr. Geikie, and of Dr. Edersheim will occur to everyone as illustrations of this statement. On the Continent, there are those of Keim, Hausrath, Renan and others, all of which have been translated into English for some years. And now we have yet another from the hand of Professor Weiss, first given to the world in the original German in 1882, and the very next year published in part in an English translation through the enterprise of Messrs. Clark. The two volumes of the German edition have been broken into three in the English. The third volume appeared as these pages were in the press.

After the favourite manner of German writers, Dr. Weiss divides his work into "Books"—seven in all. Of these, volumes one and two contain four: I. The Sources; II. The Preparation; III. Seed-Time; IV. The First Conflicts. The remaining Books are, V. The Crisis; VI. Jerusalem; VII. The Passion. Of these seven books we are inclined to think the first by far the most valuable, especially the chapters which relate to the Fourth Gospel. Here Dr. Weiss writes with the authority of one who is thoroughly master of his subject. And though even here his standpoint is not exactly ours, nor that of most of our readers, yet, in the main, one agrees with his conclusions and is grateful to him for the powerful arguments with which he supports what the Church has all along believed.

Great as must have been the number of persons who had witnessed leading acts in the life of Christ, and heard many of His discourses and conversations, yet it would be chiefly in "the limited circle of the Church in Jerusalem" that the oral tradition respecting His words and works would insensibly be created. In connexion with this fact Dr. Weiss makes an important remark. Whereas in the northern parts of Palestine the languages in common use were a good deal mixed, it was in Jerusalem "that the language was spoken which Jesus Himself had employed. And the poverty of the Aramaic dialect, which admitted of no great variation of expression, contributed to the early establishment of a fixed type of narration, which became the more settled even in details the oftener that

subject was referred to. The main points in the utterances of Jesus, the principal junctures in the narration of the events in connexion with which they were spoken, or which memory associated with them—these took more and more a permanent form, from which there was, in their subsequent recital, an ever diminishing deviation" (i. p. 17). Of course Dr. Weiss does not mean to imply that our Gospels are translations from Aramaic originals—not even of St. Matthew would he assert that—but merely that an oral tradition arose in the first instance in Aramaic, and that this had considerable influence upon the form which the Greek tradition and Greek documents afterwards assumed.

Dr. Weiss holds fast to the primitive tradition that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Aramaic, and he believes this to have been the earliest Gospel of all. He thinks its date can be ascertained with something like certainty. Irenæus (III. i. 1) says that Matthew wrote when Peter and Paul were founding the Church in Rome. This must refer to the last years of Nero, A.D. 65-68. Eusebius (H. E. III., xxiv.) says that Matthew, when he quitted Palestine, bequeathed his Gospel to the Hebrews as a substitute for his personal teaching. This must refer to the departure of Christians from the country after the outbreak of the revolutionary war in A.D. 66. Lastly, in our Gospel of St. Matthew (xxiv. 15) there is the remarkable parenthesis, "Let him that readeth understand," which seems to refer to a moment when the writer saw the Lord's words in process of fulfilment, and wished to warn his readers that the time for flight from the doomed city had already come. From these data Dr. Weiss would fix A.D. 67 as the time when the first Gospel was given to the Church by St. Matthew in Aramaic. But of this first Aramaic Gospel the Greek St. Matthew is anything but a mere translation. This is now perhaps universally conceded. Dr. Weiss considers that the existing First Gospel is the compilation of some unknown writer, who made use of the Aramaic Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Mark, and probably other materials.

With regard to the Second Gospel, Dr. Weiss holds fast to the primitive tradition that it is practically St. Peter's, and considers that its language and contents adequately establish the statement of Clement of Alexandria that it was written in Rome and for Romans. He does not discuss the conflicting evidence as to its having been written before or after St. Peter's death, but, without assigning reasons, decides for the testimony of Irenæus, who tells us that Mark wrote *after* the death of Peter and Paul. He considers that Mark ii. 26 implies that the temple with the shewbread is still in existence; so that the Gospel can hardly have been written later than 69 A.D., just a year or two after the date assigned to the Aramaic Gospel of St. Matthew. In connexion with this subject he expresses his conviction that the Apocalypse "was undoubtedly (*zweifellos*) written before the destruction of Jerusalem," a conviction with which we entirely agree. He does not think that St. Mark was entirely dependent upon St. Peter for his materials. His family belonged to Jerusalem, and while living with them he must have been acquainted with the Gospel narratives in circulation there before he became accustomed to hear St. Peter's form of narration.

On the vexed question as to the last verses of St. Mark's Gospel, recently revived by the republication of Dean Burgon's vehement articles from the *Quarterly Review*, Dr. Weiss writes as follows:

> That the present conclusion of the Gospel (xvi. 9-20) is shown, both by the testimony of the MSS. and also by its peculiarities of language and style of narrative, not to have belonged to the original Gospel, may now be regarded as admitted.

As to the Third Gospel, the one thing which he considers to be quite

certain is that it is quite independent of St. Matthew's. Scarcely less certain is it that St. Luke compiled his Gospel mainly from documentary sources, as seems to be shown from the marked difference of style between the preface and the Gospel itself. When the evangelist is quite free from Hebraic influences, he writes with "the hand of a practised Greek writer." But, seeing that he came to Palestine with St. Paul, he may quite possibly have there become familiar with the oral tradition. With all this it is not difficult to agree. But it is hard to follow Dr. Weiss when he contends that the so-called peculiarities of St. Luke's style "demonstrably originate with his sources." How can this be when they are scattered broadcast over every chapter of the Gospel and of the Acts? Let us assume, for the sake of illustration, what is in itself highly probable, that in the contents of the first three chapters of the Gospel St. Luke has edited for us three or more separate documents; then how can we account for the marked similarities of diction and construction which pervade them all, if these do not come from the evangelist, but from his sources? Anyone who will take the trouble to go through three or four chapters of either the Gospel or the Acts and mark all the things which are characteristic of what is commonly called St. Luke's style, will soon be convinced that the style is rightly called his. Let the chapters be taken not consecutively, but at intervals, the result will be exactly the same. Only where we come upon what has conveniently been styled "the triple tradition"—*i.e.*, that large element which is common to all three of the Synoptic Gospels—do these peculiarities abate somewhat. Elsewhere, no matter what may be the source from which St. Luke derived his information, these characteristics abound. The obvious inference is that they come from the evangelist, and not from his sources.

As to the date of this Gospel, Dr. Weiss considers that "the definite indication given by the prophecy of the fate of Jerusalem (xix. 43, 44) puts it beyond doubt that the Gospel, if not its source, was written after the destruction of Jerusalem" (i. p. 88). Curiosity prompted us to look to the discussion of this passage in the as yet untranslated portion of the work, to see whether Dr. Weiss went the length of maintaining that this prophecy is an invention put into the mouth of Christ after the event. Not quite that. He has too much literary acumen to believe that the evangelist *could* have invented the intensity of that appeal, "If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace!" But in his exasperatingly dogmatic way he tells us that *for the sake of effect* St. Luke has placed the weeping over Jerusalem next to the triumphal entry, although *beyond doubt it does not belong there*, and that the wording of the lamentation has been altered so as to make it fit more exactly with the details of the fulfilment. This is only one of numerous instances in which the statements of evangelists are brushed away without the smallest compunction when they chance to conflict with the convictions of our author. On this point we shall have more to say presently.

But of this First Book it is the chapters which treat of the Fourth Gospel that can be read with the largest amount of satisfaction. Here one finds one's self usually in harmony not only with the conclusions reached, but with the method of reaching them. He condemns as quite unreasonable the attempt which has lately been made to throw doubt upon the abundantly attested tradition that John the Apostle lived at Ephesus until near the close of the first century. Any confusion with "the presbyter John" is incredible. He holds firmly to the belief that the unnamed disciple in John i. 35, xiii. 23, 24, xviii. 15, 16, xix. 34, 35, xx. 2-8, is John the Apostle, the writer of the Gospel. In John xxi. 25, an addition made by the Ephesian elders, we have "a witness to the

origin of the Gospel as ancient and reliable as we could ever wish to possess." They "added this closing word to the final chapter as it was about to pass away from this circle to the Church, which of course knew quite well from whose hands it received it, and who those were who spoke here" (p. 95). On the history of modern attempts to discredit the apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel, he writes crushingly as follows:

Criticism has torn to shreds the external evidence for the Gospel. Baur would allow no trace of the Fourth Gospel before the last quarter of the second century. His followers have had to concede one after another the testimonies which he impugned. All that has been discovered since then—the *Philosophumena* with their ample quotations of John from the Gnostic writings, the end of the *Clementines* with the history of the man born blind, the Syriac commentary on Tatian's *Diatessaron*—has positively refuted assertions of criticism long and obstinately clung to. The last energetic opponent of the genuineness of the Gospel has latterly been compelled by the external evidence to push back the origination of the Gospel to the second decade of the second century. And the obvious impossibility of conceiving a forgery of the Gospel taking place so soon after the death of the Apostle has made it necessary for him to contest the tradition of the Apostle's residence at Ephesus, a position regarded as untenable hypercriticism by all prudent representatives of the Tübingen school. (P. 98.)

And as to the character of the Gospel, for the authenticity of which he so ably argues, Dr. Weiss puts the case forcibly thus:

Christianity is no philosophy which thinks to redeem the world through its ideals, while it either does not know sin or looks for its being overcome by the world's natural progress. Christianity announces an act of love on the part of God, through which the world is saved in the sending of His only-begotten Son. That in the manifestation of Christ the divine act of love perfected itself, that it was the guilt of unpardonable unbelief when Jesus was not recognised as being what He was, that in Him the faithful saw the glory of the Eternal Word brought down to the level of the senses—these are the facts which the Gospel of St. John proposes to oppose as an invincible bulwark against the approaching storm of that false Gnosis. (P. 133.)

Dr. Weiss has no sympathy with the sceptical dogmatism which pronounces the miraculous to be quite incredible or even antecedently improbable. "Indeed, whoever considers that a marvellous historical revelation, preparatory to the appearance of Jesus, is an established fact, will think it only natural that this possibility (of miracles) should be realized." Whether it was so or not is simply a question of evidence.

In passing on from the discussion of the sources of the Gospel narrative to the construction of the "Life of Christ," we find ourselves much less frequently able to agree with Dr. Weiss's method and results. A criticism of his own on Renan's work on the same subject might fitly be applied to himself: *mutato nomine de te.* A vivid reproduction of the past out of elements which are very fragmentary is a work expected from the historian.

Here lies the highest task of the historian, but also his greatest danger. Renan's "Life of Jesus" is not a history, but a romance. Not because, with rare intellectual gifts, he attempted this task at all; but because, being one to whom our sources in their actual form were distasteful, or positively unintelligible, he could not escape the danger of correcting them according to his taste, or of making purely arbitrary selections from them. (P. 205.)

This is precisely the fault that we have to find with Dr. Weiss. One would be very far indeed from asserting that he has no sympathy with the Gospels; still further from hinting that he fails to comprehend them. But we do complain of the manner in which, when the evangelist plainly says one thing, Dr. Weiss peremptorily asserts that something quite different is the truth. One instance of this kind of thing has been given

above in the paragraph respecting the Third Gospel: a few more may now be added. They seem to be cases in which, like Renan, he has been unable to resist the temptation of altering the Gospel narrative in order to suit his own fancy, and of adopting just as much or as little of it as he pleases. Thus of St. Luke's account of the Annunciation, he writes: "If it is considered to be an actual fact that Mary received a Divine revelation of the miracle which was to be wrought upon her, it must at the same time be acknowledged that *the representation belongs to the narrator*. But if anything in it can, in the highest sense, lay claim to historical truth, it is the lowly resignation with which Mary submits herself to the decree of God thus announced to her" (p. 223). Again, Elizabeth's declaration respecting Mary, "Blessed is she that believed" (Luke i. 45), "*can only belong to the writer*" (p. 244). And why? Because it is an obvious allusion to the unbelief of Zacharias; and of the unbelief of Zacharias, Elizabeth could know nothing. Has the statement that she "was filled with the Holy Ghost" no bearing on the question? The statement that "Herod the king was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him" (Matt. ii. 3), is pronounced to be "no historical record, but only the writer's conception" (p. 269). Yet the intrinsic probability of Herod's fear is admitted. He identifies the healing of the "nobleman's" son (John iv. 45) with that of the centurion's servant recorded by the Synoptists (Matt. viii. 5; Luke vii. 2). In order to do this he has of course to assume that first one evangelist and then another has made surprising mistakes as to the place, the person cured, the petitioner, and the disease (ii. pp. 46-50). Yet he justly condemns the identification of the woman who was a "sinner" with Mary of Bethany, and the anointing by the one (Luke vii. 37, 38) with the anointing by the other (John xii. 3) as absolutely untenable (ii. pp. 132, 133). The points of difference in the one case are quite as strong as in the other. We read in the Gospels that some one once asked Jesus what he must do to win eternal life, and St. Matthew (xix. 20) tells us that he was a "young man." Dr. Weiss assures us that he "cannot possibly have been a youth, for it is said that he could look back upon a youthful life free from reproach" (ii. p. 246); as if this were not a reason for believing the evangelist. The older the questioner was, the less likelihood there would be of his being able to say that his life had been free from reproach. When Jesus said, "He that is without sin, let him first cast a stone," it was the older men that slunk away first. (John viii. 7-9.)

But enough. These instances will suffice to illustrate what seems to be the glaring defect in this able work. And yet the defect itself is not all loss. Here is an acute critic who handles the Gospels with the utmost freedom: who has no scruple whatever in roundly asserting that the evangelists, under the influence of their own purposes or preconceived ideas, have frequently described as taking place in one way what really took place in quite a different way, or perhaps even did not take place at all. And yet, with all this amount of liberty, the results obtained are in the main not negative or destructive, but positive, edifying, and in harmony with traditional Christian beliefs. It is pleasant to give a few examples. Thus, in reference to the healing of the son of the royal official, a cure effected miles away from the sick person, Dr. Weiss remarks:

To those who deny the miraculous, this narrative presents an insoluble difficulty. . . . . Criticism rightly rejects every idea of spiritualistic causes remote from the spot, as well as every analogy from magnetic healing forces operating at a distance. It is evident that in this case, where Jesus never comes into contact with the invalid, no natural interposition of a corporeal or psychical kind can be admitted. If the authenticity of the narrative is disallowed, then nothing is left but to regard a story guaranteed by a twofold apostolic authority as myth or fiction. (II. p. 50.)

Dr. Weiss says "*twofold* apostolic authority," because he regards this miracle as identical with the healing of the centurion's servant. Still more strongly with regard to the feeding of the five thousand:

Thus much is absolutely certain: that all our accounts are *intended* to narrate a miracle; and by this we must abide, unless the origin of the tradition is to remain an inexplicable riddle. But, in that case, nothing remains but to admit that a miracle of Divine Providence took place. (II. p. 385.)

Yet here, unfortunately, Dr. Weiss cannot let well alone; while admitting that "the divine operation was no doubt invisible," he suggests that the miracle consisted in Christ's power over all those who had any food, inducing them to surrender it to Him for the use of all. Yet the disciples state expressly that the people "have nothing to eat" (Mark vi. 36), and the mention in all four narratives of the five loaves would be almost unintelligible if besides these five there was abundance of food. And how could His inducing others to give up their provisions kindle the enthusiasm which would have made Him a King even by force? But, with all these drawbacks, the important fact remains that Dr. Weiss finds the evidence for miracles in the Gospels quite too strong to be set aside. Our concluding quotation shall be a passage in which he contends that miracles of healing are *necessary* to the mission of the Messiah:

In truth they formed a most essential part of His ministry. The utterly unhistorical view, that the Messiah was really nothing more than a reformer of religion and morals, must be abandoned. He is nowhere represented as such in Old Testament prophecy; and therefore Jesus cannot have regarded His Messianic calling in this light. The ultimate aim of the Messianic activity never varied from being the reformation of the nation's life as a whole, the healing of all its miseries, the satisfaction of all its needs, and the bringing about the most ample salvation and blessing even as regards its external existence. . . . . He recognised the profound connexion existing between the misery of sickness and the misery of sin. . . . . The great Physician of sin, therefore, had to be a physician of the body as well, in order to show that the salvation which He brought embraced both soul and body. His ministry of healing became a great sermon in deeds on the Divine power which had appeared on earth, saving, healing, and blessing. . . . . No one has recognised this more distinctly than the fourth evangelist; and therefore Jesus's miracles in general, and His miracles of healing in particular, are by him always called *signs*. (II. p. 103.)

From these specimens our readers will see that the merits of this work are somewhat mixed. It is a book for the teacher rather than for the learner. The experienced student will learn a good deal from it; the inexperienced will be likely to be often led astray. There is a freshness and suggestiveness about it that will often set the reader thinking; but if he accepts its very positive assertions without thinking, he may find that he has exchanged the plain statements of inspired writers for the conjectural emendations of Dr. Weiss.

The translation is fair, but not excellent; and in quoting it we have

not scrupled to alter it considerably, in order to do more justice to the German original. But the learned author's fondness for compound words makes translation into idiomatic English somewhat difficult. Only once have we had to resort to the German, in order to find out the intended meaning of the English; and there (i. p. 105, "The one contains," etc.) it is not easy to see how the queer English sentence expresses the meaning of the original. It was also startling to find a chapter headed "The Immaculate Conception," and we at once referred to the German to see whether Dr. Weiss had really given such a title to a portion of his work; and we found that he had not. What can have induced Mr. Hope to give "The Immaculate Conception" as a rendering of *Empfangen von dem heiligen Geiste?* Does he think that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception refers to the conception of Jesus Christ? And we cannot congratulate him on the one addition which he has made to the work of Dr. Weiss. The footnote on p. 44 of vol. i. is both misleading and wanting in dignity.

D. D.

Short Notices.

A Summary of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners' Report, and of Dr. Stubbs' Historical Reports; together with a Review of the Evidence before the Commission. By SPENCER L. HOLLAND, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. Parker and Co., Oxford and London. 1884. Pp. 320.

THE title of this book, which is, so far as we know, the first literary effort of a young barrister, is not a little misleading. We expected from it to find, presented to us in a compendious form, the pith of the Commissioners' Report itself, and of the appendices containing the present Bishop of Chester's historical dissertations, followed by a synopsis of the voluminous evidence which was taken before the Commission. We were, no doubt, prepared to find also the author's own opinions on the documents which he had summarized, and should have had no right to complain on the ground of their being submitted to us at considerable length. But on taking into our hands what promised to be a useful substitute to persons unable to possess or consult the Report itself, we have speedily been undeceived. It is true that in an Appendix there are given the names of all the Commissioners, and the names of all the witnesses who attended before them. But these are the only particulars on which full information is vouchsafed to us; and the very fragmentary idea which we can obtain from the book of the contents of the two-volume Blue-book in which the Report and Evidence are set forth, is rendered still more difficult to grasp by the titles of the three parts into which the work is divided. Part I. has no title; but the pages throughout it are headed, "A Summary, etc., Introduction." This "Introduction," in fact, contains the substance of the Report itself, mixed up with not a few quotations from the evidence taken before the Commissioners, and much argumentative matter for which the author is himself responsible. It is a little singular that all this should be considered by him

merely as introductory to Parts II. and III., the first of which is a summary of the account, contained in Dr. Stubbs' Historical Appendix No. I. to the Report, of the Courts which have exercised Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England up to the year 1832; while the last is entitled "On the Evidence brought before the Commission as to the legislative action of Convocation in the past, and as to the suggestions for such action in the future: together with illustrations of the possible position of the Church as a self-governing body, and its relation to the Courts of Law under such conditions." In this third and last Part there are numerous extracts from the fourth and fifth of Dr. Stubbs' Historical Appendices; but we are, for the most part, left to surmise, as we read it, whether we have before us more or less verbatim extracts from those Appendices, or the oral evidence given by Dr. Stubbs before the Commissioners, or the author's deductions from other documentary or oral evidence set forth in the Blue-books of the Commission. To Dr. Stubbs' second and third Appendices we have not been able to find any allusion whatever. Mr. Holland closes the Part and the volume with a section entitled "The Principles to be deduced for the Guidance of the Church of England." His conclusion is that it would be well that the Church should remain established, but that it should have that amount of legislative and judicial freedom which is possessed by the Established Church of Scotland, and by the Roman Catholic Church in France, which is still in a certain sense connected with the State. The book displays considerable industry; and an analysis of its contents at the beginning is of some assistance to the reader in finding his way about it. But its value is largely diminished by the impossibility in some cases, and the difficulty, without the closest attention throughout the greater part of the whole work, of ascertaining who is the authority for the statements we are perusing, whether the Commissioners as a body, or Dr. Stubbs, or some other witness, or the author himself. The reservations of the dissenting Commissioners are given in part in appendices, but without any indication that there are other reservations omitted. In particular, no hint is given of the existence of Lord Coleridge's strong separate expression of dissent as to the Bishop's veto. We recommend such of our readers as desire to have before them the actual recommendations of the Commissioners, to resort, not to this book, but to the reprint of pp. lii.—lxiii. of the Report itself, containing the suggested scheme of the Commissioners, which has been brought out by the direction of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, and is sold for the sum of 2d. at 24, Lorn Road, Brixton, S.W.

Shadows. Scenes and Incidents in the Life of an old Armchair. By Mrs. O. F. WALTON. Author of "Christie's Old Organ," "A Peep Behind the Scenes," etc. Pp. 308. Religious Tract Society.

This book was given to a Sunday-school teacher, and we may repeat the criticism made: "A very good set of stories. It shows how little things that are bad, if not checked, not corrected, get bigger and bigger. It will teach young people very profitable lessons. The part about Algernon, with his fine cigars, hot-house flowers for his button-holes, and so forth, getting into debt, is a good sample." We may add that the book is tastefully got up.

Through an accident, our notice of Canon Pennington's little book, *John Wiclif* (S.P.C.K.), must be delayed a month.

We are pleased to recommend *In Wiclif's Days*, a well-written story by Miss STEBBING, published by Messrs. Shaw and Co. Three other numbers of their capital "Home Series," sixpence each, have reached us.

In the June *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivington) appears an interesting review of Bryennius's Διδαχή, with a translation. The three chapters on the Communion are thus translated :

"Chapter IX.—Concerning the Eucharistical prayer, thus give thanks. "First, about the cup : 'We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the "holy vine of David Thy servant (παιδός σου), which Thou hast made "known to us by Jesus, Thy Child (παιδός σου). To Thee be the glory "for ever.' And about the broken bread : 'We give thanks to Thee, "our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou madest known unto "us through Jesus, Thy Child. To Thee be the glory for ever. As this "bread which we break was once scattered over the hills, and gathered "together it became one, so may Thy Church be gathered from the "ends of the earth into Thy kingdom ; for Thine is the glory and the "power, through Jesus Christ, for ever.' And let no one eat or drink "of your Eucharist, except those who are baptized in the name of the "Lord ; for about this the Lord said : 'Give not that which is holy to "the dogs.'

"Chapter X.—And after reception [*lit.*, after ye are filled] thus give "thanks : 'We give thanks to Thee, Holy Father, for Thy Holy Name, "which Thou madest to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and "faith of immortality, which Thou madest known to us through Jesus, "Thy Child. To Thee be the glory for ever. Thou, Almighty Lord, "didst create all things for Thy Name's sake, and didst give food and "drink to men for enjoyment, that they may give thanks unto Thee ; "and on us Thou bestowedst spiritual food and drink and eternal life, "through Thy Child ; and above all, we give thanks to Thee for Thy "power (ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ). To Thee be the glory for ever. Remember, O "Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in Thy "love, and gather it from the four winds, the sanctified Church into Thy "kingdom, which Thou didst prepare for it ; for Thine is the power and "the glory for ever. Let grace come, and let this world pass away. "Hosanna to the Son of David ! If any be holy, let him come ; if not, "let him repent. Maranatha. Amen.' And allow the prophets to offer "what Eucharistical prayers they please.

"Chapter XIV.—Assemble yourselves on the Lord's Day, and break "bread and give thanks, having confessed your transgressions, that your "sacrifice may be pure. And if anyone has a dispute with his com-"panion, let him not join you until they be reconciled, that your "sacrifice be not desecrated ; for this was what was said by the Lord : "'In every place and time ye shall bring to Me a pure sacrifice ; for I am "a great king, saith the Lord, and My name is wonderful amongst the "Gentiles.'"

The Διδαχή, says the *Foreign Church Chronicle*, must be very early. The prominent position assigned to the prophets goes far to prove this, and there are other indications not to be mistaken. "We will cite one," says the *Chronicle*, "which does not lie on the surface. In the liturgical "directions as to the Eucharist we find a very remarkable word used for "the reception—μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι—'after ye are filled ;' whereas in the "Constitution the ordinary words—μετὰ τὴν μετάλημψιν—'after the reception,' "are used. The word in the *Teaching* indicates that the partaking of the "consecrated elements took place at the same time as the love-feast, as was "the case in the time of St. Paul (1 Cor. xi.). It was still the custom for "the Christians to bring their offerings of bread and wine, and a part of "their offerings having been taken and consecrated as the Lord's Body, "to eat the feast of charity and consume the consecrated elements one

"after the other, carefully 'discerning' the one from the other, and "giving thanks for the whole at the conclusion of the feast. Thus we "can understand the words 'after ye are filled.' At a later date, when "the two feasts—the feast of charity and the sacred feast—were separated "from one another, the words 'after the reception' were naturally sub-"stituted."

In the *Church Sunday School Magazine* for June, a double number, appears a very interesting report of the forty-first anniversary of the Institute.—The *Church Worker* is good as usual.

The *Thirty-ninth Report of the Thames Church Mission Society* (E. Stock) is exceedingly good. The illustrations are pleasing, and the narratives are full of interest. The report of the Annual Meeting tells its own tale. How is it, we wonder, that so few of the clergy allow the use of their pulpits for advocating the claims of so excellent a Mission?

The *Twelfth Annual Report of the South Eastern Clerical and Lay Alliance* (Maidstone: W. S. Vivish, 28, King Street) contains, with the usual lists, rules, and statements, a full report of the last Annual Meeting; also a report and appeal on behalf of the S. E. College, Ramsgate; also the tenth Report of the Deaconess-Home, Maidstone. The President of the S. E. Alliance, as is well-known, is the Dean of CANTERBURY. The clerical Hon. Sec. (to whom the Alliance is much indebted) is the Rev. W. F. COBB, Nettleshead Rectory, Maidstone. At the anniversary, papers were read by Mr. WALLER, now Principal of St. John's, Mr. WHITING, and other representative men.

In the *Leisure Hour* appears "Murky Skies," by Dr. MACAULAY, "written after hearing Mr. Ruskin's Lecture on the 'Plague-Cloud' of these latter times."

RUSKIN! thou sayest sadly that the skies
Are not as once they were, that heaven's blue
Has lost its azure, and a sombre hue
O'er all the earth with joyless shadow lies!
The clouds no more are golden to our eyes,
The light of other days we now ne'er view!
And as we listen to thy plaintive cries
We almost deem the dark description true.
And yet, these doleful sights by few are seen;
The heaven above with tints as gorgeous glows
As art has ever drawn or poet sung;
The sky is still as blue, the earth as green.
The change is not in nature, but in those,
Whose sight grows dimmer, and their hearts less young.

We are pleased to recommend an interesting pamphlet, *A Holiday Tour in America in* 1883. A personal narrative by Mr. GAWIN KIRKHAM, the energetic Secretary of the Open Air Mission. (Open Air Mission Office, 14, Duke Street, Adelphi, W.C.) The pamphlet has several illustrations.

Here is an excellent tract: *One Blood; being Thoughts on Acts* xvii. 26. By the Right Rev. J. C. RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool (W. Hunt and Co.). We should like to know that this tractate or pamphlet, a most valuable *multum in parvo*, was being sown broadcast over the land.

We have a respect and regard for Mr. HENRY VARLEY, remembering in especial his action in regard to the Bradlaugh election episode, but we cannot recommend his *Terse Talk on Timely Topics* (Nisbet). It is a clever book, and contains good stuff. But, to take only one point, it objects to the baptism of children.

THE MONTH.

THE chief ecclesiastical event has been the Lichfield Diocesan Synod. Some 450 clergymen assembled in the Cathedral. The prayers were all in Latin, "derived from ancient sources." No reporters were present; but the Bishop's address has appeared in full. It deals mainly with "evangelical work," "services for the masses," and "lay agency." Its earnestness, deep-toned spirituality, and directness, have been generally admired; but certain passages, particularly in regard to the Act of Uniformity and services in consecrated buildings conducted by laymen, have naturally raised misgivings.

With respect to the votes of the Convocation of Canterbury (June CHURCHMAN, p. 240), the *Guardian*[1] (June 18th) says:

> We cannot say that we regret this caution. The Bishop of Lichfield is naturally disappointed at his failure to lead the Church in a direction which seems to him so full of usefulness. But it must be obvious that more consideration is needed, and more safeguards should be enforced, before the proposal can be accepted and acted upon.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> There is a great difference between allowing a certain amount of lay preaching in buildings to which no one need go, and admitting laymen to a chief part in the chief services of the central place of worship, and though the Bishop of Lichfield's proposal is limited to bye-services, yet we doubt whether this limitation, even if it were observed, would be always understood by the less educated. They would see the church used for lay-preaching, and they would almost certainly invest the doctrines so supported with all the authority of the pulpit. And we do not quite understand why the Bishop assumes that the "poorest and the meanest" will only listen to a lay preacher, and that till laymen are admitted to preach in the churches the poor will be "banished to schoolrooms or to Mission chapels." It is surely within the power of a clergyman to preach so that the poor shall understand him. Or is simplicity of speech a purely lay accomplishment?

---

[1] In the *Guardian* the Rev. C. H. SALE writes: "The Bishop repudiates all desire of new organizations. He has immense confidence in the Church of God. He believes in its ministry, Bishops, priests, and deacons; in its methods and commission, 'because of God.' Nevertheless, he ends by relying for the evangelization of the masses upon the ministrations of laymen in our churches. Certain laws of realm and Church and the solemn judgment of Convocation are acknowledged to be in the way. These laws must be abolished or modified, and certainly will be. Meantime they are more or less ignored or evaded, and may be thus pardonably dealt with, so that their spirit be observed; and in deciding this question a latitude is claimed which does not seem to be based on any very logical method.

"Without going further into the debatable points with which this address bristles, it may be allowed to ask, with all respect, why the Bishop makes this humiliating confession of the failure of the Christian ministry, and calls despairingly for the uncommissioned ministrations of laymen in our Church, at a moment when the unanimous resolution of the Episcopate on the extension of the diaconate has placed at the service of the Church the very class of men whom he desiderates within the ranks of the ministry in which he believes."