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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XI.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1884.

ART. I.—THE PRESENT RELATION OF THE IRISH CHURCH TO IRISH PROTESTANT DISSENT.

THE importance of the subject treated in this paper is evident from the result of the last census.

The prevalent opinion in England—an opinion which owes its formation to the industrious efforts of interested parties—is, that the Protestants of Ireland are a mere handful—some go so far as to say a troublesome handful; but most of those in England who speak or think on the matter at all, would be disposed to regard them as a handful hardly worth taking into account in any arrangements to be made for the future settlement of Ireland. It must, therefore, be of importance to ascertain at the present time what really are the forces of Protestantism in Ireland as to quantity and quality, and how, possibly, those forces may be utilized so that they may work in one direction.

According to the census returns of 1881, there were then in Ireland 635,670 members of the Church, 485,503 Presbyterians, 47,669 Methodists, 37,512 Protestants of "other denominations," 453 Jews, and only 1,144 who refused to describe themselves as belonging to any denomination, some of them doubtless being non-Christians, and some of them such as might call themselves "Christians unattached." Now the whole number of these added together amounts to the respectable total of 1,207,951, nearly one million and a quarter; and when it is remembered that a large proportion of the wealth, intelligence, and energy of the population is centred in these Protestants, and that the total amount of the Roman Catholics is some 3,950,000, then it must be conceded that the majority of the Roman Catholics is not so overwhelmingly great, and that the weight of the Protestants is not so utterly insignificant.

Indeed, there can be no doubt that if the Irish Protestants were homogeneous, if they presented one united front, their numbers and weight would tell with a force which no Government could disregard. That they do not form such an united body, that they are broken up into various sections, some of them very inconsiderable in point of numbers, is matter for regret, and at the same time matter for serious consideration as to how the evils of division may be minimized.

In the case of the Church of Ireland, there are some points connected with the statistics of the census which require explanation. There was a decrease, as compared with the census of 1871, of 32,000, or 4·8 per cent. This decrease was proportionately greater than that of the Presbyterian body, which lost 12,000 members, or 2·4 per cent., whilst the Methodist body actually scored an increase of 4,228, or 9·7 per cent. on their numbers.

Such decrease of the numbers of Irish Church people might well be regarded with apprehension, if it were not capable of explanation; but the explanation of the decrease is largely supplied by the increase of this Methodist body just referred to. It is to be carefully remembered that the increase of the Methodists has arisen, not from the secession of *bonâ fide* Church members, but rather from the secession of the Primitive Methodists, who were formerly loosely connected with the Church, and numbered with her members in the census returns. It is well known that efforts were made in the general Synod to arrive at a comprehension of the Primitive Methodist body, and that these efforts were nugatory, because of the impossibility of coming to terms such as would have been satisfactory to the Conference and safe for the Church; and the result was, that whilst some of the "Primitives" maintained their old position, or were absorbed into the Church, the far larger portion was absorbed into the Wesleyan body. When to this is added the fact that the last census was made during a reign of terror in Ireland, at a time when many of the landlords were breaking up their establishments, or carrying themselves and their establishments to safer quarters, the wonder is that the numbers of the Church of Ireland showed as favourably as they did.

There is another point to be considered.

A review of the figures will show, that whilst the total of Church members amounts in round numbers to 636,000, the total of Protestant Dissenters amounts to 572,000, that is to say, to considerably over half a million; and many will be disposed to say that is a very serious proportion, which no doubt it is. Nor will it do, by way of answer to this, to fall back on the statistics of English Dissent, at least so far as those

statistics are concerned with numbers. Granting that Dissenters speak truly when they say they form one-half the population of England, or that as others say, who are probably nearer the truth, they form one-third—it might still be said to the members of the Irish Church: "You were a comparatively small body, and so might have kept yourselves together better than we could; and you, moreover, were subject to that external pressure which has a tendency to render communities homogeneous." Moreover, "Two blacks never make one white, and it is a poor thing to make excuse for one's own defects by instancing the deficiencies of one's neighbours."

The real explanation of the large apparent proportion of Irish Protestant Dissenters is found in a fact which cannot be too well known or deeply pondered; and it is this, that whilst English Dissent is a real thing in the sense that English Dissenters are lapsed members of the English Church, Irish Dissent is altogether another thing, inasmuch as the great bulk of those Protestants in Ireland who are not members of the National Church were never at any time her members, but belong—even as their fathers belonged—to a Church imported from another country: a Church with laws, government, and constitution of its own.

We cannot regard the Presbyterian community in Ireland as a Dissenting community in the ordinary sense of the word. Practically, no doubt, the Presbyterians are Dissenters from some of the doctrines, and from the worship and discipline of the Church of Ireland; but historically they cannot be called "separatists," inasmuch as they never separated from our Church; but are the descendants of those who brought over their modes of religious thought and forms of church government from a country where Presbyterianism was the religion of the people at large, and where at this day it is the established religion.

In dealing, therefore, with the question of Irish Protestant Dissent, we must eliminate from the number of Dissenters—properly so called—the 485,670 who owe allegiance to the Presbyterian Church. These people were never members of the Irish Church. They form, as they have always formed, a distinct body. Whether they might at any time have been comprehended within our ranks is a question to which some have given an affirmative answer; but the student of the history of attempted comprehensions will be inclined to hesitate, and when he turns from general efforts to such as might have been made in this particular instance, he will acknowledge that the comprehension of Irish Presbyterians, as a body, would have been at the very least as difficult a matter as the comprehen-

sion of any other body of religionists who loved to have their own way and to walk in their own paths.

For the present, and for years to come, the sense of all that we have in common with our Presbyterian brethren, and the friendliness of feeling as well as the harmony of action which spring from such sense, must stand instead of any attempt at comprehension, which would be likely to do more harm than good.

Leaving out the Presbyterians, there is a remainder of Protestant Dissenters amounting to 86,778; and of these 47,000 are Wesleyan Methodists. Time was when these Wesleyans were not regarded as ordinary Dissenters. In Ireland, even more than in England, they clung to the traditions of their founder; and in the census of 1834 they were numbered in the return of Irish Churchmen. Now, however, according to the natural tendency of things, they have settled down into a "Church," and are undoubtedly to be regarded as dissenters from the Church of Ireland. It matters little that they have points in common with that Church, and that some of the words of our formularies linger in their services; for it is a common remark that differences between those who are nearly related are often most sharply accentuated and most difficult of accommodation.

And thus it appears that in the sense of *separatism* the amount of dissent in Ireland is inconsiderable, and bears no proportion to the amount of similar dissent in England. But though this is in itself an interesting and cheering fact, it must not be forgotten that the circumstances of Ireland and her Church are less tolerant of dissent than those of her English sister.

The act of disestablishment produced an effect which might easily have been predicted, but which for obvious reasons was not predicted by the prophets and promoters of the movement. On the contrary, these prophets prophesied "smooth things." They were fain to tell us that when once the Church was disestablished, the great barrier in the way of union among Irish Protestants would be taken away. It is hardly necessary to say that these prophecies have not been fulfilled, but that, as might have been expected, each community has settled down within its own lines, and the lines are harder and faster than ever. Each community considers itself to be as good as its neighbour, and, as is proper in Ireland, a great deal better!

And all around, overlapping both Churchmen and Protestant Dissenters, there is in Ireland a compact, homogeneous body, with a regularly organized hierarchy, welded together not only by the influence of religious tenets, but by the sense of real and fancied wrongs.

We are, I trust, far from that Erastianism which confounds a Church with an establishment, for surely "the life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment." Yet all the same, it is a fact that there is a certain amount of prestige which backs up an established Church in the face of overwhelming numbers: and it is also a fact that when such prestige is taken away, it must of necessity pass to those who possess the numbers. It is fast doing so in three-fourths of Ireland. Disestablishment has been the beginning of a revolution in State as well as in Church—meaning by State the whole body politic, the whole estate of the community, civil as well as religious.

In full view of these facts, it behoves those who believe that the Reformation had to do not only with the purifying of the Church, but with the cause of liberty and true progress, to consider how best the forces of Protestantism may be consolidated, and how a *modus vivendi* may be established amongst communities which, if united for practical purposes, would be respectable in point of numbers and influence.

There are, of course, two parties called on to consider this question—Dissenters on the one hand, and Churchmen on the other. We are principally concerned with the action of Churchmen, but may be pardoned if we open the subject by directing attention to a fact which anyone, be he Dissenter or not, may read, even though he run. It is obvious that if scattered forces are to act with efficiency, there must be some centre or rallying-point around which they may gather; and if, with reference to the present question, we ask, "What is that centre in Ireland?" surely the answer must be, "The Church, which has not only a legal but an historical claim to the title CHURCH OF IRELAND, and which outnumbers all other Protestant communities put together, including the Presbyterians."

This will appear still more evident if we have regard to the distribution of Protestants throughout the country. The Presbyterians, as a body, are mainly confined to the province of Ulster; out of Ulster they are nowhere. Of the 485,000 Presbyterians, over 466,000 are in Ulster; and even the Wesleyans, out of their 47,000, have upwards of 34,000 in that province. It is not so with the members of the Church. Of her 635,000, little more than half are in Ulster. She is powerfully represented in Dublin, and fairly well in Cork, and other large towns, as well as in numerous rural districts of the south. Candid Dissenters must confess, indeed, that in many districts Protestantism would be nowhere were it not for the Church, and that they themselves would be in danger of speedy absorption if they had none but themselves to fall back upon. Even as it is, the struggle against absorption is often hard. The

tendency of the larger body to absorb the smaller prevails in social as well as in physical things.

Dublin parish clergymen can testify to the enormous pressure brought to bear on their poor parishioners in Romish quarters of the city. Interest, intermarriages, and petty persecution are powerful agents; and it may well be asked, "If these things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? If, in certain parts of the country, there are difficulties in the way of Irish Protestantism as a whole, how would those difficulties be enhanced if the contest had to be carried on by the minute section of Protestant Dissenters?" It is clear that the difficulties would soon become impossibilities. The recognition of the Irish Church as a centre is the recognition of a fact. People may shut their eyes to facts, but they remain all the same.

But this fact has to do with the Church of Ireland as well as with the communities of Dissenters; because if the Church of Ireland, having regard to her numbers, position, and claims, be the centre of Irish Protestantism, then the main impulse towards uniformity of feeling and action must come from her. And, all things considered, the difficulties in the way of such practical uniformity are by no means so great as they are in England. That strong political feeling which, if not the backbone, is at least one great support to dissent in England, has hardly any existence in Ireland. In Ireland, now, politics are reduced to two or three capital points, chief amongst which is the question of connection or non-connection with England; and whilst it may be asserted, generally, that the great majority of Irish Roman Catholics are more or less opposed to the union with England, it may also be asserted, with perfect truth, that the overwhelming majority of Irish Protestants are heart and soul in favour of that connection, which they believe to be necessary to their enjoyment of civil and religious liberty. Moreover, the question of disestablishment has been settled; and though it was never a very burning question with Irish Dissenters, still it no longer exists to give the smallest trouble to weak or wayward minds. The path is, therefore, to a large extent, cleared of obstacles; there is practically uniformity of political sentiment, and there is no question of privilege other than such as may arise from truth and purity and energy of action.

But from this the question arises, "How is the Church of Ireland to rise to the level of her responsibilities, and show herself to be indeed the centre and rallying-point for those who are not within her pale? How are those who are in camps of their own to be led to look on themselves as her allies, since

it is plain that the necessity of the case does not admit of hostile camps?"

The answer to this question is twofold: first, with reference to the dealings of Churchmen with Dissenters; and second, with reference to the duties of the Church towards Churchmen, and conversely of Churchmen towards the Church.

I. The adjustment of the relations of the Church with Dissent is, as we have already suggested, not to be effected by efforts at comprehension. Many schemes of comprehension have been floated, but their fatal defect has been that there was no finality about them. If we were to try to make the Church of Ireland or of England broad enough to include the various shades of opinion which surround them, we should soon have little left in either Church worth contending for. The effort does not lie in the direction of comprehension, but in the disposition to agree with Dissenters where we have grounds for agreement, and to regard their scruples with forbearance and respect—such forbearance and respect as we should like to have shown to ourselves.

Thackeray, long ago, gave us the natural history of the snob; and it is not too much to say that we have in Church matters suffered from what we may term ecclesiastical snobbishness. That man who, from the height of his own privilege, looks down on another less favoured than himself, calls him by derogatory names, or offends him by ill-timed patronage, is in all things a snob; and when he acts so in Church matters, an ecclesiastical snob. The best way of arriving at a *modus vivendi* is by beginning with points of agreement. When we have got so far as to see that there are important truths on which we are agreed, our own value for what we hold distinctively will teach us to treat with tenderness the scruples of others—scruples, in many instances, not taken up rashly, but the results of long tradition, early education, and constant association.

It may be very possible to trace up the causes of separation to what the Scotchman called "curstness," by which he meant "crabbedness;" but we may be sure of this—that there is no way so likely to increase crabbedness as by treating crabbed people with contempt. If we touch a man's pride and rouse his anger, we make argument and conviction impossible; nor are we in anywise called on to do so. Our Church has clearly and strongly laid down her own principles—as, for instance, in the preface to the Ordinal—but she pronounces no sentence of judgment on others; and she has worded her allusion to "foreign Churches" in such a way as to afford fair standing-ground to those who would include in the "foreign Churches" communities non-episcopal as well as episcopal.

The "social" difficulty is as great a bar in the way of harmony with the Dissenters as the controversial. No decent Dissenter would object to a Churchman holding fast to his own dogmas: what he might object to would be, as one has said, "holding his own dogmas in a doggish way."

II. Equally, if not more important, in the discharge of her responsibility towards those who differ from her, is the attitude of the Church towards those who agree with her; *i.e.*, her own members.

Is she to teach those members to sink their distinctive principles in the interests of peace, to quietly ignore, or yield, controverted points, and, in a sense which St. Paul never contemplated, "to become all things to all men, that by all means she may save some"? To this the answer must be a decided negative; the Church could do no such thing. All through she has been contending for what she has asserted to be true, and to sacrifice the truth would neither secure the respect of those who differ from her, nor deserve the blessing of God.

Already we have seen that the amount of what may be properly called Dissent in Ireland is small, and that those who ought really to be classed as separatists are between one-eighth and one-ninth of the Church population. But it must be confessed that the real weakness of the Irish Church is, that there is a good deal of what we may call "dissent in solution" among her members, or that at any rate there is not by any means enough of love for the distinctive principles of the Church—of love for the Church for her own sake; or, to put it more precisely, for her truth's sake.

There has been, no doubt, in the past generation a want of regular and careful training in the distinctive principles of the Church; and, as a direct consequence from this, there is a widely-prevailing disposition to ignore Church principles, and to regard the various denominations as being possessed of equal or even greater privileges than the Church. There is a sort of spurious liberality abroad which dignifies itself with the name "Catholic," but which is really in direct opposition to everything which deserves the name.

Such a state of feeling as this is altogether different from a sentiment of cordial goodwill towards our Dissenting brethren, as fellow-Christians, separated from us by important differences, but having, as we have, a love for the common Saviour. It is one thing to meet with manly courtesy those with whom we differ, and to co-operate with them in such works as admit of co-operation without a sacrifice of principle, and it is altogether another thing to go on asserting that there are no real principles at stake; which after all comes to no more than this—that those who make the disclaimer have themselves no

such principles, and are therefore unable to appreciate their value.

Indeed, it would seem to be an obvious truth that Churchmen must understand their own position before they can understand or adjust their relations to Dissenters. Dissenters, as a rule, understand their position; they are well grounded in their peculiar tenets; they never affect to make light of them; they are by no means ashamed of them. Thus if Churchmen claim for their Church that it is a centre and rallying-point for Protestantism in Ireland, the claim must rest not only on numbers and influence, but on truth, and those who profess it should value that truth, else how can they expect that Dissenters will value what they appear to undervalue? "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

It may, perhaps, be said that the plan of ascertaining our own position, consolidating our own forces, and appraising our own claims, though logical enough, is hardly likely to secure that *modus vivendi* which it is proposed to reach. To this the answer must be, we cannot help ourselves; we are bound to the due appreciation of our own principles; in this particular, necessity is laid upon us. If we are Churchmen because we were born so, or for political or social reasons, our Churchmanship is worth but little; but if we sincerely love our Church for her Scripturalness, her Catholicity, her order, her respect for pure and primitive antiquity, her struggles for the truth—then this enthusiasm with regard to our own Church, whilst it will surely make her stronger, will be no bar to friendly relations with other communities.

It will easily appear that the remarks above made can have little weight with those who regard Dissenters as altogether out of the pale of Church privilege, and dependent on those convenient but somewhat vague "uncovenanted mercies" of which we occasionally hear; nor with those who are disposed to ignore the differences which exist between the Church and Dissenters, and to regard those differences as of no consequence at all. But to those who are disposed to recognise rightful claims on both sides—to acknowledge the existence of a certain spiritual element—a principle of life under the forms of Dissent—and to regard the Church as a divinely-organized society, doing God's work in God's appointed way—then, no doubt, the Liberal-Conservative attitude of Churchmen—liberal towards those who differ from them, and conservative as to those principles which it is their privilege to hold—will go a long way towards securing a common sentiment and united action.

It may be well to indicate somewhat more in detail the position and duties of the Irish Church towards those who dissent from her, because the position and duties belong not only to her, but to other Churches also, which occupy a wider and more conspicuous field.

Dissenters may speak or think as they please, but there can be no doubt to any reasonable mind that the Church of Ireland is legally, historically, and practically the central reformed community in Ireland. Local differences, bitterness, and the spirit of proselytism apart, most Dissenters will be inclined to confess so much.

The Church will, then, best discharge her duties towards Dissenters by, first, a due and impartial consideration of the causes which led to Dissent, and the attitude which, in consequence, she is bound to assume towards Dissenters.

The Reformation was, all things considered, the most important event in the history of our religion—important in itself, but much more in its results, which in the course of three centuries have not been fully developed. The agitation produced by the mighty shock has not as yet fully subsided; rather, it has assumed a different form—perhaps a higher form—than at first. Boundary questions, political questions, knotty points of controversy—which were as often cut through with the sword as unravelled by argument—are now in abeyance; thought, opinions, principles—these are the things now struggling for full development.

At the time of the Reformation, the crisis was the culmination of forces which were long at work, and which were so violently repressed that when they did break forth they produced results which, though inevitable, were still to be deplored. Many flew off at a tangent from things associated with the old system, not because they were wrong in themselves, but simply because of their associations. The new liberty of thought too often degenerated into license, and the reaction from an enforced and unnatural cohesion was the sectarianism which has unhappily been exhibited in Protestantism.

The course of events which immediately followed the Reformation was not likely to counteract this unhappy tendency. Men did battle for the principles they adopted; and, from the fact that they did so, learned to love them, and handed them down to their children as a precious heritage, to be watched with jealous care, and defended with life and limb. Who would expect that men should lightly part with opinions for which they were ready to die? or who would say that if they had thus parted with them, the uniformity so obtained would not have been too dearly purchased by the sacrifice of honest

zeal and manly self-devotion? Truly then the salt would have lost its savour, and there would have been nothing left to season it withal. For ourselves, members of the Church of Ireland, let us remember that in dealing with Dissent we are dealing with the inevitable—with a state of things which has come to us by hereditary transmission; and therefore let us, in the spirit of Christian fair play, "look not on our own things, but on the things of others," hoping the while that time will rub off the angles of traditional scruples, and that such scruples, by losing much of their bitterness, will also lose much of their tendency to perpetuate sectarianism.

Nor, at the present time, having regard to England and Scotland, are we without indications of such a desirable consummation. There are movements now within the established Church of Scotland, and amongst some of the Nonconformist bodies in England, which point to modes of public worship, daily becoming more and more in unison with our own. Such indications may be isolated, but they are at least sufficient to show the direction in which public opinion is tending. In Ireland—possibly from that spirit of pugnacity which is supposed to be in the air—the indications are not so manifest; but to counterbalance this, there is a greater uniformity of political opinion amongst Irish Protestants.

The attitude of the Church, then, towards Dissenters, will be that of kindliness, and candid recognition of all that is good in themselves and their principles.

But the main duty of the Church of Ireland, and that which is calculated to produce the greatest effect, is towards her own members—to make good Churchmen of them, and to do nothing to produce Dissent. And the significance of the last words is altogether different from that which some might suppose them to imply. From the exigency of her position, the Irish Church has no temptation to those extremes, whether of doctrine or ceremony, which may possibly have tended to alienate some of the children of her English sister. The temptation of the Church of Ireland is in another direction.

The exhibition of Romanism in that large community—which, more than any other, exceeds in devotion to the papal system—has a decided tendency to deter Irish Churchmen from any line of procedure which might be supposed to lead in a Romeward direction. The danger is, lest in the strong effort to avoid Scylla, the Irish Church may drift towards Charybdis; lest in her anxiety to be clear of error, she may not lose some portion of the truth.

No doubt some who did not consider and make allowances for our position in Ireland, and who were prejudiced against us, have exaggerated our defects; no doubt our regard for the

decencies of public worship and the observance of the rubrics would compare not unfavourably with the case of many churches in England. But for all that, there is much to be done in bringing out a spirit of attachment to the Church as such—an attachment arising, not from the accident of birth or personal attachment to a reverend pastor, but from a due appreciation of the excellences of the Church, and a conviction that she holds the truth in a deeper, fuller, and broader measure than the communities by which she is surrounded. If all those who call themselves sons of the Church spent their efforts and their money in her service; if all devoted themselves, as some do, to the task of keeping their brethren within the pale; if some refrained from the attempt to produce a washed-out Plymouthism — which is neither fish, nor flesh, nor yet "gude red herring" — they would do much to strengthen their own Church, and win the real respect of those who differ from them.

It is something to say that the Church of Ireland is alive to a sense of her duty towards her own children. The various diocesan boards of education, which are in all parts of the country labouring to secure the education of the young in the principles of their Church, will doubtless, in time, succeed in leavening the minds of the rising generation with a real love for that Church, though there is still room for the hope that Churchmen may extend to those boards a larger measure of liberality, and enable them to carry on their work with more thoroughness and effect.

And thus, in discharging her duty towards her own, the Church will quietly, faithfully, and lovingly discharge a duty towards those who Dissent from her. There will be no harsh invective; no calling of names; no insulting affectation of superiority. There will only be a consolidation of force and a development of internal union; and there will be brought to bear on all who love the Lord Jesus, the instance of a Church whose members believe in their principles, and are neither afraid nor ashamed to avow them.

Then—it may be slowly, but in the end full surely—all true-hearted Dissenters will come to see that they, too, have some duties towards the Church of Ireland; and though one or two generations may regard those duties as involving no more than a general co-operation as against a common foe, after-generations may come to learn the lesson that the Church of Ireland in her protest against negations, as well as positive corruptions, has been fighting the battle of Catholic truth.

JOHN W. MURRAY.

ART. II.—DR. LOSERTH'S "WICLIF AND HUS."

Wiclif and Hus. From the German of Dr. JOHANN LOSERTH, Professor of History at the University of Czernowitz. Translated by the Rev. M. J. Evans, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1884.

IT is strange that the one gigantic intellect which exerted, towards the end of the Middle Ages, the greatest influence over Western Christendom in opposition to the Papacy and the Church of Rome, should have remained for so long a time known only second-hand from the writings of opponents. And even after the greater part of his theological system had been adopted, and as it were reissued by others with comparatively slight modifications, it has been left to the present generation to rediscover the fact, and to show that a great contest was fought out with weapons from the armoury of WYCLIF (which Mr. Evans shows to be probably the correct spelling of the name), and that the chief merit of the principal combatant was the skill, the vigour, and the dauntless courage with which those weapons were wielded. The works of Wyclif provided a kind of encyclopædia of philosophy and theology, in which almost every question of interest during the latter half of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries was fully and powerfully dealt with, and the various arguments and issues connected therewith were both thoroughly threshed out and exhibited in a concentrated form. Any cleric, animated with a sincere zeal for the reform of abuses in the Church, which during the great Papal schism attained vast and abnormal proportions, could scarcely fail to have recourse to the writings of Wyclif, when once they fell into his hands. Everything was there in readiness; he had but to select, to arrange, to connect, according to circumstances, and now and then to limit or modify. And such Dr. Loserth has shown beyond question to have been the case in the main with the Latin writings of the celebrated JOHN HUSS, or, as he himself wrote it, "HUS." Long passages from Wyclif are tacitly adapted and interwoven in Hus's Latin controversial works; and it is manifest that the philosophical and intellectual power exhibited in them belongs rather to Wyclif than to the writer.

This tacit adoption of another's words and sentiments was by no means an unusual method in that day. Dr. J. Kalousek, in the Bohemian *Athenæum* for March, 1884, in reviewing Dr. Loserth's work, draws attention to the fact that Cardinal D'Ailly, who was one of Hus's principal judges and most inveterate foes, borrowed three important dissertations, nearly verbally, from others, without making the slightest acknowledgment of

the sources from which they came. One (in 1380), in which he contended for the infallibility of the whole Church and the fallibility of any particular Church, even that of Rome, was taken from Occam. A second (in 1416), *De potestate ecclesiastica*, written for the benefit of the Council of Constance, was borrowed from a treatise, nearly one hundred years old, by John of Paris. And a third, *De reformatione* (also in 1416), was mainly taken from Henry of Langenstein. In acting, therefore, as he did, Hus was only following the custom of his day, and moreover such a course was an absolute necessity for him, though it could scarcely have been so for Peter D'Ailly. To quote Wyclif, except at quite an early epoch in the reforming movement in Bohemia, would have been to have courted condemnation at once. The good and true in Wyclif's writings must be defended and maintained without the use of Wyclif's name. And very dexterously and powerfully did Hus manage the dialectical and theological contest under these difficult circumstances.

That the ground must have been well prepared for Wyclif's writings by Hus's so-called "Precursors" is very manifest, and I do not think Dr. Loserth sets sufficient value upon their work. It is true that Hus is not in the habit of citing them, or indeed of citing any but recognised authorities; but there are coincidences, some of which I shall point out, but which I have no doubt are entirely unknown to Dr. Loserth, between passages in the writings of the first Bohemian prose writer, the philosophical and theological layman, Thomas of Stitny, and passages in the works of both Hus and Wyclif (though it was impossible for Stitny in 1376 to have any direct knowledge of Wyclif), which would render it doubtful whether Hus was adapting Stitny or Wyclif, or writing with recollections of both of them in his mind.

But it is immaterial whence Hus took commonplaces of theology, many of which will probably be found in writings anterior to Wyclif. In Wyclif Hus certainly possessed an encyclopædia, and used it to the uttermost. He adopted the predestinarian system of Wyclif in its entirety. Of one of Wyclif's cardinal doctrines he made an important limitation, which stood him in good stead at the Council of Constance; although for a notice of this important limitation I seek in vain in the pages of Dr. Loserth. Wyclif held that "a pope, priest, or prelate, in mortal sin ceased to be such;" but Hus, in his treatise against Palecz, qualifies and limits this in the following words: "We grant that an evil pope, bishop, or priest, is an unworthy minister of the sacraments, through whom God baptizes, consecrates, or works in other respects for the benefit of His Church." Again and again was this referred

to at Hus's trial before the Council of Constance, and again and again did it rescue him from his own unwise and ill-advised utterances.

Dr. Loserth is well acquainted with Wyclif, and is also acquainted with Hus's Latin works, though perhaps we may find reason to think that his acquaintance with the latter is somewhat superficial. But it would seem from the way in which he expresses himself, that he is not acquainted with the Bohemian or Czeskish language, and therefore with the major part of Hus's works in his native tongue, which have not been translated into German. It was not the Latin treatises *De Ecclesiâ*, etc., that stirred the heart of the Bohemian people; it was those Bohemian works, in which Hus brought his reforming views, and the crying abuses which had then attained their zenith, before their eyes. The importance of these Bohemian writings was well understood by the "iron Bishop," John of Litomysh, who called loudly, though happily in vain, for their suppression. Hus the philosopher was entirely, and Hus the theologian was mainly, dependent upon Wyclif; but Hus the dauntless reformer was dependent upon none but the Spirit of the Lord that anointed him. Here his necessary Precursor was the layman, Thomas of Stitny, who had brought philosophy and theology home to Bohemian hearts in the Bohemian language.

It is remarkable how differently Hus often expresses himself in Bohemian and in Latin. In his Latin works the Church is the totality (*universitas*) of the predestinate; in his Bohemian writings it is the assembly of the elect. He has no word in Bohemian for "predestination," neither can he find a word to express "material" in dealing with the question of the remanence of material bread after consecration in the Eucharist. Later writers have coined words for both these purposes, but it is noticeable that they do not agree in their selection of a word to express "predestination." It is curious, too, that Stitny at first found it difficult to express "quality" in Bohemian, and regretted his inability to do so, though later he adopted the word "*jakost*" as its proper representative.

Till the Wyclif Society, the poor support as yet received by which is a disgrace to our age and country, proceeds a great deal further with its work than it has as yet been able to do, we must labour under a disadvantage under which Dr. Loserth does not labour, viz., a very imperfect knowledge of the writings of Wyclif. Loserth's deficiency is, as I have already remarked, want of knowledge of the Bohemian writings of Hus and Stitny, and the balance cannot be satisfactorily struck without a full knowledge of all three. Meanwhile, let us do our best to examine the passages from Hus and Wyclif, placed in

parallel columns for comparison by Dr. Loserth. And here we find abundant evidence of Hus's adoption and adaptation of Wyclif's thoughts, to an extent far beyond what was formerly supposed to be the case; but we shall also find Dr. Loserth inclined to ride a good horse to death, as the common saying is, and to impute "Wyclify" to Hus, where there is really no ground for doing so, and where Hus would probably have used the selfsame terms if Wyclif had never existed.

Loserth must have glanced very carelessly over Hus's treatise against Palecz to have stated (p. 157): "As Palecz calls the adherents of Hus *Quidamists*, so the latter calls Palecz himself a liar" (*fictor*); "for which, however, he expressed deep regret at the Council." If we turn to the treatise against Palecz itself, we shall find that Hus called Palecz "fictor," *i.e.*, *concocter*, not *liar*, because he had concocted (*confinxit*) the derisive nickname "Quidamistæ" to designate Hus and his adherents.

In pp. 287 and 288, Loserth tells us that a "*gaping contradiction* will be found between the two tractates of Hus, that *De Sacramento corporis et sanguinis domini*, and that *De sanguine Christi sub specie vini a laicis sumendo;* and informs us that the second tractate belongs to an earlier date, Hus having composed it *before* he was cast into prison. It is true that such is the heading of the latter tractate in the printed editions of Hus's Latin works, but this view is not borne out by Hus's correspondence, and both Palacký and Tomek agree in considering it to have been composed in prison, and in answer to a request of Lord John of Chlum. The former tractate was also composed in prison, but either before intelligence of Jakaubek's proceedings with regard to the chalice at Prague had arrived at Constance, or else Hus specially avoided entering upon the question of reception *sub utrâque* for the sake of the warder for whose benefit he is supposed to have written. In both tractates Hus admits that *the whole sacrament is contained in each kind*, so that there is no "gaping contradiction" between them, although Hus finally determines in the latter, "that, as a priest worthily receiving under both kinds does not so receive without reason, so too a devout layman may lawfully so receive, since the nature of the case is the same in each instance as regards the reception of the body and blood." The discussion of these two tractates is not creditable to Dr. Loserth.

Loserth's attempt in p. 287 to derive Hus's *De corpore Christi*, op. i. 166 (not 146) *b*, from Wyclif's *Trialogus*, 248, is in my opinion a complete failure. It will be interesting to compare the extracts from Wyclif and Hus given by Dr. Loserth, with the treatment of the same subject by Stitny in 1400, which is,

in my judgment, very superior to that of either of the theologians, although more similar to Hus than to Wyclif. Stitny writes:

This, too, I say with regard to this Sacrament: its importance does not reside in its being gazed at and in doing obeisance to it, but it ought to be taken and received as nourishment. But there are three things to observe in connection with this Sacrament.

One is the visible Sacrament itself, which by its visible similitude signifieth an invisible spiritual grace; that is, as visible corporeal food strengthens the bodily life, so does the invisible power of this Sacrament strengthen the spiritual life.

The second thing to be noticed in this Sacrament is what is in it; for here is the very glorified body of the Son of God as it is in its glory, with both its soul and its Deity.

The third thing to be understood is this: that this Sacrament signifies something that is not in it; for it signifies the whole body of the Holy Church—that is, the whole Christian community—but that is not there, but Christ Himself is there, Who is the Head of all the Holy Church. And it is by this similarity that this Sacrament signifies all the Holy Church, in that, as one loaf is made up of many grains, so is the whole Church one body made up of many people, the Head whereof is Christ. I have for this reason touched upon this, that it may be understood that some people receive the Sacrament itself, but not that which is in it, nor that which it signifies, and they, receiving the Sacrament thus, receive to themselves condemnation.

Others sometimes do not receive the Sacrament, but receive that which is in the Sacrament, and that which the Sacrament signifies; that is, they receive Christ, and enter into the unity of the Holy Church, so that they will be one body with the devout.

A third class receive both the Sacrament and that which is in it and that which it signifies.

In p. 271, Loserth endeavours to show that a passage from one of Wyclif's "Sermons" is the original of one in Hus's *De Ecclesiâ*. Wyclif says: "Three Catholic virtues are necessary to the pilgrim (*viatori*) since *faith*, as a firm substance, is the *foundation* of the virtuous life of one on his pilgrimage (*viantis*)." Hus's words are: "The peculiar property of *faith* is that it is to the pilgrim (*viatori*) the *foundation* of arriving at the calm abode of the objects of *faith*." For my part, I can see no similarity between the passages, except that the words *faith* and *foundation* occur in both. The terms *viare* and *viator* are too frequent for any stress to be laid upon them. Had there been in Wyclif anything corresponding to the singular expression which Hus uses, "veniendi ad quietam habitacionem credendorum," the connection between the passages could not have been disputed. As it is, Loserth weakens his case, which is in the main a good one, by overdoing it.

In p. 285, Loserth cites from Hus's "Elucidation of his Belief," op. i. 486: "The foundation, therefore, of all virtues, whereby God is served meritoriously, is faith, without which it is impossible to please God." With this he compares three passages from Wyclif: (1) "Faith is the foundation of religion

without which it is impossible to please God;" (2) "The first foundation of the virtues is faith;" and (3) "Since it is impossible for anyone to sin, unless he fails in faith."

Let us again refer to our friend Stitny, writing in the Czeskish language in 1376:

> The Scripture saith: Without faith it is impossible to please God; yea, it is impossible to build a house without a foundation; wherefore he who wants to have a firm house, must first lay a firm foundation. And if there is to be any fruit, it must first proceed from the root. And though the root is not beautiful, yet all beauty of the stem and all good fruit proceed from it. Likewise, if there were no faith, there would not be other things useful for salvation, neither without faith could other good things exist. For faith is the foundation and root of all that is good, even if it be not itself so conspicuous in its beauty; nay, neither hope nor love will exist without faith.

Does not this extract from Stitny exhibit at once Loserth's absurdity in tracing to Wyclif expressions used by Hus which clearly belong to the general stock of commonplaces of theology of the day, at any rate in Bohemia, if not elsewhere?[1]

In the same page, Dr. Loserth says that Hus has likewise borrowed his definition of heresy from Wyclif. In proof of this, he cites from Wyclif's *Trialogus*, 379: "Let those foolish disciples of Antichrist know that every *dangerous* error in matter of faith is manifest heresy." From Hus's reply to the eight doctors (i. 305 *b*) he also quotes: "Heresy is a *dangerous* but very useful thing." In the first place this is a description, not a definition of heresy on the part of Hus. In the second place, Hus gives in his Bohemian treatise on Simony (*O svatokupectvi*) his real definition of heresy, viz.: "Heresy is the obstinate holding of error contrary to Holy Scripture." And thirdly, when I give the entire passage from which Loserth has excerpted a fragment, we shall see what a careless blunder he has made. This runs: "Heresy is a *dangerous* but very useful thing. Dangerous, because many are seduced by it and perish. Useful, because the faithful are tried by it and separated from the unfaithful." There is no similarity whatever between the passage cited from Wyclif and from Hus, except that the word "*dangerous*" occurs in each; neither is Hus giving a definition of heresy at all.

In p. 223 there is an unfortunate misprint in both the passages quoted from Wyclif and from Hus towards the end of the page, which makes nonsense of each of them. Hus in his *De Ecclesiâ*, cap. ix., fol. 209 *b*, is clearly adapting a passage

[1] Should any one desire further information as to Stitny, he will find it in my lectures on the "Native Literature of Bohemia in the fourteenth century," delivered before the University of Oxford on the Ilchester Foundation in 1877. The fourth lecture is entirely devoted to Stitny. (George Bell and Sons, 1878.)

from Wyclif's *De religionibus vanis monachorum*, but "*circa* Christum" is a misprint for "*citra* Christum" (*i.e., around* Christ for *except* Christ), as I find by reference to p. 438 in the only volumes as yet issued by the Wyclif Society.

In pp. 254 and 255 Loserth endeavours to make out that Hus's little dissertation on the Lord's Prayer, composed in prison, was reasoned out by Hus "in manifest dependence upon Wyclif." "As Wyclif carries out the thought," says Loserth, "that this prayer excels all others, and that alike by virtue of its authority, since it proceeds from the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, as also because, notwithstanding its brevity, it includes within itself all other prayers, so also has Hus expressed himself in analogous language." Now, Hus wrote as follows:

The Lord's Prayer is to be chosen and said above all other prayers. Firstly, because the most affectionate of Fathers composed it for His sons, and the best of Masters for His scholars. Secondly, because everything that it is necessary for a man to ask for is contained implicitly in it. And thirdly, *because it is brief. For the great Lord composed the prayer brief, that His servants might learn it quickly.*

The passage cited from Wyclif is twice as long and very involved, and is really not worth the space which it would take up. I shall therefore merely quote the corresponding passage from Stitny's *Vyklad patere*, written in 1376:

There is nothing neglected in it, for Christ, Who is the true wisdom of God the Father, invented it. Therefore, in whatsoever language a man asks for aught in other prayers, he always asks only for that which is in the Lord's Prayer, even if he asks for two or three things together. And thus the Lord's Prayer is the rule of all prayers, and it becometh not a Christian to ask for other things which cannot be understood in the Lord's Prayer. *Specially too did Christ make the Lord's Prayer brief, that no one, who had but understanding, might be unable to learn it, or not have time to chant it.*

In this case the correspondence between the words of Hus and Stitny is very close, while that between those of Hus and Wyclif is very distant. Doubtless Hus was as well acquainted with the Bohemian writings of Stitny as with the Latin works of Wyclif.

I have by this time, I hope, made it plain, that in order to form a satisfactory estimate of Hus, it is necessary to be acquainted not only with Hus's Latin works and with those of Wyclif, but also with Hus's Bohemian works and with those of Stitny, who rendered it possible for Hus to appeal to his countrymen in their own language.

Loserth passes rapidly over Hus's trial and condemnation, which he does not consider to fall within the scope of his work. But when he tells us that "only deep in the background [of the flames of Constance] has been discerned since then likewise the shadow of that man *for whose doctrine Hus*

went to the stake—John de Wyclif," he ought not to have passed over the remarkable fact that Hus was not required to recant any definite propositions, but everything that was articled against him, whether truly or falsely. Loserth considers that the assembled Fathers at Constance were guilty of a mistake in not treating Hus as already condemned in the condemnation of Wyclif. But Wyclif rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Hus unhesitatingly accepted, evidently believing it to be a genuine Church doctrine; and the importance attached to this doctrine was clearly sufficient to separate the two cases entirely. And although Hus may easily be proved non-Catholic, if tried by the standards of the subsequent Council of Trent, yet there was no really authoritative formula existing in his day which he denied or rejected. Try him by the then existing standards, and we may safely accept the judgment of Lechler, when he writes: "The question is only whether Hus was really convicted of a heresy. And to this we answer decidedly, No."

That Hus was thoroughly permeated with both the philosophy and theology of Wyclif, that his theology may be properly termed a "modified Wyclify," and that there is no such thing as a separate Hussite theology, are propositions which are fairly proved to demonstration by Dr. Loserth, although he apparently claims to have proved considerably more than this. But Hus's little works, composed in prison without the aid of books, show him to have been possessed of theological powers and attainments of no mean order; and certainly in his Bohemian writings he left behind him intellectual and spiritual influences which ere long pervaded all classes of society where the Czeskish language was spoken, and eventually rose up against and successfully withstood the whole power of Papacy and Empire. Yet, such is human nature, that after all it is scarcely probable that Wyclif and Hus together would have effected the mighty work that was effected, had not Jakaubek or Jacobellus, after Hus's departure for Constance, raised the standard of THE CHALICE at Prague, and demanded the concession of its use for the laity as well as the clergy. Intelligence of his proceedings was received by Hus, who well knew that they would more or less disintegrate his followers, with doubts and misgivings, and his assent was at first but reluctantly given to them on the ground of the absolute supremacy of Scripture. "Wyclify" in England had no such outward and visible sign. It decayed and all but perished in the land of its nativity; and thus it came to pass that Wyclif himself has only lately—and in this respect a great deal of credit is undoubtedly due to Dr. Loserth—obtained the due recognition of his great and material, or, I may

almost venture to say, dominating influence upon the successful Bohemian or Hussite movement.

A. H. WRATISLAW.

ART. III.—THE TRANSFIGURATION.

AT the triennial Convocation of the American Church, which assembled in Philadelphia on October 3rd, 1883, it was resolved, on the recommendation of the Committee on enlarging the Book of Common Prayer, to make an addition to the Calendar by the insertion of "The Transfiguration" as a festival of the first class, provided with its own proper Psalms. I cannot but think that it is to be regretted that the compilers of our Calendar, in their reasonable anxiety to diminish the burdensome number of holy days superstitiously observed before the Reformation, omitted the recognition of this festival of very ancient observance; inasmuch as the event in the life of our Lord which it commemorated is very important and interesting, and its teaching most profitable.

I propose to endeavour to substantiate this claim by inviting attention to the significance, purpose, and teaching of the scene recorded by the Evangelists, matters which, it may safely be said, have too little attention commonly paid to them by readers of the Gospel narrative. It must be "good for us to be" there, in thought, at the foot of the mountain; for, as Bishop Hall says, "Nearer to heaven ye cannot come, while ye are upon earth." May both writer and readers feel that they are on "holy ground," and that a reverent and cautious spirit alone befits such an investigation.

I. *The Narrative.*—The three Synoptic Gospels give us very precise and strictly harmonious accounts. It was six days after our Lord's declaration in the last verse of Matt. xvi., which is closely connected with Peter's good confession and subsequent rash and mistaken expostulation with his Master, that Jesus took with Him the favoured three—the inner circle of the Apostles, who were privileged to be His companions on other special occasions, notably at the scene of His deepest humiliation (in which the strongest contrast to the glory of the Transfiguration was presented) in Gethsemane—"and brought them up into an high mountain apart." He went there, as St. Luke, the Evangelist of the true humanity of our Lord, tells us, *to pray*—no unwonted practice with Him.

None of the Evangelists give us the name of "the mountain," or enable us with certainty to identify it. It is enough to remark that the traditionary Tabor is out of the question, since

its summit was at that time occupied by a stronghold; and that it is almost universally held that one of the spurs of Mount Hermon, the only snow-capped mountain in Palestine, and which is near to Cæsarea Philippi, the scene of the events of the preceding chapter, and the place whence it would appear from St. Mark (ix. 30) our Lord and His followers set out for Galilee on the next day, was in all probability the mountain of the Transfiguration.

We may however, I think, believe that the precise sites of most of the great events in our Lord's earthly life are not, and never will be known; God in His wise providence having guarded against the danger of the superstitious veneration and idolatrous use of such localities.

It was probably night, for this was the Lord's accustomed season for retirement to pray, and St. Luke assigns the descent to "the day after." This would greatly enhance the striking character of the scene.

"As He prayed," He was transfigured before them; "the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment became white and glistering as snow" (Luke); "so as no fuller on earth can white them" (Mark); "His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment was white as the light" (Matt.).

Of this mysterious change two explanations may be given. (1) The exceeding brightness may have been the effect of the Divine nature in Christ, irradiating His humanity, and breaking through the veil of flesh which ordinarily concealed it from mortal eye. "We were eye-witnesses of His majesty," says St. Peter, alluding to this event (2 Ep. i. 16.)

"Not from above or from without, as in the case of Moses and Stephen, came the light, reflected only upon the beholder, but from within, while it did not merely play upon the countenance, but arrayed His entire person, and overflowed the very garments which He wore." (Compare "Thou deckest thyself with light as it were with a garment" Psa. civ. 2, P.B.V.)

Or (2) it may be regarded as an anticipation of the glorification of His humanity, (for we must never forget that as truly man He attained glory through suffering),—of His mediatorial glory. "He received from God the Father honour and glory," says St. Peter (2 Ep. i. 17). The description given by one of the three witnesses who, while a prisoner in Patmos, saw Him again in His glory, is essentially similar to the account given of His appearance on this occasion. "His head and His hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and His eyes were as a flame of fire. . . His countenance was as the sun shineth in His strength" (Rev. i. 14, 16.) If this be the true explanation, the disciples saw Jesus on the holy mount as He is now at the

right hand of God, and as He will appear when He shall come again in His own glory, and in His Father's, and of the holy angels. Then, too, this glory was a glimpse of the glory which shall hereafter be theirs who look for the Saviour from heaven, "Who shall change the body of our humiliation that it may be like the body of His glory."

"And behold there talked with Him two men, which were Moses and Elias, who appeared in glory." The recognition of their identity on the part of the Apostles seems to have been intuitive, and may serve as an intimation that there will be such recognition in a future state. What the subject of their discourse was, St. Luke tells us: "They spake of His decease ['departure,' R.V. margin—ἔξοδον, a noteworthy expression] which He should accomplish at Jerusalem."

The presence of these two had a special significance in connection with the teaching of the Transfiguration. Moses the lawgiver, and Elijah the prophet—the one the founder, the other the great defender of the Old Dispensation, which He had come at once to supersede and to fulfil, bear their united testimony to Jesus, the end of the law, and the subject of prophecy. They bear witness, moreover, to that which is the crowning-point of His work—His atoning death. Nor is it without significance that while they depart, fading away from sight now that their testimony has been borne, and their delegated and temporary authority resigned into His hands, He remains; and the same voice which gave the law, and spake by the prophets, now proclaims of Him: "This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him." "God Who at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son."

Moses and Elijah may have discharged another mission with reference to the Saviour. They both had passed through death, or at least *from* this life, and knew the triumph that lies beyond mortality for the faithful servants of God. Their presence spake of the grave conquered, and of the eternal glory beyond. "When," remarks the author of "Modern Painters" (vol. iii. 392), "in the desert He was girding Himself for the work of life, angels of life came and ministered unto Him. Now in the fair world, when He is girding Himself for the work of death, the ministrants come to Him from the grave, but from the grave conquered—one from that tomb under Abarim, which His own hand had sealed long ago; the other from the rest into which he had entered without seeing corruption. There stood by Him Moses and Elias, and spake of His decease. And when the prayer is ended, the task accepted, then first since the star paused over Him at Bethlehem, the full glory falls upon Him from heaven, and the

testimony is borne to His everlasting Sonship and power, "Hear ye Him."

We may, I think, further regard this appearance as throwing light upon the resurrection-state, as a foreshadowing of the Communion of Saints in their glorified condition, finding its centre in the Incarnate Son of God. The one is the representative of those who shall not sleep, but shall be changed at the last trump—the prophet caught up into heaven in a whirlwind: and the other of those who shall be raised from the sleep of death—Moses, whose body it seems probable, after being subject to dissolution, was withdrawn from the dominion of death without seeing corruption. The mysterious statement in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 6, as to the Lord burying him, indicating that his body was reserved for some special honour,[1] and the equally mysterious reference, in Jude 9, to the contest between Michael and the devil disputing about the body of Moses, intimating, may we not infer, the unwillingness of Satan, who has the power of death, to be prematurely despoiled of his prey by him who brought God's order of release; both lend support to this supposition, while it serves to throw light upon the latter passage.

The three disciples, as afterwards in Gethsemane, were heavy with sleep, either the effect of weariness—natural, as it was night—or perhaps rather the evidence of a state of ecstasy (as in the case of Abraham (Genesis xv. 12); Daniel (viii. 18; x. 9) and others). Apparently they did not witness the beginning of the scene, but "when they were [wide] awake ['suddenly starting into full consciousness,' such is the force of the expression employed; Alford and Trench, however, render it, 'having watched, or kept themselves awake throughout'] they saw His glory, and the two men who stood with Him." The narrative forbids the idea of a dream, or vision of a disordered imagination, or an optical delusion.

"And it came to pass as they [Moses and Elias] were parting from Him" (Luke, R.V.), their testimony borne, their mission

---

[1] "The purpose of God was to prepare for him a condition both of body and soul resembling that of these two men of God, Enoch and Elijah. Men bury a corpse that it may pass into corruption. If Jehovah, therefore, would not suffer the body of Moses to be buried by men, it is but natural to seek for the reason in the fact that He did not intend to leave him to corruption, but when burying it (with His own hand) imparted a power to it which preserved it from corruption, and prepared the way for it to pass into the same form of existence to which Enoch and Elijah were taken without either death or burial." (Kurtz, quoted in Keil and Delitzsch's "Commentary on the Pentateuch," vol. iii. p. 515, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, which takes the same view, referring, in proof of it, to the narrative of the Transfiguration.)

of consolation ended, Peter, always himself, as though desirous of detaining them and prolonging the fascinating scene, said unto Jesus, "Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles [booths, R.V. margin]; one for Thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias: not knowing what he said"—"for," St. Mark adds, "they were sore afraid," bewildered and amazed at what they saw. "While he thus spoke, there came a bright cloud and overshadowed them, and they feared as they [Jesus and the two men] entered into the cloud." That cloud was doubtless the visible sign of the presence of the invisible God; the cloud in which He came down of old on Sinai, and from which He spake to Moses at the door of the tabernacle; the cloud which covered the tent of the congregation and filled the Temple of Solomon, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud. "And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is My beloved Son; hear Him." It was the Father's "Amen" to the witness of Law and Prophets: the Father's acceptance of His Son's consecration of Himself to do His will through death: the Father's investiture of His Son with supreme authority over men. "And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their faces and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid. And when they had lifted up their eyes and looked suddenly round about" (Mark), "they saw no man any more, save Jesus only with themselves." The scene was over: the glory had departed. Around them stood the grey mountain-tops, catching the morning light, and at their feet lay the familiar landscape, and the hum of distant voices rose from the plain below. And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus charged them that they should tell no man what they had seen, till the Son of Man were risen from the dead." Its lesson was for Him, and for themselves, and not for the world.[1]

[1] Those who would eliminate the supernatural element from the life of Christ have, as might be expected, sought to explain away the scene, either by attributing its origin to the impression made by a thunder-storm on the excited minds of the narrators, or by resolving it into the imagery of a dream or a waking vision. It may be enough, in reply to such theories, to remark that to one who believes in the miracle of the Incarnation, who acknowledges Emmanuel—God manifest in the flesh—no miracles connected with His life can present any difficulty. The marvel would be, if in the record of that life we did not meet with such. The simple, graphic, circumstantial style of the narrative, moreover, and the perfect harmony of the three versions which we possess, coupled with the slight variations of detail in their description, testifying, as these do, against any collusion between their authors, are so inconsistent with any view but that of its literal truth and objective reality, that to accept any of these theories would be not only to ignore the inspiration of the Evangelists, but even to destroy the credibility of their narrative. The

II. What that lesson was, and what is the special significance of this event, we will now consider; and we shall, I think, easily see that it was no unmeaning pageant, no unintelligible interruption in the life of the "man of sorrows," although apparently so much out of keeping with its wonted course.

In order to realize this, we must carefully note the position which the Transfiguration occupies in the narrative of the Evangelists. We shall find that it fills a very clearly-defined place in our Lord's ministry, and serves as a landmark in His life, standing as the great intermediate event between His Baptism and His Passion, occurring, as it probably did, about six months before the Crucifixion. It is carefully narrated with all that preceded and followed it in each of the three Synoptic Gospels.[1]

The teaching of our Lord admits of easy division into two periods or stages. During the first of these, its theme was the testimony concerning His person—that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. During the second, its theme was that He must suffer, and die, and rise again. We shall find that the Transfiguration occupies in relation to the latter period a similar position to that which is occupied by our Lord's Baptism in relation to the former period. In both cases the audible voice of God the Father bears witness to His Incarnate Son.[2]

This is distinctly perceived when we note the context, and what immediately preceded it. We find in all the three records that our Lord at Cæsarea Philippi closed the first

---

way in which one of the three speaks of the event as a sure evidence of Christ's Deity and glory, equally forbids any such explanation, save at the expense of the trustworthiness of his testimony, for he adduces it (2 Peter i. 16-19) as a confirmation of his teaching, declaring it to be no "cunningly devised fable."

[1] Archbishop Thomson, in his valuable introduction to the Gospels in the "Speaker's Commentary," has given from this point of view an analysis of the contents of the three Gospels, comparing the treatment of these divisions by each Evangelist. "In St. Matthew, the history up to the Transfiguration occupies rather more than one half of the whole: the history of the last six months rather less than one half: and the history of the Passion, beginning from the entry into Jerusalem, about one third. In St. Mark, the history up to the Transfiguration is almost exactly one half, and the history of the Passion occupies about a third. In St. Luke, the first part of the history is a little more than one third, and the account of the Passion about one fourth of the whole: the difference in his case being owing to the interposition between the Transfiguration and the Passion of a long section containing acts and sayings of the Lord, which neither of the other two Evangelists have recorded."—(Page xiv.)

[2] See Godet, p. 11. "This moment marks the apogee of the public ministry of Jesus; and, if we may venture to say it, the point of transition from action to passion."

period of His ministry with the appropriate question: "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am? Has what they have seen and heard of Me led them to know Me?" In the name of his fellow-apostles, Peter declares that *they* had learned; *they* knew that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus commends this confession of faith, and tells him that "flesh and blood"—human teachers, or natural wisdom—"had not revealed the truth unto him." "*From that time forth*," says St. Matthew, and St. Mark and St. Luke are equally explicit as to the time and the sequence of the teaching, "began Jesus to shew unto His disciples how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." Such teaching we do not meet with in any of the previous discourses of our Lord. But the disciples were now, as Peter's confession indicated, prepared to be led into further truth, and henceforward their Master's teaching was directed, as the events of His life were hastening, to the Cross.

How hard this new lesson was for them to learn we may gather from Peter's unseemly remonstrance with Jesus. "He took Him and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from Thee, Lord [or 'God have mercy on Thee,' R.V. margin]: this shall never be unto Thee." But He turned and said unto Peter, "Get thee behind Me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto Me: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men" (R.V.). The Lord further warned His disciples that they too must be content to endure self-denial, and take up the Cross, and lose life for His sake, that they might find it. "For the Son of Man," He added, "shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then shall He reward every man according to His works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom."[1]

---

[1] We may ask the question, Was the Transfiguration a fulfilment of the closing words of the discourse quoted above? These cannot, it is evident, refer to the second advent referred to in the previous verse, for our Lord says that some of those who were then present should live to see that coming. On the other hand, the transient glory of the Transfiguration can scarcely be held to fully satisfy the grandeur of the language used—language which again would scarcely have been employed with reference to an event only a week distant. The most satisfactory explanation of the prediction recognises its accomplishment in the destruction of Jerusalem and the passing away of the old Jewish economy—the mightiest act of judgment by the Son of Man which the world has yet seen, and which, occurring about forty years later, was to be witnessed by some survivors of the little company whom our Lord was addressing. In confirmation of this interpretation, we may recall two other sayings of the Lord: "This generation shall not pass till all be fulfilled" (Matt. xxiv. 34);

The Transfiguration took place exactly a week after the unfolding of this new and saddening phase in the teaching of the Lord. "After six days," say SS. Matthew and Mark; while St. Luke, including the days on which the words were spoken and the event took place, writes, "About an eight days after these sayings."

Standing then in this well-defined position, and relation to the progressive character of our Lord's teaching, we may, I think, without much difficulty, gather the main purposes which this event was designed to serve.

The first purpose of the Transfiguration doubtless regarded the Redeemer Himself; while its second regarded the Apostles.

(1) We shall ignore the truth of our Lord's perfect humanity, and fail to appreciate the purport of much that He said and did, if we do not realize that although He voluntarily and cheerfully gave Himself to suffer and die, the prospect of His approaching agony and death was nevertheless one from which His human nature shrank. It was a real struggle with the powers of darkness upon which He had entered—a real temptation of Satan which He endured. The sad and gloomy vista of shame and suffering, with the cross standing at the end of it, lay all open before Him; and as He looked down it, the exclamation broke forth, "Now is My soul troubled, and what shall I say?"

As man, He needed strength and comfort under the prospect. As man, He sought them by prayer. Those long nights spent on the mountain-top, of which this was one (St. Luke tells us, ix. 28, He had gone up to pray), were they not seasons in which the sorrowful soul of Jesus sought consolation and support, and in which these were communicated to Him? Ordinarily speaking, indeed, none are privy to what passes at such seasons save the soul that seeks and receives, and the God Who hears and gives. We are, however, in the case of our Great Exemplar, permitted almost to enter the secret chamber of communion with heaven, and not only to hear the

---

and concerning John, "If I will that he tarry *till I come*, what is that to thee?" (John xxi. 22.)

Have then these words no reference to an event which in all the three Synoptic Gospels is narrated in immediate connection with them? The true answer seems to be that they have, inasmuch as the Transfiguration was a pledge to the disciples, and a prelude of what should be hereafter. It was a revelation of the glory of the Son of Man, which, though now hidden from human eyes, could at any time be manifested. It showed that even while He wore the form of a servant, and was about to suffer and die at the hands of men, He had a kingdom to come in. St. Peter's words, referring to this event, seem to confirm this view: "We made known to you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . We were eyewitnesses to His majesty" (2 Ep. i. 16). See Trench's "Studies in the Gospels," p. 184, etc.; and Bishop Horsley's "Sermons," xii.

prayer which goes up, but also to see the answer which comes down. In Gethsemane we listen to the thrice-repeated supplication, and behold the outward manifestation of the exceeding sorrow of soul which poured it forth. We see also the answer given—the angel who appeared from heaven strengthening Him. So here, too, the answer to Christ's prayer ("as He prayed," Luke) is made visible to us, while we gain a glimpse of the glory that surrounded Him, till the mountain-top becomes the gate of heaven—nay, heaven itself, and while we hear the voice that speaks of a Father's love to Him, and bears divine testimony on His behalf before His followers. Must we not believe that such nights as these, when the Son of God breathed, so to speak, His native air (for may we not regard this as only a sample in which the curtain is withdrawn for the instruction of the three, and of ourselves through their testimony?), refreshed and invigorated and calmed His spirit after and before the long days of unceasing and arduous and generally discouraging labour which preceded and followed them, and enabled Him to bear up under the foreknowledge of his coming woes?[1]

(2) With regard to the three witnesses, the design of the Transfiguration was doubtless to prepare them, as it strengthened their Master for Gethsemane, where they should be with Him also, and for all that should follow. It is difficult for us to realize how bitter and disappointing a lesson it was which

[1] Professor Godet, in his very suggestive "Studies on the New Testament," propounds the following explanation as the key to the story of the Transfiguration: "Two opposite modes of departing this life offered themselves to Him at that moment. One, that to which He had a right by virtue of His holiness, and which, so considered, was in His case the normal issue—the glorious transformation originally appointed for man when not separated from God, and of which this transfiguration itself was the prelude. Jesus had it in His power to accept this triumphal departure; and it was right that God should offer it to Him, for it was the reward due to His holiness. But in thus re-entering heaven, Jesus must have entered it alone. The door must of necessity have closed behind Him. Humanity, unreconciled, would have remained on earth, struggling with the bonds of sin and death until its entire dissolution. Side by side with this mode of departure, Jesus contemplates another, to be accomplished at Jerusalem, that city which kills the prophets, and which would still less spare the holy One of God, if He refuses to give way to its carnal will. This painful end to His life is the subject of His conversation with the two great representatives of the Old Covenant, and is the one which, as He declares to them, He prefers and accepts. . . . He turns His back upon the arch of triumph which rises before Him, and resolutely decides in favour of the pathway of shadows which leads to heaven through the grave. . . . Jesus had the power to ascend: He exercises a free choice, and prefers to descend and take the road to Jerusalem."—(Pp. 112, 113. The whole section, pp. 110-114, should be studied.)

they had just been set to learn, that their Lord and Master must suffer and die. It was not only their own great loss which was apparently involved. A suffering Messiah was, and still is, to the Jew a stumbling-block. And they, too, looked for a kingdom rather than a cross, and could ill reconcile themselves to the idea that the cross stood in the way to that kingdom. Hence it was that Peter, even immediately after he had witnessed his good confession, could not endure when his Master began to speak of His sufferings and death, and even ventured to remonstrate with Him. Graciously therefore was it granted to Peter and his companions to witness this manifestation of their Master's glory, and to hear the voice from the cloud, bearing testimony to His Person—that Person which they were now being taught to connect with thoughts of shame and death; and even to find that the thought of death entered into and did not darken the glory of that hour, but was rather the very centre of that glory. For Moses and Elias were talking with Him upon the same theme which He had been opening to them. They "spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem."

Nor did those who were privileged to witness it forget that sight; nor was its lesson lost upon them. More than thirty years after, Peter thus spoke of it: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of His majesty. For He received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to Him from the excellent glory, This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with Him in the holy mount" (2 Pet. i. 16-19). John also, doubtless, had it in his mind when in his Gospel he wrote (i. 14), "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father." And may we not believe that its remembrance was also with them when they were called not only to testify of Christ, but also to do and to suffer for His sake; when John stood by the cross, and acknowledged his Master hanging between two malefactors, by accepting the charge of His mother, as he afterwards bore the martyrdom of a long life of waiting; when Peter stood forth and preached Jesus boldly on the day of Pentecost, or patiently endured for His Name's sake bonds and imprisonment, and at last was content to die upon the cross; and when James sealed his testimony with his blood, slain by the sword of Herod.

I close with suggesting a practical lesson which we may learn in connection with the words of St. Peter, "Master, it is good for us to be here; let us make three tabernacles."

Apart from the mistaken view of the claims of Jesus compared with those of Moses and Elias, which seems to be implied in the proposal to build tabernacles for *all three*, these words surely indicate the same shrinking from suffering, the same failure to comprehend the necessity of the Cross, as his former "Be it far from thee, Lord." Here was the kingdom begun on earth; heaven opened without the key of suffering. Their poor and despised Master was surrounded by excellent glory. The "spirits of just men made perfect" held communion with Him, and they were admitted into that holy fellowship; and the light of the presence of God was over them all. There had been enough of strife with an evil world in the past; and those new sayings haunted him; and the future looked dark and threatening. Let them return no more to the vale of tears—the scenes of sorrow and toil. Let them dwell here always, and make this their abiding-place. "Let us make three tabernacles." But he knew not what he said. Such rest is not, save in foretastes like this, to be sought on earth, but in heaven: such unalloyed bliss is not given to abide with man on this side of the grave.

The afflicted father, with his child possessed of a foul spirit, awaited their return at the foot of the mountain—emblem of a world lying in the wicked one, which was still to be reclaimed by the blood of the Cross—a kingdom to be won in battle for Christ, by His followers; a field wherein they must do their day's labour before their rest should be earned.[1]

Peter's spirit seems to have been that which has manifested itself in every age of the Church—in the hermit who separated himself from contact with the outer world, and the mystic whose religion consists in contemplation rather than action. We are told that three monasteries were afterwards built on the very mountain, as men believed, where Apostles were not suffered to construct three booths. Such a life must always be unreal and selfish, and one far removed from the resemblance to His, Who if He spent the night upon the mountain-top, alone with God, all the day long "went about doing good." Contemplation is to prepare us for action; and communion on the mountain-top for the battle of life below. Life is too short, and its work too great for indulgence in vain aspi-

[1] "It was not for Peter to construct the universe for his personal satisfaction. He had to learn the meaning of Calvary no less than that of Hermon. Not in a cloud of glory or chariot of fire was Jesus to pass away from them, but with arms outstretched in agony on the accursed tree; not between Moses and Elias, but between two thieves who were crucified with Him, on either side one."—(Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. ii., p. 29.)

rations and visionary day-dreams. We are not to live to ourselves, but to the Lord, and in living *to* Him we are to live *for* others. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" was the question which sent the orphaned disciples down from the Mount of the Ascension to their work in the busy streets of Jerusalem. "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil," was the Lord's prayer for His followers, as His charge was—"Ye are the light of the world;" "Ye are the salt of the earth,"—indicating to them and to us the path of duty.[1]

The Transfiguration and its sequel may well remind us that for the servant, as for his Master, glory comes through suffering, and life springs from death.

Yet let us make the "Holy Mount" a school of prayer, and learn there whence alone cometh our help. Does not the Transfiguration speak to us of the blessedness of seasons of retirement for communion with God, and of the power of prayer to elevate the soul's vision above the mists and shadows of a world of sin, and care, and strife, and to animate us for the work and the welfare, and, if God so will it, for the suffering too, by Pisgah glimpses, in which it is given to the eye of faith to see the King in His beauty, and to "behold the land that is very far off"? Nor is it given alone to see but also to receive. Still while men pray the strength comes: the witness is borne to their spirits from heaven; the glory falls upon them, and they go back to their work and their warfare calmed, and comforted, and invigorated. The Transfiguration teaches us that honour from God comes to those who pray. "As they pray," beholding the glory of the Lord, they too are transfigured, transformed, "changed [the word in 2 Cor. iii. 18 is the same in the Greek, *μεταμορφούμεθα*] into the same image from glory to glory." The process of transformation surely though secretly advances until the day of "the manifestation

---

[1] Since writing this paper, I have met with the following version of this lesson, interpreted by Rev. Dr. Matheson in his delightful little book, "My Aspirations" (*Heart Chords*, Cassell and Co.). "The answer to me (for I too have had this desire) and to Peter is the same, 'Arise and depart, for this is not your rest.' You were not made for the mountain, but for the valley. The place that is good for you is not the sphere of exaltation, but the sphere of ministration. See, at the foot of the mountain there is a demoniac waiting to be healed. He cries to you from the valley of humiliation! Shall you fear to enter into his cloud of suffering? Is it too prosaic a thing to be a healer of common pains? The cloud that hides the vision is itself thy glory. The storm that breaks thy mountain tabernacle is itself thy rest; it calls thee down into the valley to minister with the angels of God. Thou canst build thy tabernacle *there*!" Pp. 42, 43.

of the sons of God." "Then shall the righteous shine forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

At best such seasons of rapture are only brief and infrequent, and may be, as is often the case, thrown into vivid contrast with the shadows which constantly linger beside the light. They who are privileged to enjoy them may soon meet with discouragement when they go down from the hill into the valley of spiritual strife and temptation, even as the disciples descended to a world of sin, and disputing, and unbelief below. It is then encouraging to remember that the happy converse and communion which excited Peter's mistaken and impracticable desire only typifies the state of fellowship with the Lord, and participation in His glory which awaits all His true disciples, and which will not only realize but infinitely surpass their most enlarged desires. For if a brief glimpse of the heavenly glory so overpowered and entranced the disciples on the Mount, what will be the blessedness of those who "come to Mount Zion—the heavenly Jerusalem—to an innumerable company of angels, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant," where they shall see Him as He is, and be with Him and like Him for ever! Oh! how good shall it be to be there, abiding not in a quickly dissolved tabernacle such as Peter would have made, but in a building from God—"an house not made with hands—eternal in the heavens"!

T. A. Stowell.

Art. IV.—PESSIMISM.

PESSIMISM may be popularly described as philosophy turned sour; and the smaller the beer the sooner it turns sour when the electric tension of the weather is severe. Pessimism for ever contemplates the back of the canvas on which the tapestry is wrought. It dwells by preference in darkness, feeds on darkness, is a product of darkness, and to darkness returns. All the greater names of human tradition are against it. The entire array of the fathers and masters of human thought, since philosophy first awoke in the half-legendary Seven Sages, condemn it with one voice. The sages of feeling, the poets, who interpret humanity to man on its sentimental side, are equally unequivocal and (with one modern exception) unanimous in its condemnation. Tap the spring of

Parnassus where you will, from the first sprightly runnings down to the very dregs, you will hardly find an infinitesimal percentage of sympathy with the teachings of Schopenhauer and Hartmann. From Homer to Shakespeare, from Shakespeare to Goethe, from Goethe to Longfellow—I take my stand purposely on those whom death has removed from the sphere of envy and on whom time has set his final seal—the grand chorus of those who teach us through the imagination abhor the theories of the pessimist as degrading that human nature which they ennobled, as sinking man just as far below the brutes as they would exalt him above them. Spinoza is as dead against it as was Plato; Lucretius in his "Alma Venus genitrix,"[1] as Milton himself in the words, "These are Thy glorious works, Parent of Good."

Of course, we find poetry streaked and veined with all the products of human consciousness. Even Homer in one passage proclaims "nothing more miserable than man," and whoso will may, if they please, erect "Timon of Athens" into the normal standard of the humanities of Shakespeare.[2] And poetry, as a whole, could not be itself if it missed the dark pathetic background on which the joys of our common nature are thrown out. Nobody denies the mixed experience which poetry idealizes, and in which the minor as well as major keys of emotion find their place in the gamut. The marvellous capacity of man for suffering and his power of sinking into the bathos of despair have their interpreters at full length, or tragedy would be an unmeaning name. But the greater masters of emotion leave not the balance unrectified. Prometheus is unbound at last, Œdipus is justified and consoled, Orestes receives expiation, the "ballot of Pallas" turns the scale, and the Furies depart appeased. This is the moral of all the grander teachings of tragedy. Although

> Never was a story of more woe
> Than that of Juliet and her Romeo,

yet the reconciliation of the deadly feud of the rival houses is sealed in their blood; they have not lived and loved in vain.

---

[1] Lucretius in the much-admired passage, iii. 936-7, in precise terms denies what Schopenhauer affirms:

> Et *non* omnia pertusum congesta quasi in vas,
> Commoda perfluxere atque ingrata interiere.

[2] Of course, isolated utterances may be met with in passages of gloom—and what would poetry be without shadow to interpret its light? Thus we find Sophocles, Œd., Col. 1225-6, saying: *μὴ φῦναι τὸν ἅπαντα νικᾷ λόγον τὸ δ', ἐπεὶ φανῇ, βάναι κεῖθεν ὅθεν περ ἥκει πολὺ δεύτερον ὡς τάχιστα.* In a similar spirit dark glimpses of inner thought break from Heine and from Herder here and there.

But, to give the pessimist his most hopeful poetic embodiment which modern times have furnished, take Byron. One specimen—an extreme one—will suffice. He says:

> Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen,
> Count o'er thy days from anguish free;
> And know, whatever thou hast been,
> 'Tis something better not to be.

His own career is the great refutation of the pessimist spirit which haunts his poetry. He believed with all his heart in the resuscitation of his beloved Greece, and died in the act of consecrating himself to her service. Vilify him as we will as rake, debauchee, demoralized and demoralizer, he found a noble aim at last, and laid down his life in the effort to realize it. As it were with foot in stirrup and lance in rest against tyranny and barbarism, his turbulent spirit passed away. *Magnis tamen excidit ausis* might truly be written on his tomb, as an effectual answer to the pessimistic twaddle which he was fond of preaching in his verse. Indeed, as he chewed tobacco to keep himself from growing fat, so he chewed the cud of pseudo-melancholy to keep himself interesting—to isolate himself from other men, in an affectation of the lonely grandeurs of sorrow. But this after all mere morbid fancy of Byron's was not pessimism proper, but only a subjective echo or, as it were, bastard variety of it. It is not pessimism to croak as Byron did, and raise a coil about his ideally lacerated feelings and fine-porcelain woes, and enjoy the lonely dignity of being the darkest of sinners and dreariest of sufferers. Pessimism is essentially objective. It works on gloom like Rembrandt, and makes black threads its web and woof. It "puts bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter, darkness for light and light for darkness." "Evil, be thou my good" is its leading sentiment. It seeks to traduce the goodness of the Father of Lights by a Mephistophelic caricature. From the standpoint of the Gospels it seems to touch the confines of the unforgiven sin, and to quench hope in the Shadow of Death—that "hope" which "springs eternal in the human breast."

The one poet who can be quoted as pessimist in spirit and feeling is one hardly known by name probably to the great mass of our countrymen, Leopardi the Italian. It is a curious fact that over thirty years ago he received the tribute of a high encomium from the present Prime Minister; but it seems likely that common sympathies for Hellenic freedom was the root out of which this sprang, and that the panegyrist stood wholly apart from the pessimistic point. Leopardi began literature as a Christian Apologist and Hymnist. Yet despair

is his key-note even now as a quasi-Christian lyrist. "Now I go from hope to hope," he exclaims, "erring every day and forgetting Thee, although always deceived. A day will come when, having nowhere else to turn to, I shall place all my hope in death, and then I shall finally return to Thee." But he soon lost even the shadow of personal faith which these words bespeak, and finding all traditionary bonds of thought hanging like broken bandages loose about him, re-moulded his theory of life on the grand conception that it was not worth living, and passed on the secret to the world that whatever is is wrong, in a volume of poems. Here is a fair specimen of his fretful cavilling which can only pass for argument with those whose minds are already poisoned by the fatalistic poison of pessimism:

> What is a great name? A name which often represents nothing. The idea of the good is constantly changing. As for scientific works, they soon become stale and are forgotten. The most middling mathematicians of our day know more than Galileo and Newton. Glory is a shadow, and genius of which it is the only recompense is but a mournful gift to its possessor.

Here is nearly a false statement or a false argument in every separate clause. That many have deserved the fame of a greatness which few comparatively have found would be a harmless truism; but to say that a great name often represents nothing, gives the lie to all the personal records which time has found worth preserving. It is a statement which flies in the face of human history. Again, had it been urged that a great name is often wholly independent of the moral worth of him who bears it, the maxim is obvious. But moral worth seems of no account in pessimistic eyes. They only recognise Will under the form of force. All moral systems from Plato to Paley are equally dead dust in their finely critical balance. Again, the "idea of the good" is, like all ideas, only a function of the human mind. What he really means who charges it with "constantly changing" is merely that human minds fluctuate and oscillate perpetually. The question of a *summum bonum* objective and external to such minds is untouched by such fluctuations, as the orb of the moon is unshaken by the fluctuations which shiver her watery image into molecules of light. Again, "Scientific works become stale"—he instances Newton. The *Principia* are never stale. They live a new lease of life in every new chapter of science which further study unfolds. The one thing which gets stale is experimental research in material physics, Bacon's method survives and governs still. His actual "experiments special of hot and cold" are the old clothes of modern science, only fit for the rag-picker. Mind in its purer products remains supreme.

Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Des Cartes, and others "rule our spirits from their urns" by purely mental power. But the Timæus in its greater part, the Physica, the Ptolemæan astronomy, and all the older interpretation of nature are now mere mummy-cases to us. Mind in its grander manifestations is never "stale," is never "forgotten," until it connects itself with matter and material results. It is even then a lump of camphor in a mass of decaying vegetables. The refuse may overpower it and cause it to be flung contemptuously aside. But its own perfume taken *per se* is abiding and undying.

If we seek the true cradle and sphere of adult development of pessimism, we must look for it in the far East. The Buddhist school of philosophy there counts its 500 millions out of the estimated total of 1,250 millions of humanity, and as formulated by its author is wholly pessimistic. Nor have the recent revivers of this oriental conception added much to the germ planted at Benares some 2,300 years ago. Schopenhauer has interwoven some results of modern thought into the system, and has fitted it concentrically round an axis of physical science. He, like others who deprave philosophy, perverts its terms. Will, with him, stands for Force. The object of this is to enable him to start with an assumption of the negation of Will in the sense of reasonable choice. Thus he views the world and all nature as merely a function of Will = Force. This force he represents as struggling blindly without end or object, without any foresight or guiding mind. In short, viewing mind as a mere function of the physical organization, he places it last in the scale of nature; which stands thus: 1. Will=Force; 2. Physical basis; 3. Intellect.

He proceeds somewhat as follows: Will is the driving-wheel of the whole machine, including nature and man. Out of the blindly working but inevitable instinct impressed on either—a resolution as it were *to live*, but apart from all design or moral purpose—spring all the forms of life. The same Will is ever striving to satisfy itself, but satisfaction is momentary and craving perpetual. Thus the normal condition of man is restless yearning and discontent. The pressure of this Will ever stimulates to new cravings; it pervades, indeed, all organic activity, but, rising from the merely sentient to man, the higher organization of consciousness, its dissatisfaction culminates acutely in him, and he wears the crown of nature's misery. From momentary satisfaction, which, "like the agreeable morsel as soon as it is swallowed ceases to exist for our sensibility," there springs new eagerness of longing. The equilibrium is no sooner achieved than it is disturbed. It is merely the turning-point or perihelion, from which we start again to describe a new orbit of unrest. The one broad

feature of Buddhism which is not included is the doctrine of transmigration through successive stages of renewed existence, through which a gradual approach to Nirvana, or the absorption of individual life in the Infinite Existence, is made; and by the happy few that goal is at last attained. He thus infers that even pleasure has no positive existence, it being merely a temporary respite from the pain of longing—a momentary negative interval in a note perpetually prolonged—and that the only positive state of existence is pain.

For the unreasoning *Will* of Schopenhauer Hartmann substitutes the "Unconscious," as the basis which supports all being, the protoplasm which furnishes the staple of the universe. According to him this "Unconscious" is pervaded by an aim or design, which seems to us a contradiction in terms. By virtue of this aim it works endlessly onwards, "not," like the Creative Deity of olden thought, "through discursive reflection," but by constantly "externalizing the idea" which thus blindly possessed it, "into reality." The assertion of this aim or end as the law of working to the "Unconscious," and as developing the phenomena of life in natural and human history, is the key-note of Hartmann's system. He is a teleologist before all things. But to formulate the Unconscious teleologically seems like predicating sight of the blind. Borrowing, however, this one peacock's plume to adorn the jackdaw of pessimism, he develops by means of it a tendency to sink into annihilation, and thus ultimately to relieve itself and all that it involves of the dire burdens of existence. Thus the whole evolution of life is to be rolled back into nonentity, and humanity is by some moral process, the action of which we have no clue to explain, to assist the work of demolition, until—

> **Lets the great Anarch's hand the curtain fall,**
> **And universal darkness buries all.**

Hartmann, however, carries his theory into a remorseless detail. He takes hunger and love, by which he appears to mean sexual love, and analyses the pangs of the former, and the cumulative embarrassments which flow from the latter, and succeeds in showing, as he thinks, that every rose is all thorns. By looking at every evil, drawback, or inconvenience on every side, by gathering all into a heap under the strongest light, and then endeavouring to show *per contra* that all the blessings and joys of life are tainted with illusion, he makes an array which affects the mind somewhat, as does an anatomical museum with its bottled specimens of all monstrous and morbid forms. A huge seeming overbalance in favour of pain and woe is thus easily struck. Civilization itself breeds a new

crop of sufferings—strange diseases, new morbid sensibilities—and human nature goes on "stewing in its own juice," which is a mere secretion of misery at every pore. Science and art, according to Hartmann, dribble away into mediocrity and mechanism, or degenerate into intellectual pride and æsthetic vanity. Thus the world receives, as it grows older, fresh coats of evil. We are all tarred with the same brush, only it is laid on thicker as humanity progresses. Thus the "conclusion of the whole matter" is that the "whole duty of man" lies in shaking off the love of life as a delusion, and escaping from it as from a snare; in foregoing the love of offspring, for that only weaves a new mesh in the net of universal suffering, and forges a new link in the chain of inevitable calamity which binds the race. The only refuge is to extinguish the torch and trample out the last spark. Schopenhauer, less utterly intolerant, admits a refuge of the soul in art. In art, he seems to get his head out of the atmosphere which chokes all aspirations with the dust which it contains. Only he points out that those who win their way to such rare pinnacles of outlook are the very few, and that they pay for their realizing the beautiful by a more intense sensibility to pain. In proportion as they rise above the cloudy horizon of the earth, they are exposed to sun-stroke in the brain. Like the spider, their web of extended perception being spun from themselves, they extend their sensitiveness, and tingle in every thread of it.

Yet again, Schopenhauer seems inconsistent in the function which he assigns to love and pity. What are these from the standpoint of universal Will rushing forth in a life of unsatisfied cravings, save sources inexhaustible of cravings which are insatiate? All mankind being plunged in this bath of incurable suffering, the objects of pity lie weltering hopelessly all around. Love must in all its otherwise possible forms under the law of pessimism determine in that of pity only, or remain a mere theory of feeling, barren of realization, and therefore only prolific of idle longings unappeased. Yet Schopenhauer treats these almost as Aristotle treats "terror and pity," where, discerning in them the essence of tragedy, he calls them the "cathartics of the soul" (Aristotle, Poet., 1449). By love and pity, Schopenhauer says, the individual loses, or tends to lose, the sense of self, and realize the essential unity of all sentient existence. He argues that:

> When, through the power of love and pity, one ceases to draw egoistic distinctions between self and others, and shares their sorrows as largely as one feels his own, one then realizes the meaning of all that is, grasps its essence, recognises the nullity of all effort; and this conviction brings the will to a standstill. Thus will becomes averse to life, and the man reaches the renunciation of self, reaches resignation and a refusal of the

will to live. The phenomenal manifestation of this lies in the passing over of virtue into asceticism.

Thus the superimposed stratum of individuality is to be pared away. The will becoming stagnant ceases to harbour yearnings, and the fangs of pain have nothing in which to fix their hold. And in asceticism he seems to see the first stage towards this consummation, which however can only be reached by pushing it to the extreme which extinguishes life. Only so can individuality really cease. The success is like that of the man who trained his donkey down to a straw a day, and then, to crown the experiment, the creature died! It is obvious, in short, that suicide is the one practical outcome of such teachings. In short, in all the many forms of melancholy which terminate life by violence, pessimism may be said to practically dominate at the moment, and a large increase of suicide is said to be noted at present in Saxony and other German States as running parallel to the spread of negations of all faith, whether pessimistic or not. But although loud in his praises of asceticism, Schopenhauer was no ascetic. He never tried to get down to the straw a day, or near it. He made not the most distant approaches to what, in his own theory, was a "happy despatch." He might calmly await his quietus through the sedative and self-effacing agency of "love and pity," but he showed no inclination to "make" it "with a bare bodkin." The Archbishop of York has remarked:[1]

The cholera came to Berlin; here was a door to Nirvana—cessation of existence—open before him. He packed his portmanteau like the veriest optimist, and found in safer quarters renewed pleasure in the activity of his denunciation of all activity as pain. He is not the first philosopher who has refuted *ambulando* his own theories.

The pessimistic standpoint is only reached by those who shut their eyes to the broadest, grandest fact in nature, viz., that existence, wholly apart from and antecedently to the balance of particular pains against pleasures, is of itself normally a state of enjoyment. You may compare particular pains to the thorns and prickles, particular pleasures to the flowers and fruit which grow on the same tree, but there is beneath them all a sap of even and buoyant pleasurableness which circulates through all the fibres of the common growth. To sleep and wake, use moderate exertion and repose after it, to exchange thoughts and receive or transmit feelings in ordinary talk, nay, to experience passively the sensations of the unconscious functions of a frame in average health when duly performed, to draw breath and take in light by the eye

[1] "The Worth of Life," an Address to the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, by William, Lord Archbishop of York. London, 1877.

and sound by the ear, are all ingredients in this placid *plenum* of enjoyment. In nearly all these the lower animals more or less have their share. There can be no doubt that they enjoy existence, and stamp it with an unanimous verdict of approval which is none the less weighty for being merely sentient rather than conscious. It is in this kindly soil that all secondary and particular sensations, whether pleasurable or the opposite, strike root. This is the great current of passive happiness in which they all float. It may be no very exalted or refined state of sensation; but though a low-level stream, it is deep and wide enough to bathe the roots of all sentient things. It covers the greatest number of existences, and pervades the greatest number of hours of every day. Its low level, but universal diffusion, shows that nature aims at quantity rather than quality, and spreads a general protoplasm of enjoyment rather than formulates individual happiness. The animals which are amenable to human influence, most notably the dog, seem to rise at once under kindly treatment to a higher standard of this life-joy. The intense delight which dogs show in human society, and the friendships which they thus form both with man, with one another, and with other animals of the domestic circle, clearly attest this. This life-joy, a medium which all share, a sympathy to which all respond, seems to enfold all sentient existence, as the luminiferous ether interfused between the orbs of space binds all in one communion of the light of life.

And this is precisely what the pessimist ignores. He is, as it were, colour-blind to all the warmer hues of the spectrum. The leaders of pessimistic thought seem all of them—notably those whom we have mentioned—men of eccentric temperament, but on their idiosyncrasy we cannot now pause to dwell. But the causes which, especially in Germany, make their craze ephemerally fashionable, are not far to seek. The popularity of this lean and barren school of thought is part of the recoil of the human mind from the pressure of authority. Having exhausted all that can be said against God and revelation, nothing remains but to present an indictment against nature —the further fetched the better. They fetch it accordingly from the Eastern sources of human thought on which, unless indirectly through remote tradition, no ray of revelation ever fell. It is further stimulated by mere intellectual curiosity to see the utmost that can be said against all that is, to exhaust the possibilities of experiment on the negative side, until a vacuum is reached, and the pump of speculation sucks at last. Its next ally is the purely critical faculty which demands a higher standard than the subject-matter admits, and carries the war of objections into the entire field of maxims and beliefs

which have hitherto formed the staple of mind among the energetic races of men. It has a fascination for minds which wish to be assured of nothing but their own power, and yet cannot breathe the attenuated atmosphere of pure neutral scepticism. To proclaim the overthrow of all positive results previously registered, and leave a *tabula rasa*, is not enough; they must go on to establish negative ones.

Pessimism furnishes an instructive contrast and counterbalance to Comtism and the worship of humanity. To exalt and idealize human nature into an object of the highest reverence and affection for all who share that nature, appears to be the accepted definition of this Positivist attempt to do without God. It was a saying ascribed to Voltaire, that, had there been no God, it would have been necessary in the interests of humanity to invent one. But Auguste Comte did not see the necessity, and thought men could grow, to speak roughly, their own idols from among themselves. His resource, however, compels the exaltation of human nature, exactly in proportion as the pessimists proclaim its debasement and pour opprobrium on the collective notion of humanity. If Comte's sect be Positivists, these latter are surely Negativists. The former lavish veneration and gratitude exactly where the latter spit out their contempt and aversion, and what to the former are names of pyramid stability and grandeur, are to the latter so many masses of drifting wreck. We may let them pair off together. They cannot both be true, but the fact that either looks exactly at what the other neglects, suggests that both are in effect false.

But, to return to the critical faculty, we may remark that as belief and imagination tend to verify their own dictates through the enthusiasm which they inspire, as is shown for instance in a large class of diseases which they assist the physician to combat and quell, so to renounce their help and erect the critical faculty into the sole arbiter of all problems, opens the door to an inrush of evils, and taints the sphere of thought with an inbred malaria of subtle and specious falsehood, and tends to fortify the pessimistic view.

Life is largely made up of uncertainties, thus giving hope an indefinite range. Hope is an enjoyable state, and, assuming an Author of nature working by design to make life's uncertainties enjoyable, one does not see any method so conducive thereto, as this large sphere of influence, elastic and inexhaustible, which is filled by hope. As it is with love, so it is with hope. The pessimist denounces love as delusive, because the object of love may disappoint by unworthiness or vileness, and the feeling itself may give way to selfishness or pride. But as it "is better to have loved and lost than never to have

loved at all," so it is better to have hoped and been disappointed than never to have hoped at all. Again, the pessimist neglects the fact that a desire which incites to pursuit, so far from being a pain, is distinctly pleasurable so long as it sustains us in that pursuit. Some will give over sooner, others later, if pursuit becomes protracted without result. The result may be as incommensurate with the effort expended as was the wreath of wild olive with the efforts called forth by the Olympic games; but it is followed with other indirect recompenses, as was that intrinsically paltry prize. The game may not be "worth the candle," but it is as amusing as if it were. The pessimist is prepared in either case to damn it equally and utterly.

Pessimism also ignores the moral government by rewards and punishments on which Bishop Butler so strongly insists, and his proof of which need not be repeated here; and, with this, ignores equally our present state as one of probation. One obvious reason for this is, that finding various degrees of incompleteness and uncertainty in the moral sequence, pessimism is intolerant of them. Probation may be said, on the contrary, to rest on uncertainty as its element, being in its nature tentative and gradual. It shows what is in a man, and, by bringing it in contact with his surroundings, makes it more stable and durable. It is always tending to resolve uncertainty into certainty, to mature what is crude, and complete what is inchoate, and to strike the final balance of character by the aid of all the items of oscillation. But, impatient of the process, pessimism rejects the tendency, and ascribes a finality to every case of failure by the way.

Precisely because it recognises probation and moral discipline, tragedy is radically inconsistent with that pessimism to which some of its phenomena are superficially akin. It may for instance leave suffering predominant and moral worth crushed by it; but if so, it in effect propounds a moral enigma which it does not solve—a result widely different from the didactics of despair which pessimism preaches. Further, tragedy may look forward to a final adjustment of the moral balance left defective so far—a deferred answer to the enigma propounded; how different from pessimism, which seems to pull the mask off life, and show that there is nothing below!

We have spoken of impatience and intolerance. We are all more or less familiar in private life with the grumbler who ever frets at petty losses, cavils at magnified difficulties, and underrates all results which do not come immediately to hand when efforts have been made, puts up with no drawback to expectations, and parades a grievance as fondly and proudly as an affectionate mother does "the finest baby ever seen." Such a

snappish temper, such a narrowness of intellectual outlook—as if one studied life and nature through the arrow-slit of a mediæval fortress—transferred only from private dealings to the grandest questions on the largest scale which can interest humanity, seems to lie at the root of the pessimist outgrowth of what is miscalled philosophy—*misosophy* would be its fitter name. The frame of mind which produces it is one closely akin to misanthropy, and is one equally distorted and unnatural "These are murmurers, *complainers*," says St. Jude (16) where our A. V. inadequately renders the very effective Greek word, *μεμψίμοιροι*, for which probably in popular English no more effective term than "pessimists" could be hit upon. To those who are such deliberately and of set purpose, no argument, probably, can effectively be addressed. They set themselves advisedly to find a scientific basis on which to arraign the whole scheme of nature. The obscurity, intricacy, and inconsistency of their respective systems will probably prevent any large number of followers from swelling the ranks of their school. But a large number, who are merely anxious for weapons of offence against all that is accepted, and seek merely to shock modesty and outrage reverence, may probably snatch such from their armoury ready forged. A large mass of sarcastic maxims and humorous-cynical remarks are said to be interspersed in the lumbering discussions and arid abstractions of Hartmann. Probably many of these may live as poisoned arrows on the lips of club-room materialists and slang-philosophers. Not wishing to furnish missiles for such hands, we abstain from quoting any specimens. But on the whole, men will continue to prize life and love it, and the pessimist to reply that men cheat themselves by an illusion which has become instinctive and hereditary. The madman not uncommonly thinks that insanity is ascribable to those who restrain his excesses, and the question between Bedlam and the outside public is never likely to find an arbiter acceptable to both parties. Not unlike this is the state of the question between the pessimists and average humanity. There is no common platform of accepted principles on which discussion can proceed.

The inert masses of Asiatics who form the rank and file of nominal Buddhism carry little weight of authority to the Western mind, and least of all on that branch of its teaching which involves pessimism. In the vast realms which furnish the votaries of Buddhism the ethical code may be said to be popular; the ascetic discipline to influence practically a few, the pessimistic theory to be almost confined to the academic circles of metaphysical disputation. On the other hand, the most eccentric and inconsistent additions have

been made to the original teaching. On the scanty outline of Buddhism proper, as on a scaffolding, human feeling has erected its own objects of worshipful reverence, which that creed or negation passes by. Thus there are polytheistic Buddhists, there are monotheistic Buddhists; and there exists in China a highly primitive worship of heaven and earth, rivers and mountains, regarded as actual essences. Besides these there comes in, of course, a vast array of ritual (which Buddha expressly denounced as worthless), ceremonies and charms. All these have their sphere of influence on the mind of the million, whereas that of the original pessimistic basis may be struck out of the problem as wholly inconsiderable.

To preach to the world its own misery, and to rouse men from their dream of happiness to a due sense of its delusiveness, is the cheerful mission avowed by the pessimists. To such teaching it were only the proper sequel to second it by action, and devote all the energies to the increase of suffering and the diffusion of woe. By a patient use of the opportunities for inflicting anguish, modern sages may help the proof that happiness is out of reach for man. Tyranny and terrorism become angelic occupations, and share the glory of regenerating humanity. Ivan "the Terrible" was an exemplary apostle of this new form of beneficence. Phalaris of Agrigentum, Dionysius of Syracuse, Sulla and Domitian at Rome, mistakenly execrated, together with certain kings of modern Dahomey, shine in the new light of advanced thought. Their object was to accentuate practically the lesson that life is misery, and that

> The sooner 'tis over, the sooner to sleep.

HENRY HAYMAN.

ART. V.—THE LISLE PAPERS.

II.

DURING the year 1538 came the first sign of the reaction which was about to set in. Some of the more fervid Protestants were disposed to run faster on the road of reformation than the more lukewarm or cautious found convenient. It was therefore thought desirable to recede a little, and to let the populace see that the authorities did not mean to abandon all the old ceremonies, nor to depart entirely from the doctrines

hitherto promulgated. The burning question of the Sacraments was singled out as the one to be first dealt with.

"It *have* pleased the King's Majesty," writes Lord Sandes, so early as May 22nd, "to sustain the labour to resort in his Grace's own person among the bishops to determine and discuss such arguments and doubts as were in controversy concerning the blessed sacrament of *thawtor* [the altar]: I trust now that a good establishment shall ensue, to the great comfort of all perfect Christians; for after this, I hope the sincere Christians shall be discerned from the others."

A few days before this, Husee had written petulantly, "The Abbot of Westminster will not meddle with the wine my Lord sent. I pray God never let me have ado with more monks, for I am too much weary of this."

In the midst of all these grave topics come occasional letters having reference to supplies of provisions and new fashions; "I have sent," writes Husee at this time, "by Harry Drury, six pair of hosen for your Lordship; item, two caps with two under-caps [skull-caps ?], one of velvet, another of satin, locked in a new cap-case, whereof he hath the key: more, a yard and a half of violet frisado for Mr. James. Item, two dozen staff-torches, two dozen quarries [arrows]. More, a chest containing therein 102 lbs. fine sugar in loaves, two lbs. cinnamon, two lbs. ginger, one lb. cloves, one lb. maces, one lb. sawndres [sandal-wood], ten lbs. pepper, one lb. turnsell, half lb. isinglass."

Two months later, on the 19th of July, Bekynsaw reports that he had been to see the Archdeacon of Paris, who was Vicar-General, to ask his leave for a suffragan bishop to ordain young James Basset, who at this time was destined for the Church. The Archdeacon's reply was that no bishop out of England would dare to do such a thing without letters dimissory from the bishop of the diocese in which the young man was born, unless he held a dispensation from the Pope or the Legate. "I reasoned with him, but no reason would prevail, and knowing that I was an Englishman [he] thrust me from him, and said I smelled of the fire. Howbeit, it was done laughingly and merrily." James Basset was now barely eleven years of age.

The Archdeacon of Paris might well, from his point of view, sneer at the English bishops. Only the day before this letter was written, "our late Lady of Walsingham," as Husee oddly styles the image which for centuries had been one of the chief idols in this country, "was brought to Lambeth, where was both my Lord Chancellor [Audley] and my Lord Privy Seal [Cromwell], with many virtuous prelates; but there was offered neither ob. [halfpenny] nor candle. What shall become of her is not

determined." The "Hot Gospellers" of that day were probably not aware that, a hundred and fifty years before, the Lollards had dubbed this piece of carved wood "The Witch of Walsingham." Had they known it, some among them would have been sure to take up the opprobrious epithet with glee.

In September, Sir Richard Lee writes to his cousin, Lady Lisle, who was very uneasy concerning a rumour that Archbishop Cranmer suspected her of "Papistry"—an accusation which at that moment was not profitable to the person of whom it was made. The Archbishop owned to Sir Richard that "he had such words to your servant much after the rate your Ladyship did write unto me," and that report had been made "that your Ladyship was given to be a little *Papisch.*" He desired both her and her husband "to be favourers of them that favour the truth . . . and so doing, my Lord and you both shall be assured of him to be at your commandment as any friend ye have alive."

Lady Lisle was now interesting herself in the endeavour to get up an "interlude"—namely, private theatricals. It must, however, be remembered that in 1538 very few plays were not of a religious cast. Whether this made them better or worse may be a doubtful question. Husee was desired to see to this matter; and, like many others, her Ladyship demanded novelty. The old worn-out "mysteries," or miracle-plays, which had been performed in England for many centuries past, would not suit her.

"I will be in hand with Felstede the silk dyer," writes Husee on the 3rd of October, "for the players' garments, and also to procure to get some good matter for them; but *this* new ecclesiastical matters shall be hard to come by." Two days later, he sends word that "I have been with Feltstede, and given him earnest for a suit of players' garments, which he will keep for you; and an interlude which he called Rex Diabole [*sic*]. I will do my best to get some of this new Scripture matters, but they be very dear; they asketh above 20s. for an interlude." We hear no more of the matter, but probably her Ladyship had her play, in which she may herself have stood for the Virgin Mary, or St. Katherine, while her ladies and gentlemen played the remaining characters, including Vice, Virtue, and the Devil—three individuals never absent from a miracle-play.

The royal pendulum which bore the name of Henry Tudor had by this time swung across to the other side. The first sign of departure from the *status quo* was furnished by the trial of John Nicholson, or Lambert, better known by the latter name—the martyr of whom every Protestant has heard as he who at the stake lifted his arms with the dying triumphal

shout of "None but Christ!" Here is Husee's account of the matter, written Nov. 16th, 1538:

Pleaseth your Lordship to be advertised that this day, in the King's hall of his Grace's Manor of York Place, were certain scaffolds, benches, and seats, made on both sides the hall, and also a *hault* place for the King's Majesty, where his Grace sat, at the highest end thereof, the said hall being hanged most richly; and about noon, his Grace sitting in his majesty, with the most parts of the Lords temporal, and spiritual bishops and doctors divers, with judges, serjeants-at-law, the Mayor and Aldermen of London, with divers others of worshipful and honest of the town's, was brought before his Grace one John Nicolson, clerk, otherwise called Lambert, sometime chaplain unto the English nation in Antwerp, to whom was laid certain articles of his opinions, and in especial one concerning the blessed sacrament of the altar, wherein he rested and *abydd* by his denying the very body of God to be in the said sacrament in corporeal substance as flesh and blood, *realiter et especialiter*, but only to be there spiritually: and in fine, and notwithstanding all Scripture and authorities of the holy doctors and fathers of the Church clearly to the contrary, the King's Majesty reasoning with him in person, yea, and sundry times confounding him in his own talk: which undoubtedly his Highness handled so that his Grace alone had been sufficient to confound them, and they had been a thousand of like opinion; it was not a little rejoicing unto all his Grace's commons, and also to all others that saw and heard how his Grace handled and used that matter, for it will be a precedent while the world standeth; for I think there will be none so bold hereafter to attempt any such like cause. And after his Grace had done, and confounded him by Scripture, so that he had nothing to say for himself [had Lambert written the account, perhaps this part of it might have been a little qualified] the bishops and doctors were [in] hand with him, exhorting him to forsake his opinion, and to be in the number of the Catholics, which also his Grace earnestly willed him to do. He clearly refused it, and bid by his opinion, and shall have his desert according unto his demerits. They began at noon, and were there upon that matter till five of the clock, and then was he conveyed to the Marshalsea, and there remaineth.

On the 23rd, Husee writes again: "Yesterday the xxijth day was brent in Smithfield Lambert alias John Nycolson, and the same day two Flemings, and a woman, one of their wives, adjudged to death, and the third man abjured. These were Anabaptists. It is thought more of that sect shall to the fire."

How could Henry VIII. be otherwise than a selfish tyrant, when on every side he heard himself extolled as a paragon of wisdom and learning, and pre-eminent in power, to such an extent that the kingdom, and the Church, and even God Almighty Himself, were expected to be grateful for his condescending patronage? Never was man set in more slippery places, nor did any ever need fuller supplies of grace to keep him from becoming a very demon.

The year 1539 was the time of reaction from all the previous progress in the direction of reformation. The changed tone of

the writers quickly shows that the weathercocks were sensible of an alteration in the wind. Husee writes on May 21st:

> There is good hope here that such an Act shall be established concerning the blessed sacrament of the altar, that people shall not be so busy as they have been these late days, nor versify [disparage] nor scan so many ways upon the same as they have done, but have the same in due reverence, as appertaineth. The King's Highness in proper person hath take daily pains for the establishment thereof, insomuch that his Grace was divers times amongst his Lords and Council for deciding of the same. Whenever it cometh, it shall be the best and wholesomest Act yet passed in this realm.

A few days later he adds, "As concerning the sacrament of the altar, it shall not be long ere your Lordship shall hear the best news that may be heard." In these words Husee introduces the Bloody Statute, fitly so termed by the common people, for no Act more calculated to make men familiar with pain, danger, anguish, and death, ever passed the English Parliament. It was no wonder, when Gardiner drew it up. The letter which gives a *résumé* of the Act has been intentionally deprived of its signature, doubtless lest it should lead to evil consequences for the writer; but the hand is that of John Husee. He writes thus:

> The Act concerning the sacrament is passed, and I think shall be shortly published by proclamation: the sum whereof is, that whatsoever hereafter be reasoned and spoken of the same, after the consecration, otherwise than hath been in time past, that is, the very body of God to be there in flesh and blood, *realiter* [*et*] *essentialiter*, the offenders thereof to be taken as traitors and heretics, and to suffer as in case of like offences: and further, no priests nor religious persons hereafter to marry in pain of death, and those that are already married to separate them from their spouses by a day limited, which is not long hence, and never to be taken again in their company upon pain of death; and all such persons as shall so offend to be taken as felons: further, that no vows of religious women, widows or maidens, in any wise to be dispensed withal, but the same to be observed and kept; and all such as transgress and infringe the same to be judged as felonies.

He goes on to say that the day before, Thomas Broke, M.P. for Calais,

> handled himself so in the Parliament House concerning the Sacrament, that the most part of the same House was weary of his oration; and divers . . . Mr. Comptroller of the King's house [Sir W. Kingston] being one, so taunted him that I think he shall have little mind to reason the matter again in that place. The saying is, that he uttered himself after a great preamble such stuff as was in him: by my faith, I am right sorry to hear the infamy that is spread of him. I will not write all that hath been reported of credible persons of him. God turn all to good in him, if it be His will!

We must now turn back for a few weeks in the chronology, having anticipated it in order to present at one view the

letters concerning the Bloody Statute. The full story of the persecution which took place this year in Calais, and which will be found narrated in the fifth volume of Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," I do not propose to relate, except just so far as is necessary to render the quotations intelligible. Those readers who wish to enter more thoroughly into the subject will find it interesting to compare these letters with the account as given by Foxe.

About the end of April, 1539, Lord Hertford, better known by his after name of the Protector Somerset, had passed through Calais on his way home, and found the town in an ecclesiastical commotion, which he reported to the Lord Privy Seal when he reached London. The Sacramentaries, a name then given to the body subsequently known as Zwinglians, Puritans, and Evangelicals, had pulled down the image of "our Lady in the Wall," and were accused of having spoken contemptuously of the Sacrament—which doubtless means that they had thrown contempt on the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Lord Privy Seal wrote to Lord Lisle on the 6th of May a letter of surprised remonstrance, "that you, having knowledge of my good-will and desire for the repression of error, would not tell me" of this affair. He ordered an inquiry to be at once instituted, which Lord Lisle did without the least delay, since his reply was dated on the 8th. Cromwell's next letter, written on the 14th, seems to show that the affair had been found to be a mere nothing. As to the image, he says, "though it be thought that many abuses and fond superstitions were maintained by the same, yet if it were taken down after any such sort as implied a contempt of common authority, or might have made any tumult in the people," he will "take order" about it on receiving information to that effect. But this apparent storm in a teapot was not destined to blow over as might at first have been expected.

The direction in which King Henry was now inclining is plainly shown by an important letter from an unknown writer, dated Holy Thursday, which fell on May 29th. The signature has been carefully erased, only a "J" of the Christian name being left visible. The hand is not unlike Husee's, yet the letter is not from him, for its conclusion, "Your poor bedeman at commandment," shows it to come from a priest. (Husee's usual ending is, "by your own man bounden.")

This present day, Holy Thursday eve [by which term the writer shows that he means not the vigil, but the evening, of Ascension Day], the King's Grace took his barge at White Hall, and so rowed up to Lambeth, and had his drums and fifes playing, and so rowed up and down the Thames an hour in the evening after evensong: and on Holy Thursday his Grace went a procession about the Court at Westminster [that portion

of the street now called Whitehall was then termed *the Court*, the former name being restricted to the Palace itself] and in the White Hall, and my Lord Cobham bare the sword before the King's Grace, with other nobles a great multitude, and the high altar in the Chappe [St. Stephen's Chapel ?] was garnished with all the apostles upon the altar, and mass by note, and the organs playing, to as much honour to God as might be devised to be done: and they that be in the King's Chapel showed me, and so did Killigrew also, that upon Good Friday last past the King's Grace crept to the cross from the chapel door upward devoutly, and so served the priest to mass [*i.e.*, as acolyte] that same day, his own person, kneeling on his Grace's knees.

The writer is evidently overwhelmed with the unheard-of humility of that minor divinity, bluff King Hal! He continues: "Also here has been the goodliest mysteries in London that ever was seen upon Easter Day last past. . . . The week past there was one hanged for eating flesh upon a Friday, against the King's commandment. . . . God save the King! And his Grace every Sunday doth receive holy bread and holy water, and doth daily use all other laudable ceremonies, and in all London no man upon pain of death to speak against them."

The persecution in Calais had now fairly set in. There were several members of the Council—notably Palmer and Rookwood—who took care not to let it drop; and Lord Grey de Wilton and Sir Richard Grenville, the chief Protestant members, could not make head against them. Four prisoners were arrested and sent over to London—Sir William Smith, curate of the Lady Church; Sir John Butler, the Archbishop's Commissary; the Rev. Ralph Hare, a man of more zeal than education, who had been preaching the "new doctrine" with vehement fervour; and a Fleming of whom no more is known than that his name was James Cocke, and that he was a barber living at La Mark, one of the small villages within the English pale. A letter from Lord Cromwell, dated June 1st, reports that he has received two prisoners, Ralph Hare and the barber, who have been committed to the Gate House that they may be examined. Thomas Boys writes on the 8th—a letter which, though unaccountably dated "Anno 16," namely 1525, bears conclusive internal evidence that it was penned in 1539—saying that His Majesty and my Lord Privy Seal have commanded him to give further relation of the misbehaviour of divers evil persons in Calais, which he has accordingly done. "My Lord showed me that he marvelled greatly of your Lordship and of the Council; the King's Grace hath appointed you there to see the town well ordered, and hath given you power to punish them that are ill-doers, and you take upon you in punishment of them nothing, but troubles the King's Grace and his Council with such matters as you should redress yourselves." Having thus rated his master as

deputy for my Lord Privy Seal, Mr. Boys proceeds: "The King is not a little displeased with such erroneous opinions and acts as is used in Calais. My Lord, I do think that you shall have a commandment directed . . . shortly to inquire of such persons as hath eaten flesh in Lent, and them that hath otherwise misused themselves contrary to the King's injunctions and commandments. . . . They say that the most part of Calais are heretics." By the 19th of June, Husee reports that he has received his master's letters, from which he sees that the Commissary and the parish priest are come over, and also the witnesses against Ralph Hare. "I think some of them shall be this afternoon examined before the King, and some other before the bishops. It is thought things done before the proclamation [of the Bloody Statute] shall not be punished equally with those committed since." On the 22nd he writes, "The Commissary, the parish priest, Ralph Hare, and the Fleming, were before the King's Council, on Thursday in the afternoon. None heard their causes decided but the Lords and themselves; but at their departing, the Commissary and the *partlous* priest were committed to the Fleet, and the other two to the Gate House. . . . They beareth a good brag, and especially the Commissary."

The Commissary, Sir John Butler, must have been a brave, steadfast, uncompromising man. He made too many enemies to be otherwise; and, as we shall see, he was the only one of the prisoners who never wavered. Husee detested him; Lord Sandes laughed at him; nobody speaks well of him except Cranmer. He was so advanced a Gospeller that he dared to scandalize the public by becoming a married priest.

Mr. Broke, the Member for Calais, now became involved in the same trouble as the Curate and Commissary. A letter from Thomas Larke, on the 24th of June, recounts an interview with Bishop Gardiner, to whom he had conveyed a message from Lord Lisle, concerning Mr. Broke. The Bishop's reply was, that as to "the motion by him made in the Parliament House against the Sacrament, he being a burgess there, might well declare his mind and opinion; nevertheless he was immediately and fully answered by Sir William Kingston, Comptroller, . . who said . . If he doubted in the Sacrament of the altar, he should resort to the King's Council after the 12th of July next, and there to show his opinion; and then he should be plainly and directly answered to every article that he could propose." Secondly, "As to whether this came of his own mind, or by instigation of other . . . he shall be in more due fashion examined than he *have* been yet, before his departure out of the city. . . . I showed unto him such trouble as your Lordship had then sustained by the Commissary and other obstinate

persons, by reason of their . . . opinions, and he said that they have denied all objected against them." Four days later Husee reports that but little is laid to the Commissary's charge. He wickedly adds that "Wenlock hath been divers times in the company of Ralph Hare, and I have spoken divers times with the said Wenlock; but he is too wise to open anything to me, but I will not fail to set one to him to attempt what he can gather of him." Let us hope that Wenlock abode in his wisdom. How little could be brought against Butler may be gathered by the fact that of the accusations offered against Hare, who was the more heavily charged of the two, one was that he refused to join in any sort of game, and another that he used no manner of swearing in his conversation![1]

A formal letter came from the King's Commissioners, on the 5th of July, signed by Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Sampson of Chichester, and Dr. Gwent, calling upon the Deputy and Council of Calais to remember "whether you can prove any article of heresy against Ralph Hare, which he hath spoken or maintained sithence the King's proclamation late made, pardoning all Anabaptists and Sacramentaries, who had offended before the date of the said proclamation."

Next day came a rather humorous letter from the spearman, Francis Hall, whose chief news is that "the Bishops of Worcester [Latimer] and *Salseberry* [Shaxton] have resigned up

---

[1] An undated letter from Husee, which must belong to this period, is full of spleen against the prisoners. Touching the Commissary and the parish priest, he warmly denies that he ever saw or spake with them since their coming: "I am assured neither of them loveth me, and specially the Commissary; and he is not deceived, for if they were both hanged, I pass not a quarter [*i.e.*, I do not care a farthing]: and whosoever informed your Lordship that I know of their discharge, your Lordship's honour reserved, they falsely belieth, and that will I at all times justify. . . . There is no man that ever heard me brag of the Commissary, nor the parish priest, for of all men I love least to do with them. . . . For my part, I would they were hanged!"

With intense glee, on the 3rd of July, Lord Sandes writes to report that he has heard that one of the books in the Church of St. Pierre-lèz-Calais, of which the Commissary was Vicar, had in it "a leaf not yet reformed of Thomas Becket. . . . And herein doth appear how good, how virtuous, how discreet, how obedient unto God and his Prince, and how meet to be a judge, or to be put in authority for to govern, Sir John Butler is, who in contempt of the King's Majesty his Act, and contrary to his Highness's injunctions and proclamations, hath not only presumed himself in wilful disobedience, and in resisting of the King's Majesty his commandments, but also hath suffered his own and other curates (for lack of his duty doing) to incur the same offence." It would seem that the Prayer-books in use were hastily "reformed" by cutting out the prohibited parts; and that a leaf containing the "Mass of St. Thomas of Canterbury" had been overlooked in this volume.

their bishoprics. They be not of the wisest sort, me thinks, for few now a days will leave and give over such promotions for keeping of opinion. God above knoweth all!" He furthermore reminds Lady Lisle that she knows him for "a plain, blunt knave," and begs that she will not forget "my shrewd [ill-tempered] little wife, though she be so short a mistress, and so diverse of conditions [so variable in her conduct], and few or none gentlewomen in Calais be glad of her company. . . . Yet must so poor a man keep her with all her shrewd conditions, whatsoever they be, as you do know." Perhaps Mr. Hall would scarcely have written of her with such frankness had not the British Channel lain just then between himself and Mistress Ursula.

News of the prisoners came from Warley, dated the same day:

Yesterday, the 5th day of July, as I came to Westminster Bridge [writes he] with my Lord Chancellor, Ralph Hare was sent to Lambeth to be examined. . . . Mr. Hall the spear, and Laylond the parson of Pepling. . . . said that the Bishop of Canterbury did speak very earnestly against Hare [Cranmer was still a Lutheran in 1539], and after willed him to declare the truth and to relinquish his opinions; which [*i.e.*, Hare] said he would rest to the King's proclamation and pardon, and desired him to be his good lord: which [Cranmer] said, that if he did declare the truth he would be good to him; and if he would not, that, if he were condemned, he would be punished, and that the least punishment he should have, he should lose his room [his situation or office, at Calais]: and Hare kneeled down, saying if he lost his room, he were worse than a dog, and utterly cast away, etc. Also this day, one George, a priest, bare a faggot [the sign of recantation] at Powls . . . whose opinion was that [neither] Christ nor any creature had any merit by His passion; and also that exorcising of holy water or holy bread were execrable and detestable before God; and after the sermon was ended, he delivered the faggot to cast it to the sumner, which he should have carried where he received it, but he would not for anything they could do. Also the Bishop of Worcester and the Bishop of Salisbury have surrendered their bishoprics to the King; and the late Bishop of Worcester, now Latimer, was gone to Gravesend, but he was brought back. Also yesternight Corromer parson of Aldermary was brought before my Lord Chancellor, and the Lord Privy Seal, and other of the King's Council, and some say he hath rescinded. God send them all as they deserve! . . . Thomas Broke is not in very good case, nor Sir Richard Grenville was greatly proud of his welcome to my Lord Privy Seal, as he said himself to me.

On the 19th of July, Husee writes: "This day hath divers, as the most part of the witnesses, been before my Lord of Canterbury, the Bishop of Chichester, and Dr. Gwent; where were also Hare, the Commissary, and other, and Thomas Broke. . . . I doubt not but my Lord of Chichester shall do well enough, and be vehement in these causes; howbeit I am right sorry my Lord of Nortohuz [Norwich?] is gone home, for he should do much good." The next day he adds: "Yesterday Ralph Hare had his penance enjoined to bear a

faggot at Calais, and the Fleming to bear another at the Mark, and the parish priest to preach and recall openly in the Market Place [at Calais] all his false doctrine, knowledging his offence, and likewise to make another sermon at the Mark; and the Commissary is enjoined not to come at Calais till after Easter, without the King's special licence. . . . Mr. Broke and his man are committed to the Fleet, there to abide their trial further betwixt this and Christmas."

It is worth while pausing to take note of the difference between these sentences. The three men who had not courage to stand by their Lord's banner were brought to open shame, but there was no shame and no penalty worth mention inflicted upon the one who had sought God's honour before his own. "Because thou hast kept the word of My patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation."

The next letter is from the Bishop of Chichester, Richard Sampson. "Broke is in the Fleet till after All-Hallows'-tide. The Commissary before Easter at the first shall not come to you. . . . Of the rest of your great doctors there ye have such a bridle that I trust both ye shall be in quietness, and they shall reform themselves, as I pray God they may."

Bishop Sampson was a Protestant at heart, yet he can speak thus of more advanced Protestants than himself. Is it any wonder that Romanists should misinterpret the actions of Protestants, when we see how completely some of the Protestants misunderstand each other? The Lutherans were quite as inimical to the Gospellers as were the Papists themselves; and yet some of them were hereafter to come out into the full Gospel light, and to die for those doctrines which now they sought to destroy.

Archbishop Cranmer writes a week later thus:

> Ralph Hare and others are enjoined penance to be done in Calais. . . They do fear to be imprisoned and further corrected by you [Lord Lisle] and the Council. I will desire you, my Lord, although I myself suspect no such thing by you, that they may do their penance quietly, without further let or perturbation, so that they may go and come freely, for else it may be thought that justice is not indifferently ministered.

Husee writes more strongly on this point: "Ralph Hare hath so used himself," he says on the 9th of August, "that he is loth to return to Calais, and therefore he will invent all the means he can to be stayed here; howbeit if he refuse to fulfil his promise he is like to have a worse journey, for by law he doth in his so doing condemn himself to the fire." Did that unhappy man never envy Sir John Butler, nor wish that he too had stood firm to his Master? The three recanters did their penance, and disappear from history after that day. Let us

hope that the day came when they crept back, though perhaps in abject misery, to the place whence they had strayed, with "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee!" But methinks he was the happier man who did not stray, and needed not to be driven home through such thorny discipline.

During the following month, we find Mr. Husee's besetting contempt for his fellow-creatures employed in the opposite direction. "As touching Mr. Pollard," writes that gentleman, "he hath been so busied both night and day in prayer, with offering unto St. Thomas' shrine and head, with other dead relics, that he could have no idle worldly time to peruse your Ladyship's book for the draught of your Ladyship's letters: howbeit when his special devotion is past, I doubt not but he shall at one time or other apply his worldly causes accustomed, amongst which I trust your Ladyship's shall not be the last." This seems to have much nettled Mr. Husee, for he recurs to the question two days later: "Mr. Pollard hath so much ado with St. Thomas' shrine, in offering and praying, that he cannot yet intend to follow worldly causes; but I trust when he hath prayed and received the offering and relics he shall be at *layzr*."

Much trouble was caused to Mr. Husee by the want of money to accomplish his numerous commissions. He was of an economical turn of mind—more so than his mistress; while Lord Lisle, who at the close of 1539 was on a visit to England, appears to have irritated the soul of his unhappy agent by paying bills without ever troubling himself about a receipt. All through the correspondence there are complaints from Husee on these points. "This journey shall be a warning for me while I do live," he writes at one time; "for I am unfortunate to lose my wages, considering the charges I have been at." On another occasion, he hears that her Ladyship "has seen my reckoning, and do not like the same very well." He is very sorry to hear this, and begs her to understand that if she does not repay him, "I shall lose both my poor honesty and credit, for I have endangered my friends sundry ways for this money." When he does acknowledge the receipt of his overdue salary, which is not until nearly a year afterwards, he reminds his mistress that he "had not a little need thereof." "The grocer is unpaid, whereby I have lost a friend!" "The draper calleth so on me that I cannot tell what to say nor do." "I will try to get your quittance [receipt] . . it was not well done of your Lordship to deliver the same without bill or knowledge."[1]

[1] Husee writes again, Dec. 1, 1539: "I think money was never so scant here since the King reigned. The world is not here thoroughly settled."

On another point Husee found his mistress difficult to please. She liked her garments made after the newest fashion, and if her agents sent her anything which she suspected to be antiquated, they were rewarded with one of those acetic epistles to which reference has already been made. Mr. Scott, her tailor, had to promise to make her sleeves "of the biggest and largest size," and Husee does his best to get "some new *patron* for my Lady's frontlet, but there is none that will part with them." At another time he is sorry to find her annoyed with his last letter. "And whereas your Ladyship writeth that you write not all you think or may, your Ladyship may like a noble woman write and think at your pleasure, as reason is, and such poor men as I am must do as well as God shall give us grace!"

"I live by hope of comfortable words, and my purse waxeth light!" writes Warley, in an undated letter.

Undated also is the following complimentary remark from the pen of one John White, of whom nothing more is known: "And where it hath pleased Almighty God to call unto His mercy the soul of Sir Robert Wallop, and it hath pleased Him to have taken that good lady his wife to have kept company with her husband to Heaven, I would then have trusted that it should have been the end of much trouble that hereafter may be procured by her, as it only hath been before this time."

A letter from Warley, on Feb. 17th, 1539, says:

> The Lord Cobham would have sent two of his sons into high Almayne [North Germany] with the Chancellor of the Duke of Cleve, but my Lord Privy Seal would not consent they should out of England. . . . If your Lordship had now a great horse to sell, money might be gotten. for £20 is a great price for a horse; the [gentlemen] pensioners [of the King's Guard] can have none for their money. . . . The search from auditor to auditor, from clerk to clerk of Augmentations passeth the Bishop of Rome's feigned Purgatory; for it lighteth the purse, weareth the legs, distempereth the body.

Sir John Wallop writes on March 30th: "Never Prince with more affection and with more charitable dexterity hath and daily doth prosecute such ungracious persons as do preach and teach ill learnings, or against any of the old ceremonies of the Church, than the King doth. Barnes the friar, Garrerd [Garnet] parson of Honey Lane, Jerome Vicar of Stepney, hath recanted from their lewd opinions; and, to be plain, his Highness is of such sort that I think all Christendom shall shortly say the King of England is the only perfect [king] of good faith; God save him!" He adds that the Bishop of Winchester yesterday dined with the Lord Privy Seal, "where they were more than four hours, and opened their hearts: and so

concluded that or there be truth or honesty in them"—there was not much in one of them—"not only all displeasures be forgotten, but also in their hearts be now perfect entire friends, and in like wise the said Wriothesley with the said Bishop."

And now came the sudden fall of the House of Lisle, and the equally sudden closing of the correspondence. One of the last letters is the official command from King Henry, on the 6th of April, 1540, for the repair of the Lord Deputy to Court, leaving everything in the hands of Lady Lisle's nephew by marriage, the Earl of Sussex, "to whom we have written to demoore [live] there for that purpose." Lord Lisle went over on the 17th of April; and on the 17th of May he was tried at Greenwich Palace on frivolous pretexts, manifestly the work of enemies whose object was to ruin him. Lady Lisle and her daughters, Philippa and Mary, with Lord Lisle's daughter Bridget, were made prisoners: but not till Lady Lisle had, with quick dexterity, destroyed a quantity of papers which she fancied might be used against her husband. They continued prisoners until the death of Lord Lisle, March 3rd, 1542, Lady Lisle having for a time been out of her mind. Then the hapless ladies were released, and returned to England, where out of all the family property both of husband and wife only a few of the Basset lands remained to them, and these had to be gradually sold for means to live. The probable date of Lady Lisle's death is 1547, and she was buried with her first husband, Sir John Basset, at Atherington, co. Devon, where their brass still remains. With her second and best-loved lord she could not be buried: for he lies in that little chapel in the Tower of London, where the dust of traitors, villains, heroes, saints, and martyrs, awaits the resurrection at the last day.

EMILY S. HOLT.

ART. VI.—MR. LITTON AND CANON WESTCOTT ON 1 JOHN I. 7.

IN THE CHURCHMAN for last month there appeared an able and timely article by the Rev. E. A. Litton, entitled "Canon Westcott on 1 John i. 7." The "remarkable theory," as Mr. Litton truly calls it, propounded by Canon Westcott, that the expression "The blood of Christ" signifies in holy Scripture

not only the atoning virtue of His death, but the power of His risen life, "as imparted to the Church for the purposes of quickening and sanctification," must have attracted the observation of all thoughtful readers of his Commentary on the Epistles of St. John, and prepared them to welcome the calm discussion, and as we think successful refutation of it, which Mr. Litton's article supplies.

The high and deserved reputation of the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge as a scholar and a theologian, and the debt of gratitude which the Church owes him for his spiritual and exhaustive Commentaries on the writings of St. John, make it all the more desirable that any important misconception into which he may have been betrayed should not pass unchallenged.

In the course, however, of his article of useful criticism, Mr. Litton himself appears to us to have employed language with reference to another no less important part of revealed truth, which, to say the least of it, requires explanation. In proceeding "to make some remarks on the dogmatical import" of the Canon's "theory," Mr. Litton observes, "We are constrained to regard it as a symptom of the tendency, visible at present in many quarters, to substitute the *Redeemer*, Christ, for the third Person of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Ghost, in the economy of redemption." And he adds that there is no point in which Scripture is more plain than upon this, that it is not Christ but the Holy Ghost Who discharges for His Church "offices connected with sanctification." Now we are not at present concerned to inquire how far this vindication of the elementary lesson of our childhood—"I believe in God the Holy Ghost, Who sanctifieth me and all the elect people of God"—is called for by the Canon's argument, though of the importance of keeping it clearly in view in this and every age we are heartily persuaded. But what we desire to call attention to is the interpretation which follows of such Scriptural phrases as "Christ in us," "Christ dwelling in us," and the like. With reference to these, Mr. Litton says: "The Holy Ghost is now 'Christ in us, the hope of glory,' Christ 'dwelling in our hearts by faith'; the same Christ Who instructed and comforted the Apostles, for where the Holy Ghost is, there is in fact the Son; but Christ under the form, the *modus subsistendi*, of the Holy Ghost, not as the incarnate Redeemer." And again: "He (Christ) is no doubt present on earth, but it is as the Holy Ghost." "The Holy Ghost, Who is in fact Christ, but Christ *as* the Holy Ghost, and not as the incarnate Son."

Now these expressions, we venture to think, are confusing and inexact, and most unintentionally, we are sure, open to

the charge of "confounding the Persons." Is there anything in Scripture to warrant the assertion that "the Holy Ghost is Christ in us,"[1] or to justify our speaking of "Christ under the form, the *modus subsistendi*, of the Holy Ghost," or of "Christ *as* the Holy Ghost"? If it is only intended to controvert, what indeed Mr. Litton subsequently condemns, "those physical theories which find their ultimate result in transubstantiation," we should be content with Hooker, writing on this very subject, to say of them, "Which gross conceit doth fight openly against reason." But if the proper meaning of these Scriptural phrases be in question, then may we not, with the same judicious writer, believe that Christ is indeed in us, though "not *κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον*, but *κατὰ το νοούμενον*: not according to that natural substance which visibly was seen on earth, but according to that intellectual comprehension which the mind is capable of? So that the difference between Christ on earth and Christ in us, is no less than between a ship on the sea and in the mind of him that builded it: the one a sensible thing, the other a mere shape of a thing sensible." "So that," he concludes thus far, "Christ is formed when Christianity is comprehended." And then passing to another element, as it were, of this blessed indwelling, the love of the heart, which in order to its existence, must be added to the comprehension of the mind, he says, "As things we know and delight in are said to dwell in our minds and possess our hearts [Philip. i. 7], so Christ, knowing His sheep and being known of them, loving and being loved, is not without cause said to be in them, and they in Him."

That it is the Spirit of Christ, God the Holy Ghost, Who is the Divine Agent in all this we entirely agree with Mr. Litton in believing. That He *is* the Christ Who dwells in us is what we find it difficult to accept. In the heart, as in the world, He "testifies" of Christ.[2] He takes of the things of Christ, and reveals them. He forms Christ, but for aught that is revealed, he *is not* Christ. As Hooker goes on to say: "And forasmuch as we are not on our parts hereof by our own inclination capable, God hath given unto His that Spirit which, teaching their hearts to acknowledge and tongues to confess Christ, the Son of the Living God, is for this cause also said to quicken . . . . Which life is

[1] In Romans viii. 9, 10, the expressions "The Spirit of Christ in you" and "Christ in you," might at first seem to be convertible. But, as Mr. Moule happily explains it, "The supreme work of the Spirit is to acquaint the soul with Christ; hence the indwelling of the Spirit as the Divine Teacher results by holy necessity in the indwelling of Christ as the Divine Guest." (*Camb. Bible for Schools.*)

[2] See, for example, Ephes. iii. 16, 17.

nothing else but a spiritual and divine kind of being, which men by regeneration attain unto, Christ and His Spirit [not Christ *as* His Spirit] dwelling in them, and as the soul of their souls moving them unto such both inward and outward actions as in the sight of God are acceptable." (Sermon III., vol. iii., pp. 612, 613, Keble's ed.)

A beautiful passage from "The Eclipse of Faith" will appropriately illustrate our meaning:

> May we feel more and more the interior presence of that Guest of guests, that Divine impersonation of Truth, Rectitude, and Love, Whose image has had more power to soothe and tranquillize, stimulate and fortify, the human heart than all the philosophies ever devised by man . . . . Whose life and death include all motives which can enforce His lessons on humanity; motives all intensely animated by the conviction that He is a Living Personality, in communion with our own spirits, and attracted towards us by all the sympathies of a friendship truly divine . . . . May He become so familiar to our souls that no suggestion of evil from within, no incursion of evil from without, shall be so swift and sudden that the thought of Him shall not be at least as near to our spirits, intercept the treachery of our infirm nature, and guard that throne which He alone deserves to fill; till at every turn and every posture of our earthly life, we realize a mental image of that countenance of Divine compassion bent upon us, and that voice of gentle instruction murmuring in our ears its words of heavenly wisdom . . . . till, in a word, as we hear His faintest footsteps approaching our hearts, and His gentle signal there, according to His own beautiful image, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock," our souls may hasten to welcome the heavenly Guest.

T. T. PEROWNE.

Reviews.

The Mystery of the Universe our Common Faith, by the Rev. JOSEPH WILLIAM REYNOLDS, M.A., Rector of St. Anne's and St. Agnes, Prebendary of St. Paul's. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co. 1884.

THE most dangerous form of scepticism in our day has taken advantage of the popularity of Science, and defends itself by assuming that there is an irreconcilable opposition between Religion and Science. Thousands of readers who know little of Science or of Theology are led astray by specious arguments of this kind to reject Revelation and to deny the existence of God. When it is so much the fashion to smile at orthodoxy as fit only for the uncultured and the ignorant, Prebendary Reynolds has undertaken to assert that "the old truths and the old forms of truth are scientific." He is pressed by a sense of duty to make this venture, and in this book we have the result. It is a large book, consist-

ing of ten chapters, or themes, with numerous subdivisions, a well-arranged table of contents, and a copious index. It contains in all, over 500 pages. It is a complete storehouse of new and most interesting suggestions, bearing on the relations of Science and Religion, and showing the most intimate acquaintance with the leading sceptical writers and the popular systems of sceptical philosophy—German as well as English.

It is doubtful whether the time has yet come to satisfy that which the author declares to be "the emphatic" requirement of this generation: so to employ Science as to throw light on the physical constitution of the universe, and "to bring out clearly the great facts and doctrines which accord our intellectual and emotional experience." Physical Science has not yet advanced so far. In none of its departments, least of all in those which touch on religion, have its conclusions attained a shape so definite, certain, and permanent that we may argue from them as verified conclusions. It is questionable whether the time will ever come, when all the knowledge of mankind can be condensed into "one verified system combining theology and philosophy" so as to reveal the mystery of the universe. Such a result seems to go far beyond any possible improvement of the faculties of man, or any possible attainment of Science; but to have proposed it, and to have accumulated so much of the materials for its realization from the testimony of adverse witnesses, is no slight praise.

The first chapter, which is called "Puzzles for Sceptics," brings out with much clearness and force the principle which is the leading idea of the whole book, and which we presume suggested its title, that the mysteries of Science are not only as numerous and as difficult as the mysteries of Religion, but that they are in many respects analogous and sometimes identical. Without faith and reverence there can be no intellectual life, no scientific explanation of the mysteries of the universe. Why, then, should men of Science who find mysteries everywhere, reject them only in religion? Why should they condemn and ridicule in religion the faith which they ask us to repose in their own unverified theories, and which is, in fact, the element of all true greatness? If knowledge be the true end of man, how wretched is the condition of the world! "If the population of the earth is twelve hundred millions, only twenty millions are of really cultured minds. They die without adding one fact to knowledge, one thought to wisdom; they pluck no fruit from the tree of Science, and they do no good."

The most valuable chapter in this book is the third, on "The oppositions of Science falsely so called." Atheists say there is no God, and then they tell us "We only accept that which we can reasonably prove." How well has Foster exposed this shallow dogmatism! If he does not know every agent in the universe, the one which he does not know may be God. If he does not know all truth, the truth which he wants may be that there is a God. If he does not know everything which has been done in ages past, some things may have been done by God. Thus, unless he knows all things, and becomes a god to himself, he cannot know that the being which he rejects does not exist. They say, "There is no God great enough to create an atom, but little atoms are able to make the universe." The creed of a sceptic is full of such mysteries and contradictions which continually remind us of Bacon's words: "I would rather believe all the fables of the Koran than that this universal Frame is without a mind." The following passage embodies the substance of this the most valuable chapter in the book; and it may enable our readers to judge of the method of argument and the forcible style of the author, which have made many parts of the treatise so interesting and suggestive:

It is time that the science of earth and the science of heaven be re-allied; they are no more opposed than astronomy and geology contradict one another. As by these, we, as sons of earth, obtain a true system of physics, and know that the heavens are not empty; so by those we, as sons of God, shall uplift terrestrial science into the empire of all life, and gather the whole of humanity around that Christ Whom none can rival in love or enlightenment, than Whom none has known better how to be, to do, and to suffer.

We have an admirable section on the principle of Materialism as stated by Comte, and accepted by many in England who disclaim the name of Positivists. That the higher is to be explained by the lower, the greater by the less, the organic by the inorganic, and mind by matter. We have an admirable analysis of the real meaning of this philosophy and the absurdities which it involves.

> "If Chaos umpire sits,
> He, by decision, more embroils the fray,
> By which he reigns."

We are asked by men who sneer at reasonable faith in revelation, to believe that the effect exceeds the cause, that that can come out of a thing which was not in it; that the lowest is the highest; that the weakest is the strongest, and that the least contains the greatest. The demands which the Comtist system of philosophy makes on the credulity of mankind in the name of positive knowledge, is summed up in the following passage, which may be taken as an example of the argumentative portion of this book. It shows to what extravagant and baseless theories men are compelled to resort who try to account for creation without a Creator. Prebendary Reynolds writes:

The actual meaning of their teaching is—the greatest comes from the less, that less from the smaller, and the smaller from that which has no dimensions at all. The smaller, we are told, is a finite minimum having parts; say an atom of hydrogen; it has a surface with thickness, solidity and volume. The smallest is, say, an atom of æther; the nearest approach to an infinite minimum, like a non-finite mathematical point of geometry. We are to suppose, for proof is impossible, that these atoms and æther points are indivisible, infrangible, incompressible: and no force in the universe can make them occupy a smaller space by compression, nor a larger by separation of their parts. Then, though it sets at nought the science on which all we know is based, we are informed that every point is such a plenum as to be a plenissimum of acting energy; a complex little world, with an inner mechanism stronger and more lasting than the universe itself. The universe will perish, but these atoms will never perish; though the whole of the universal forces were brought to bear on them, they could never be broken up, nor dissolved into smaller portions. Hence the least possible in the nature of things is greater than that whole nature; the finite existing minimum transcends the infinite or maximum. There is something space-filling, something concrete, solid, composite, in time and space and action; which nevertheless is out of time; which, while only occupying a finite minimum of space, transcends everything that space contains; and acts infinitely, though only the smallest finite. On the whole, atheistic materialism is—nonsense.

The earlier portions of this book are mainly taken up with the controversy with various forms of infidelity, of which the foregoing extract may be regarded as an instance. Many others not less valuable might be given, did space permit. The later chapters appeal more directly to the faith of Christians, and contain many passages of sustained and graceful eloquence such as the following:

The astronomer traces in every particle of the millions and millions of suns which sparkle in the pathways of the universe, an exhibition of the might which holds all worlds in brilliancy. We theologians tell of great verities; underneath all depths of science is a fathomless compassion; above all heights of anguish is

a canopy of sympathy; beyond and around our every weakness and fear, stretching about and closing within, are those everlasting arms which wrought Atonement on the Cross. Oh, the life of Christ, how good! the death of Christ, how precious!

In the chapter called "Pathways of Thought to the Eternal," we have certain physical illustrations of the Trinity, which may appear far-fetched and are therefore of a lower degree of cogency than the other analogies which are so interesting and suggestive. Mr. Reynolds believes that the Trinity enters into and is the essence of all things. There are three parts of space—length, depth, breadth; three successive periods—past, present, future: three forms of matter—solid, fluid, gaseous; three forces all due to one energy—centripetal, centrifugal, cohesive. "Infinity, eternity, power, are the essentials of Him Who, as the Eternal, gives birth to time; Who, as the Infinite, sets bounds to space. Truth is His substance; Light is His shadow; Life is His Smile." Our present dwelling is earth, sea, sky. The truest measurement of that earth, and sea, and sky is by the triangle—a Trinity in unity. Mr. Reynolds finds traces of the same analogy in light, in music, in our bodies and in our knowledge.

In the sixth theme, which treats of the revelation of the unknown, we have an interesting section on the analogy between the revelation of Nature and the revelation of Scripture. The Bible is the slow product of many ages, with more life in it than any other book, yet written long ago; old and at the same time new, far off and yet so near. Here we have the mingling of small beginnings with vast results, minute details with unlimited comprehensiveness.

We have a chapter on the "Origin of the World," in which the learned author compares the first two chapters of Genesis with recent discoveries of Science. He would not be unwilling to rest the whole proof of Christianity on this part of the Bible alone. Herein he finds the verification of the commencement, progress, and completion of the creation. He mentions no less than fifty points of correspondence between the recent discoveries of Science and various details in these two chapters. It is a dangerous experiment to single out one point in a great line of argument, which is historical, moral, spiritual, and personal, as well as scientific, and to rest the main stress of the whole on this single issue; for there are several of those fifty scientific verifications of Scriptural truth which it would be hard to reconcile, either with the accepted truths of Science or with the fair interpretation of Scripture; and a fanciful analogy or a strained interpretation in any single instance would discredit the whole series. The general argument is clear and decisive. We weaken it and expose it to numberless and unnecessary difficulties, when we follow it out in no less than fifty minute details.

In a subsequent chapter we have an admirable summary of the argument for the resurrection of Christ, and a harmony of the various accounts of the Evangelists and of St. Paul, as well as the evidence on which it was believed at the time and transmitted by the Church to succeeding generations. He enumerates eleven appearances in all, and those appearances of Christ after the Ascension.

We have no doubt that this book will be helpful in many ways to students of the Bible no less than to students of Science. Some of the Scriptural parallels may seem to be fanciful, but we are reminded that "those are helps not proofs, parallels, not arguments." They will give a fresh interest to many familiar passages in the Old Testament, and fresh proofs of the unity of the Bible and of the harmony between its earlier and later portions, which are among the most precious fruits of modern research. The student of Science will find himself in the presence of one to whom the latest discoveries, as well as the most daring specula-

tions of Science are familiar, and who is not afraid to meet the masters of Science on their own ground. It may be that the "unification of all knowledge in one verified system, a philosophy that combines theology and philosophy," must always remain an unrealized ideal. The full attainment of so noble an ambition is probably beyond the faculties of man. But, however our judgments may differ on this subject, the book itself will remain as one of the most valuable of all modern contributions to Evidential Theology, a monument of great industry, learning, and ability, removing many scientific difficulties, and confirming, in various ways, the truth of Revelation.

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

The Origins of Religion and Language, considered in Five Essays by F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter, Chaplain to the Queen, and Editor of "The Speaker's Commentary." John Murray, Albemarle Street, London. 1884. Pp. 481.

Canon Cook has, by the publication of this volume, added greatly to the obligations under which he has laid all who are anxious for information and truth. In five valuable essays he has treated with a surprising wealth of learning, with great acuteness and ready logic, and in a free and vigorous style of writing, various questions which lie close to the "Origins" of both "Religion and Language."

At a time when philosophical researches into the nature of the universe, and into the records of life and movement which the roll of time has crystallized around us, have now for some years revealed facts which at first view were in seeming opposition to the verdict of Holy Writ, it is extremely refreshing to read a calm summing up of the latest results of inquiry upon many points of the first importance, which brings things mainly back to early starting-points. We need hardly say that, unlike some inquirers who plume themselves upon an arrogated freedom from prejudice, Canon Cook does not consider it necessary to exclude the most important of all historical documents—to judge it on a par with others—from historical investigation. But he finds that the verdict of evidence outside of the Holy Scriptures witnesses to the truth of the account of the origin of the human race which is therein given.

The Canon very wisely takes a comprehensive and candid view of his subject. The Bible, Religion, and Truth can never suffer from such a course, if comprehension is really comprehension, and candour really candour; if hasty processes of inference are utterly eschewed, and the cautious discrimination of a master distinguishes between what is proven and what is not. There is, as we are told (Pref. ix.), a "flexibility of secondary convictions," an "all but unlimited toleration of speculative opinions" at the present time, which "is a prominent, perhaps the most prominent, characteristic of the Christian intelligence in our age." But the Author justly adds that, although it is probable that "no permanent danger" may result from this, yet "there is no inconsiderable danger lest, in times of wide speculation, the minds of young or untrained inquirers should be seriously affected." So that it is most important that "all who take part in controversies touching the foundations of religion and morality" "should strenuously, earnestly, fearlessly hold fast all fundamental principles, and deliberate most carefully before they abandon any position by which those principles seem to be supported, or by the surrender of which they might be imperilled."

In the First Essay, we learn about the history, precedent and contemporary, and the religious system of the Rig Veda. This is an opportune discussion, because the complete text of that most important series of songs has been not long published, and because the issue of various translations

and treatises have drawn the attention of thoughtful men to the book itself, and to problems which it helps to elucidate. Besides, this must always be a point of great interest as regards missionary work in India. Translations of Hymns to Varuna and Indra are added, happily done into blank rhythmical verse.

The Second Essay, upon "The Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Zend Avesta," is extremely interesting. The description of the great inscriptions at Behistun, unravelled by Sir Henry Rawlinson, is admirably given, and an argument for fixing the date of Zoroaster as coinciding with the era of Darius, son of Hystaspes, who is identified with the Vistâspa of the inscriptions, is very well drawn out. The three periods of Persian or "Eranian" Literature, as Canon Cook writes, instead of "Iranian," for reasons given, come into consideration, viz., under the Achæmenidæ, when the Zoroastrian cult of Ormuzd and Ahriman were introduced, under the Sassanidæ, when Pehlevi was the form of the language, and in modern times when it has become the Parsi, to which the way was being led about the time of Firdausi, the composer of the Shahnâmeh, the great epic poem of Persia.

A shorter Essay follows upon "The Gâthâs of Zoroaster," with some more happily expressed translations; and then we arrive at the chief interest of the book to general readers, as set forth in the long and complete Essay upon "The Characteristics of Languages spoken by different Families of the Human Race, from the earliest time to the present."

This Essay is of great value as suggesting and maintaining a well-considered way of uniting the conclusions favoured by Comparative Philology with the Mosaic account of the origin of mankind. It is well known that in both cases we find three classes, in the one the races of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and in the other the Semitic, Aryan, and Turanian or Scythian families of speech. The misfortune is that the two sets when brought together do not coincide. Here Canon Cook brings his extensive knowledge and close analysis to bear most usefully. He shows that there is great reason to infer that the Semitic and Hamitic nations lived for a long time near one another, and therefore retained so many characteristics in common, that their speech did not reflect the greater distance of relationship between them. The Egyptians, who present many Semitic features as well as Hamitic, are proved, proud as they were, to have regarded the Negro race as connected with themselves. And he supplies very considerable, if not conclusive, grounds for supposing that the Turanians are by no means so distant from the Aryan, or Indo-Germanic group of nations, as has been supposed. Mr. Max Müller had before pointed out that these two were looked upon respectively as the Nomads and the Agriculturists. And Canon Cook brings strong arguments from their language to strengthen the inference that both came from a common stock, which dwelt together for some time, and then split up into two grand divisions, each of which revolved round a centre of its own for a longer period.

The most valuable part of the book is perhaps to be found at the end. In the last Essay, the Canon has collected a considerable assemblage of Egyptian words, which find their counterpart or resemblance in words of other languages nearly all over the world. This is the growth, he tells us, of eighteen years. From this he derives the conclusion that all languages must originally have been one. He says with justice, that if a sufficient number of words exists, "either perfectly identical in form or meaning, or differing only to the extent to which modifications are common or universal in languages of the same family, in Egyptian, Semitic, Aryan, Turanian, I do not see how we can resist the conclusion that all these people had a common ancestry" (p. 361). There seems no question of this, only such an assemblage is beyond the powers

of one man to collect. Canon Cook has set the ball rolling; it remains for others to carry it on successfully to the goal. Meanwhile, his present store is most valuable.

The book needs a good index. With this one deduction, and that far from being of the first importance, we thank Canon Cook most heartily.

Memoirs of an ex-Minister. An Autobiography. By the Right Hon. the Earl of MALMESBURY, G.C.B. Two vols. Longmans. 1884.

The readers of these Memoirs, says Lord Malmesbury, are not to expect a continuous narrative, but rather a *macédoine* of memoranda, diary, and correspondence, recalling the social and political events of a long and busy life. His principal object has been to sketch the three Administrations of the late Earl of Derby, whose colleague he was, and also some incidents respecting the Emperor Louis Napoleon, who, during all Lord Derby's Governments, played such a part in the history of Europe. Of men, events, and common things, Lord Malmesbury adds, "I wrote as they appeared to me at the time, and have altered nothing since they were noted."

He was born in the year 1807; and at the hour of his birth, Lord Fitzharris, his father, received a letter from Mr. Canning, then Foreign Secretary, announcing his appointment as Under Secretary at the Foreign Office. Of the father—who soon resigned his post as Under Secretary—we are told that he lived at Heron Court for ten months out of the twelve, inconsolable at the death of his wife, which happened in 1815. Until his own death in 1841, not a plant in her garden or a trinket in her boudoir was ever moved or changed. He was a Tory of the purest school; stiffly aristocratic. When in the country, in the game season, he hardly ever missed a day's shooting; and for forty years he kept a journal of his sport. With this journal, when it was shown him, Lord Beaconsfield was extremely struck, declaring it to be an extraordinary example of patience and a sturdy character.

When eight years old, the future Foreign Secretary was sent to a private school at Wimborne; he learned nothing there, he says, but Latin and Greek Grammar. He went home twice a year for his holidays. His grandfather, Lord Malmesbury, sometimes went to see him; and when his visit occurred it caused a great sensation in the house—as seventy years ago an old earl would not on any account have driven to an important county town without four horses to his carriage and his star on his coat. Three years were spent at Wimborne. In 1820, accompanied by the same private tutor under whose care they had been at Heron Court, he and his brother went to Eton. At that time there were 600 boys at the College. The Harris boys were the only boys who went with a private tutor, except the Duke of Buccleuch, Lord John Scott, and the sons of the Duke of Wellington.

In 1825 Lord Fitzharris[1] went to Oriel College, Oxford. Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff, was then Provost of Oriel, Samuel Wilberforce an undergraduate, and Newman one of the tutors. Of this last celebrated writer, according to Lord Malmesbury, "no one at that time could have predicted the future career." He used to allow his class to torment him with the most helpless resignation: at lectures they would make the table advance gradually till he was jammed into a corner. He was "painfully tolerant." On one occasion, it seems, Newman was nearly driven from Copleston's table, when the Provost,

[1] His grandfather, Lord Malmesbury, died in 1821.

who was an epicure, upbraiding him for what he called "mutilating" a fine haunch of venison, shouted out, "Mr. Newman, you are unconscious of the mischief you have done."

In the course of his travels on the Continent, Lord Fitzharris met Louis Napoleon. This was in 1829, at Rome, where Queen Hortense was living. The young men became friends. Even then, Napoleon was possessed with the conviction that he would some day rule over France. Of this, when President and Emperor, he reminded Lord Malmesbury.

Of the acrimony with which the battle for and against Reform proceeded, both in and out of Parliament, Lord Malmesbury gives some curious illustrations. Thus, when the Reform Bill was thrown out by the Peers in 1831, his father-in-law, Lord Tankerville, voted against it:

> My wife and I [he writes] accompanied him on his journey to Chillingham, which at that time took four days to accomplish, being 330 miles, although posting with four horses. When we got to Darlington we halted for luncheon, and perceived a large crowd at the door of the hotel examining the crest on the panels and apparently quiet; but we were hardly reseated in the family coach when a storm of stones assailed it, and a furious mob tried to stop us. The postboys behaved well, and ran the gauntlet at full gallop till we cleared the town, but in what a condition! The coach was full of stones of all sizes, the front part of it was smashed, and the panels stove in; yet we all escaped with a few scratches. When I saw what was coming, I pulled my wife under the seat, which saved her from a large paving-stone that struck the place where she had been sitting . . . This outrage was committed deliberately and with preparation for the first Peer who passed Darlington after having voted against the Reform Bill.

Touching the Eglinton Tournament (Louis Napoleon being a principal knight in the lists), and the resignation of Sir Robert Peel,[1] the diary of 1839 is chatty as usual. That of 1840 has many items of interest;[2] for instance:

> In the Queen's Address, announcing her marriage, she made no allusion to Prince Albert being a Protestant. The Duke of Wellington proposed an amendment to insert the word "Protestant" before that of "Prince;" and notwithstanding the opposition of Lord Melbourne, the amendment was carried without a division.

On August 6th Louis Napoleon landed at Boulogne with fifty followers: the diary says—

> This explains an expression he used to me two evenings ago. He was standing on the steps of Lady Blessington's house after a party, wrapped up in a cloak, with Persigny by him, and I observed to them, "You look like two conspirators;" upon which he answered, "You may be nearer right than you think."

In the year 1844 the diary records: "Dined with the Cannings and met Mr. Gladstone . . . .; he is a man much spoken of as one who will come to the front. We were disappointed at his appearance, which is that of a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, but he is very agreeable." Shortly afterwards the noble Earl received at Heron Court the present Lord Derby, then Mr. Edward Stanley, nineteen years old, acute and well-informed, but "of rather advanced opinions." In April, 1845, he paid a visit to Louis Napoleon, a prisoner in the Castle of Ham; soon after, the

---

[1] "Lord Melbourne and his colleagues agreed that the Queen ought not to give up her ladies." They gave advice "after they were no longer responsible" (p. 107).

[2] In November, 1840, dining "with the Tankervilles, we met with Mr. and Mrs. Disraeli. Much struck by Mrs. Disraeli, who is a most extraordinary woman both in appearance and in her conversation. She was a widow with a large jointure, and twenty years older than him, but he seems much attached to her" (p. 128).

Prince escaped. Disraeli was now coming to the front, and in 1846 he made a speech, which (according to Lord George Bentinck) O'Connell said was the greatest speech he had ever heard in Parliament. In the House of Commons, however, there was a strong feeling against him; the Tories were puzzled by his manner, which had much of the foreigner about it. In 1848, noting the sudden death of Lord George Bentinck, the diary says: "No one but Disraeli can fill his place." Later, Lord Granby and Mr. Herries, as chiefs, were "in the way" of Disraeli. In 1849, in Paris, Lord Malmesbury had an audience of the Prince President; and the diary records his impression that the Prince was full of schemes for the revision of the map of Europe.

In 1851, Feb. 2, appears this record:

> Dined with Lord Stanley, Lord Redesdale, Mr. Disraeli, and Mr. Herries, and sat talking politics till one in the morning.

A few days later, and Lord Malmesbury records a failure: "All the Peelites have refused to join Lord Stanley." Some Conservatives were nervous; and at the "timid conduct" of Mr. Henley and Mr. Herries, we learn, "Mr. Disraeli did not conceal his anger." In Feb. 1852, however, Lord John was beaten on Lord Palmerston's amendment to the Militia Bill, and he resigned. This was the natural termination of the dispute between Lord Palmerston and the Premier; and the Tories came in. Lord Malmesbury records:

> Went to Disraeli's after breakfast, and found him in a state of delight at coming into office, constantly repeating "Now we have got a *status*." With all his apparent apathy when attacked in the House of Commons, he is always when out of it in the highest state of elation, or lowest depth of despair, according to the fortune of the day.

When in Feb. 1855 Lord Derby refused to undertake the Government, Disraeli, according to the diary, was "in a state of disgust beyond all control;" he spoke "his mind to Lord Derby, and told him some very disagreeable truths." Lord Derby, however, "had invited Gladstone to join him, who had refused." Mr. Gladstone refused to join Lord Derby, and stopped Lord Palmerston, who was ready to do so, by promising to take office under him, and then resigned (with Graham and Herbert), leaving Lord Palmerston in the lurch at a moment of great difficulty and danger. The French Ambassador, Walewski, we read, was "most active in the intrigue" which kept Lord Derby out of office. In April 1856, Lord Malmesbury writes: "I think Mr. Whiteside decidedly a greater orator than Disraeli, though his Irish accent, which is very strong when he gets animated, spoils the effect to English ears. He was immensely cheered." The speech was upon Kars; but Lord Palmerston was triumphant. Clearly Lord Derby had lost a great deal of his influence by declining to take office. The responsibility of conducting the war, no doubt, would have been, with a minority, extremely great; but a wonderful opportunity was lost.

At the close of 1856, Lord Derby, in writing to Lord Malmesbury, refers to Lord Palmerston as a "Conservative Minister working with Radical tools," and regrets that Mr. Disraeli "does not see more of the party [the Tories] in private." The party could not do without him. Shortly afterwards Lord Malmesbury records that Disraeli was sulky, and discouraged a debate on the Chinese Question. But others were pugnacious. Nevertheless, the elections, after the defeat of the Government on the China War, proved that Disraeli was right.

On the Refugee Bill (Milner Gibson's amendment) Lord Palmerston was defeated, and the Tories came in. According to Lord Grey, Mr. Gladstone would have joined Lord Derby had he been offered the leader-

ship of the Commons. When a friendly despatch arrived from Paris, we read, Mr. Disraeli rushed into Lord Derby's room in a desperate hurry; "his delight was indescribable and amazingly demonstrative." In July of this year the Ministerial fish-dinner took place at Greenwich. Lord Derby having to propose "Sir John Pakington and the Navy," alluding to Sir John having received the "wooden spoon," which is given to the Minister in the House of Commons who has been in the fewest divisions, proposed "Sir John Pakington and the Wooden Spoons of Old England." This created much laughter from all but Pakington himself. The diary adds, that Sir John was a very young man of his age, both in activity and appearance, and was always dapperly dressed. On one occasion he kept the Ministers all waiting at a Cabinet Council. When at last he appeared, Lord Derby said: "We have been waiting for you, Sir John." "I am sorry, my lord; but I was at Spithead." "Then," said Lord Derby, "I'll be bound there never was such a *swell* there before!"

Of Lord Derby, whom Mr. Justin McCarthy calls "a superb specimen of an English political nobleman," the diary gives a pleasing portraiture. We quote a single anecdote:

June 28th [1861].—Concert at Buckingham Palace. Whilst we were waiting for our carriage to go away, Lord Derby joined us, and immediately after Lord John Russell came up. Lord Derby exclaimed: "How do you do, Lord John? You have got into very bad company." He looked round at us all with a very grim smile, and said: "I see I have;" when Lord Derby, looking at him attentively, observed that he was incorrectly dressed, having his Levée uniform instead of the full dress which he ought to have worn. Lord John said: "I know I am wrong, and the porter wanted to turn me out." "Oh, did he?" exclaimed Lord Derby. "Thou canst not say *I* did it." Of course all those round laughed at the apt quotation from Shakespeare, and no one more than Lord John himself.

In 1864 the diary records a visit to Hughenden. The Duke and Duchess of Wellington, Lord and Lady Raglan, and others were of the party. "The dinner was very gay; Disraeli exerted himself to the utmost to be agreeable. The evening was very short, Mrs. Disraeli sending us all to bed at half-past ten." In the same year we find a letter from Lord Derby; he was greatly astonished at the puff of his "Homer" in the *Times;* did not know who wrote it, and Mr. Murray professed himself quite at a loss. Lord Derby adds: "I am going to write to 'Dizzy' and some of our political friends" about a visit to Knowsley.

In 1866 the diary records Lord Grosvenor's amendment to the second reading of the Reform Bill—that it is inexpedient to discuss a bill for the reduction of the franchise "until the *House has before it the entire scheme contemplated by the Government;*" and Lord Malmesbury has added this note: "History repeats itself, *e.g.* 1884, but not the Duke of Westminster." Mr. Gladstone's single-barrelled Bill of 1884, however, has not yet passed! The diary in this year records a conversation with Lady Palmerston; her husband (said Lady Palmerston) "had very serious apprehensions respecting Gladstone's future career, and considered him a very dangerous and reckless politician."

In 1868 appear many interesting entries on the Irish Church Question. Disraeli was now Premier: "Nothing can exceed the anger of Gladstone at Disraeli's elevation," writes Lord Malmesbury (May 6th); "he wanted to stop the supplies on the 4th, but found his party would not go with him." On July 12th, 1869, says the diary:

Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, voted with the Government on the Irish Church Bill. Some one observing him go out with them in the division, said: "The Bishop of Oxford is going the wrong way." "No," observed Lord Chelmsford, "it is the road to Winchester."

Lord Derby's speech, on the second reading, was a very good one, says the diary; "and the peroration very eloquent and touching." For

ourselves, some portions of the speech (the illustration, *e.g.*, from "Guy Mannering") seem to us as fresh as when we heard them. It was a melancholy debate. In the various debates we heard most of the speeches in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, and we are not surprised that in Lord Malmesbury's diary there is at least a mention of Mr. Gladstone's "hostility and bitterness" regarding amendments in favour of the Church of Ireland.

The few extracts which we have given from the volumes before us will serve to whet the appetite of our readers, those at all events who are interested in political matters. A lengthy review of the "Memoirs" is not now within our power. Some of our Liberal friends will criticize, of course, certain comments in them, and the historical accuracy of several of their statements will be called in question. Sir Algernon Borthwick has written to the papers calling in question the reference to the *Morning Post*, and Lord Blachford believes that the entry about Mr. Newman at Oriel is altogether a mistake. But in any case this work will be regarded as forming an interesting and valuable addition to our somewhat scanty stock of political memoirs.

Short Notices.

The Church Quarterly Review, October, 1884. Spottiswoode and Co.

THIS number is above the average. The article entitled "Ordination, Nonconformity, and Separatism," is well worth reading; and with a certain portion of it we quite agree, but the tone is somewhat harsh. The writer distinguishes between the Nonconformists and the Dissenters or Separatists. The Nonconformists "had frequently generalized their enemies the Separatists as 'the Dissension' early in the seventeenth century. But the phrase 'Dissenter' first came into common use as a fitting description for the small, able, and pertinacious minority of Independents who sat in the Westminster Assembly of Divines." Thus the title "Dissenter" was invented by the Nonconformists, not by the Separatists. Lightfoot, in the latter part of his journal, writes of the "Independents" and the "Dissenters" interchangeably.

A see-saw article headed "Cardinal Repyngdon and the Followers of Wycliffe," complains of the "unmeasured laudations" which have appeared in "the excitement lately manifested" as to Wycliffe. Professor Montagu Burrows, we are told, has given "an enthusiastic but uncritical panegyric," and Canon Pennington's book is dismissed as "somewhat of a medley." These writers are able to take care of themselves. The *Church Quarterly* nibbles at the reputation of Wycliffe, with goodwill, but not with much success. Philip Repyngdon, who gave up his Wycliffism, sought the sunshine of Court favour; he became bitter against "heretics," was made Bishop of Lincoln, and at length a Cardinal.

"The History of the Old Catholic Movement" is ably written, and full of interest.

The Young Trawler. A Story of Life and Death and Rescue on the North Sea. By R. M. BALLANTYNE, Author of "Dusty Diamonds," etc., etc., with illustrations. Nisbet and Co.

During some sixteen years, the present writer has examined, now and then, a book by the author of "The Young Trawler." To write a notice

of these books, as a rule, has been a truly welcome task, for there are few writers of stories on the lines which Mr. Ballantyne has chosen who show anything like the same measure of skill and judgment. Mr. Ballantyne's tales are undeniably clever; they are also cheery, and very readable. But more, they are generally stories with a purpose—practical, and in many ways likely to do good. A distinctly religious tone pervades the whole; and though there is just enough *sensation* in them to win boys attention and approval, they are thoroughly sensible rather than "sensational." We have lent several volumes to cottagers and artisans, to the elder children in a Sunday-school, girls as well as boys, and to representatives of other classes, and we have always found that the tales were read with interest, and were much enjoyed. "The Iron Horse," "The Battery and the Boiler," "The Floating Light of the Goodwin Sands," "Deep Down, a tale of the Cornish Mines," and "Under the Waves," may be named as specimen stories of what, after all these years, makes a large shelf, and a handsome shelf in a library for the young. The volume before us has its own merits and its own attractions. Those of our readers who appreciated the article in the August CHURCHMAN, on the work done by the Thames Church Mission "among the Fishing Fleets of the North Sea," will understand what forms the staple of Mr. Ballantyne's "The Young Trawler." We may add that an appendix contains a very interesting statement as to the Dutch floating grog-shops, to which reference has of late been made in the newspapers. When, in the year 1881, Mr. Mather, the secretary of the Thames Church Mission, visited the "Short Blue" fleet of Messrs. Hewett and Co., and had his attention drawn to the "Cooper," or Dutch grog-shop, he thought: "Shall the devil have his mission-ship, whose crew are not afraid to face the winter gales, and the servants of the Lord be less earnest than they?" Prayer and effort were fruitful; funds were found for the *Ensign*. At present, there are four mission-vessels. These, as was explained in the August CHURCHMAN, toil all the week to maintain themselves, if possible; but, unlike the other smacks, they do not fish on Sundays. Mr. Ballantyne's timely tale about the trawlers may be heartily recommended.

The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures. Being the Additions to the Old Testament Canon which were included in the Ancient Greek and Latin Versions; the English Text of the Authorized Version, together with the additional matter found in the Vulgate and other Ancient Versions; Introductions to the several Books and Fragments; Marginal Notes and References; and a General Introduction to the Apocrypha. By the Rev. W. R. CHURTON, B.D., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Canon of St. Alban's, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop. Pp. 600. London: J. Whitaker, 12, Warwick Lane. 1884.

The full title-page, which we have given, shows the character of this work; but in explanation of the title itself, we may quote Canon Churton's remark that the Books and Fragments commonly designated "Apocrypha" are all "Uncanonical," but not all "Apocryphal" in the strictest sense of the term. The book is well printed, and handy.

Sermons on Neglected Texts. By C. S. ROBINSON, D.D., Pastor of the Memorial Church, New York. Pp. 310. Dickinson, 89, Farringdon Street, E.C. 1884.

There are many good things in this book; some of them are anecdotes and quotations.

Sermons. By DAVID SWING, Pastor Fourth Presbyterian Church. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1884.

A calculation was made one day as to the number of men's names—heroes, statesmen, authors, and so forth—which on an average appeared in a leading article of a certain newspaper. The critic was nearly right, as his calculation proved, in his remark about "brilliant" leader-writers of a showy sort. We are reminded of this by a perusal of some of Mr. Swing's sermons. On p. 152, for example, we find the names of Gough, Everett, Wendell Phillips, and Talmage; on the next page, Paine, Voltaire, Bolingbroke; and so forth. There is thought in the sermons. Thus, in pointing out objections to evolution, it is remarked that "Mr. Beecher can harmonize the theory with religion more easily than he can harmonize it with scientific facts. . . . The facts of science do not blend with the assumed situation as readily as does a *more facile religion.*" (The italics are our own.) For ourselves, we are amazed at the readiness with which many religious men have dealt with the "assumed situation." What *are* "the facts of science"? (FACTS.) This is one question. Another is, What about the Bible record of creation, in particular of the creation of *man?* These questions, we think, many shirk. But we turn again to Mr. Swing. In replying to evolutionists who hold the theory in its atheistic form, he remarks that after all that has been said about "forces," the real question is of *guided* force. Mr. Swing's objections to evolution are more worthy of note because his sermons are extremely "Broad." The remark was once made that a certain discourse hadn't enough "Gospel" in it to save a fly. To say nothing about "the *Gospel*," Mr. Swing's notions about theology may be understood from his remark that "Gladstone, Victor Hugo, and their class" are moving along, giants to the last. Victor Hugo! Is a "Presbyterian" Church, even in New York, satisfied with this?

The Boy's Own Annual.—The Girl's Own Annual. R. T. S.

These excellent magazines have been so often commended in the pages of THE CHURCHMAN, that a few words only are necessary in our praise of the volumes for 1884. Full of interesting matter, they are wonderfully cheap. Of the two volumes, somehow we prefer "The Boys';" it will be a treasure for the winter evenings, to many, through a village library.

Touchstones; or Christian Graces and Characters tested. By Right Rev. Bishop OXENDEN. Hatchards.

We heartily recommend this volume, which, like all the honoured Bishop's writings, is thoroughly practical, and of a gentle, winning tone. It is always a pleasure to give away, or lend, or recommend, a book by Bishop Oxenden. What an amount of good has been wrought by his publications! They are many in number, but all are wise, and of value.

Quacks: The Story of the Ugly Duckling. After H. C. Andersen, by MARION M. WINGRAVE, Authoress of rhymes in "Afternoon Tea." London: Ward, Lock and Co.

This is a charming, very tasteful volume; and happy indeed will be the little folks who receive it. The illustrations, coloured, are delightful; and the "get up" of the whole is excellent. The drawing, in some respects, is faulty; but children will not notice a lack of likeness in shape or colour. "Quacks" is a choice gift-book.

The Mela at Tulsipur. Glimpses of Missionary Life and Work in India. A book for children. By Rev. B. H. BADLEY, M.A., for ten years a Missionary in North India. The Religious Tract Society.

A good "Missionary" book for young readers; instructive, and not dry. The *Melas* are religious fairs; and Mr. Badley tells all about them.

The Church of England Continuous Sunday Service Book, for the Year of our Lord 1885. London: Henry Frowde. Oxford: University Press Warehouse.

The Sunday Service Book will prove, we make no doubt, very popular. We gladly welcome it, and are pleased to commend it. The Morning Services are printed separately. Morning and Evening together do not make the book too bulky. A quotation from the preface will explain its character:

The Annual Sunday Service Book of the Church of England has been prepared, at the suggestion of many well-known clergymen, in order to meet the requirements of those who, for whatever reason, find the present arrangement of the Book of Common Prayer in some cases intricate and confusing.

By the publication of the present work this long-felt difficulty will, if the hopes of the promoters are in any degree realized, be effectually removed.

The Morning and Evening Services are here given without omission or alteration of any kind *in the precise order in which they are used in our churches Sunday by Sunday throughout the year;* so that they can henceforward be readily and intelligently followed, even by persons wholly unaccustomed to them.

John Wiclif's Polemical Works in Latin. For the first time edited from the manuscripts, with critical and historical notes, by RUDOLF BUDDENSIEG. English edition. Two vols. Published for the Wiclif Society, by Trübner and Co., 57, Ludgate Hill.

We thoroughly agree with the remarks made by Mr. Wratislaw in the present CHURCHMAN concerning the support given to the Wiclif Society; and for ourselves we regret that a fitting notice of the work done by Dr. Buddensieg has not appeared in our pages. To these two volumes we shall return. The Society is by no means as well known as it ought to be.

Notes on the Church Service. By the Right Rev. W. WALSHAM HOW, D.D., Bishop of Bedford and Suffragan of London. Wells, Gardner, Darton and Co.

This tiny book, in its way a *multum in parvo*, will be interesting and helpful to many. The esteemed Bishop's "Notes" are on the modes of rendering the Services; nearly all of them on the *musical* rendering. They may be well compared with Mr. Hay Aitken's in a recent CHURCHMAN.

The Prophets of Christendom. Sketches of Eminent Preachers. By the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, Lord Bishop of Ripon. Second edition. Hodder and Stoughton.

We are pleased to see a second edition of these graceful and suggestive "Sketches." Few men were better qualified to write on eminent preachers than Mr. Boyd Carpenter.

The Doctor's Experiment. By the Author of "Under Fire," etc. R. T. S.

This is a "pretty book," and the tale is pleasing and wholesome. Whether schoolboys will reckon these "Adventures of one of Dr. Reade's pupils narrated by himself" very interesting, and "natural," is matter of doubt. There is plenty of incident.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received *My Coloured Picture Story Book*, with sixty-four coloured plates (some of which surely we have seen before); a good book for the smaller children: the annual of *The Child's Companion* (bright, as usual): also, *The Sweet Story of Old*, "A Sunday book for the little ones," by the author of "Jessica's first Prayer," with twelve full-paged coloured illustrations; and the annual of our old friend *The Cottager and Artisan*.

The sixth volume of "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge," that excellent series of the Religious Tract Society, is *Egyptian Life and History according to the Monuments*, by M. E. HARKNESS; a good volume, but hardly equal to some of its predecessors.—A dainty little book is *Flowers from the King's Garden*; texts with pictures for a month; quite a gem.—*Short Biographies for the People*, also from the R.T.S., may be heartily commended; a well-printed book and cheap; Luther, Calvin, Pollock, Knox, Anselm, and others; Vol. I., Nos. 1-12; a new and useful series. These biographies are short, but full, and interesting.

Of *Theology and Life*, sermons chiefly on special occasions, by Dr. PLUMPTRE, Dean of Wells, a new issue has reached us (Griffith and Farran). The writings of this suggestive and learned divine are well known. His sermon on the "Prophets of the New Testament" has a special interest just now.

Light for India, quarterly Record of the Christian Vernacular Education Society for India, is now published by Mr. Elliot Stock.

Thoughts Suggested by the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts. A Paper read at the Annual Conference of the Midland Clerical and Lay Association, 1884, by J. T. TOMLINSON, author of "The Legal History of Canon Stubbs." An ably-written paper. It is published by Messrs. Bemrose and Sons, 23, Old Bailey; and Derby.

Messrs. Nisbet and Co. have published a charming tiny book, *Ivy Leaves*, selections from Miss Havergal's verses, illustrated. Another interesting little book is *Life in Hospital*, "by a Sister;" very touching.

A "popular edition" of Archdeacon FARRAR'S *Life and Work of St. Paul* has been sent to us by Messrs. Cassell and Company. The volume (of 780 pages) is well got up, and printed in clear type—sufficiently large; it is of convenient shape, and very cheap. Such an edition is sure to prove "popular."

Of Dr. BLAKENEY'S excellent *Hand-Book of the Liturgy*, and Captain CHURCHILL'S new book, *Church Ordinances, from a Layman's Standpoint* (interesting and likely to be very useful), notices are deferred.

THE MONTH.

THE Marquis of Salisbury has made some remarkable political speeches in Scotland, mainly upon the Franchise Bill; and it seems probable that the House of Lords will adhere to its former decision. Lord Hartington, speaking at Rawtenstall, was conciliatory; and Mr. Chamberlain's speech in the Potteries, although, as usual, strongly Radical, and with

much abuse of the Peers, seemed to show that the Ministry are feeling their way to a compromise. The publication by the *Standard*, on the 9th, of what purported to be the Draft Scheme of the Government in reference to Redistribution, occasioned much excitement; it was a great surprise. The representatives of the doomed boroughs will have something to say, no doubt, when such a scheme is officially made known.

Lord Randolph Churchill's speeches in Leeds and Birmingham have excited much attention. At Birmingham some Radical "roughs" made an outrageous disturbance at a great demonstration to receive Sir Stafford Northcote. Mr. Sclater Booth has rallied the Government on their watchwords, Peace and Retrenchment; and deplored the estrangement not only of France and Austria, but of Germany, as their handiwork. Lord Harrowby, in an able speech at Liverpool, remarked that the House of Lords had lasted six hundred years, and expressed his belief that it would last another six hundred.

The news from Egypt has occasioned the greatest anxiety. Colonel Stewart, General Gordon's gallant colleague, has (it is feared) been murdered.[1] The financial side of the Egyptian Question has entered upon a grave phase, the Powers having protested against a decree suspending the operation of the Sinking Fund. Lord Wolseley's Relief Expedition is making its way; but the process of taking up men and stores is very slow. The expenses of the expedition are extremely heavy.

Operations between the French and Chinese, naval and military, have been, as yet, in favour of the French.

The news from South Africa could scarcely be more serious. The British flag has been insulted.[2]

The recall of Mr. Mackenzie, the Imperial Commissioner, raised a strong feeling in South Africa. Mr. Forster has spoken well at a meeting in London, and it is announced (15th) that the Imperial Government has at length resolved to restrain the Boers.

The centenary of the consecration at Aberdeen of Bishop

---

[1] A diary of the siege of Khartoum, sent home by Mr. Power, the Vice-Consul, and the correspondence of the *Times*, brought us down to July 31st. The *Record*, of October 3rd, says: "At last a lurid light has been thrown upon Khartoum. The veil that has hidden General Gordon and those that are with him for nearly six months has for a brief moment been drawn aside, and all England has read with pride and shame a tale of mingled heroism and hardship. But it is merely as if a flash of lightning had revealed to those on shore a doomed vessel among the breakers, and then the spectacle had again been shrouded in darkness."

[2] At a great meeting held in Capetown resolutions were unanimously passed declaring that the failure of the Imperial Government to maintain its just rights under the Transvaal Convention must be fatal to the cause of British supremacy in South Africa.

Seabury, the first Anglican Bishop in America, has been celebrated in Aberdeen.[1]

An interesting "In Memoriam" of the Rev. W. Milton, of Sheffield, has appeared in the *Record.*

Canon Simmons, Rector of Dalton Holme, has entered into rest. His papers on "Alms and Oblations" appeared in THE CHURCHMAN a year or two ago. We readily pay a tribute of respect to another learned contributor to this magazine, Mr. W. R. Browne, some time Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The memorial to the Queen, set on foot by the Church Association, has been, by the Home Secretary, laid before Her Majesty.[2]

On September 28th, the new buildings of the South-Eastern College, Ramsgate, were formally opened by the Dean of Canterbury.[3]

The Bishop of Rochester has issued an interesting letter to his clergy touching their "Temperance Sunday" (Nov. 9).

An admirable letter from the Dean of Chester to the Bishop (Dr. Stubbs), concerning the eastward position in Chester Cathedral, and his Lordship's reply, have been published. The Dean, whose writings on this subject are well known, says:

> The statutes of the cathedral impose upon me the responsibility of regulating its services. If I had introduced novelties in this respect the

---

[1] The Bishop of Connecticut, successor to Bishop Seabury, preached in St. Andrew's Church, and, after speaking of Bishop Seabury, said the marvellous growth and awakened life of the Church during the past century was a true illustration of the text, "The forces of the Gentiles shall come in to them." At a great reception banquet the Marquis of Lothian occupied the chair. Among others present were Lord Kintore, Lord Glasgow, Lord Forbes, the Bishop of Connecticut, the Bishop of Carlisle, the Bishop of Minnesota, the Bishop of Winchester, the Bishop of St. Andrew's, Lord Aberdeen, the Bishop of Meath, the Bishop of Gibraltar, the Bishop of Albany, U.S.A., Lord Nelson, the Bishop of Aberdeen, Mr. Cunliffe Brooks, M.P., Dr. Webster, M.P., and Dr. Farquharson, M.P.

[2] The memorial gave Constitutional reasons for objecting to the recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners. The memorial received 37,751 signatures, of which 36,362 were lay, and 1,389 clerical. The lay signatures were headed by the Marquis of Exeter, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Earl Ferrers, Viscount Combermere, Lords Wolseley, Walsingham, Digby, Portman, Oranmore, and Ebury.

[3] The Head-master, the Rev. E. d'Auquier, expressed, in words of much feeling, the deep obligations he was under to the Dean for the invaluable moral and material support he had rendered, and the helpful advice he had ever been so ready to give. The Dean, in reply, spoke of the extreme importance he attached to the successful accomplishment of the South-Eastern College scheme, alluded to the difficulties which has beset the path of its early promoters, and paid a high tribute to the abilities and energy of the Head-master, to whose able government the brilliant success of the College had been largely due.—*The Record.*

case would have been different; but in this matter we have simply done in this cathedral what I believe has been done by every Bishop and Dean of Chester since 1662: and, knowing how thoroughly you share my appreciation of our late Bishop's learning and acuteness, I need not hesitate to add that his opinion and practice in regard to this question were very decided. Thus I am very anxious for the continuance of our cathedral custom without any imputation of blame.

But inasmuch as I am committed to certain published arguments on this subject, I am placed at this moment in a position quite different from that which would be occupied by any other English dean under similar circumstances.

The Bishop replied: "I simply exercise what I conceive to be my lawful liberty."

At the Oxford Diocesan Conference, the subject of clerical fees was discussed, and it was proposed that fees should be exchanged for voluntary offerings; but the main body of the clergy (no wonder!) did not see this. In regard to another debate, an Oxford correspondent writes to us as follows:

Readers of THE CHURCHMAN are no doubt aware that during the last fortnight an event has occurred of great interest to those who are concerned in keeping up the observance of the Lord's Day. I allude to the debate at the Oxford Diocesan Conference, which terminated in the rejection by all present, except a small minority of some fifteen or so, of Dr. Phillimore's proposal for promoting the opening of Museums, Picture Galleries and Public Gardens on the sacred day.

Dr. Phillimore's arguments in his opening speech were mainly based upon the usual allegations, viz., that the Lord's Day differs from the Jewish Sabbath: that it ought to be a day of happiness instead of gloom; that the change would be a slight one, and that it would promote much rational enjoyment. His only new point was that he had attended several meetings of working-men, at all of which, except one, where there was a slight opposition, resolutions were passed unanimously in favour of the legislation which he recommended. His seconder, Professor Stokoe, insisted upon the need amongst the lower orders of some rational occupation upon the Lord's Day.

Except in one instance, which I will notice presently, perfectly satisfactory answers were given upon all the points raised. No one upheld any gloominess in the observance of the day, though several speakers pointed out the danger of introducing secular pursuits and amusements which, even if innocent in themselves, would be sure to lead to others of an objectionable character. The certainty that the opening of theatres and music-halls, and the introduction of bands of music and dancing would soon follow any such change, was strongly urged. The body of Secularists in the background was unveiled. The evil tendency of the Continental observance of the day was shown in the facts that the attendance at public worship at Berlin amounts only to 2 per cent.; that bull-baiting is not uncommon on Sunday in Spain; and that in France an atheistic Republic has been set up. Dr. Phillimore's own experience of working-men was more than balanced by Mr. Broadhurst's declarations and other evidence of their real feeling. It would be desirable, I may add, for him to prosecute inquiries for himself among the class of domestic servants in the houses of those people in London who disregard the day, and to learn what they feel and think about the doings of their masters and mistresses, and how many leave their places because Sunday has become to them like any other day.

But the arguments upon one point were eminently unsatisfactory. In accordance with the theory which has held its place in Oxford ever since the days of Archbishop Whately, it was strongly maintained under high academical sanction, that the Sabbath and the Lord's Day are distinct institutions, and that the binding character of the former has not passed on into the latter. Great stress was laid upon the absence of any positive and literal direction in the New Testament, and that the observance of the Lord's Day was rested upon ecclesiastical arrangements alone.

I was prevented from replying upon the spur of the moment, as I wished to do. But perhaps you will allow me to suggest some heads of answer, with the brevity which your space demands.

1. Granting that the Sabbath was not instituted before Moses—for this is a moot-point of controversy, though it is difficult to see how, under the extreme shortness of the record, the plea of want of definite information can stand, especially in the face of the history of the Creation—yet the fact remains that the observance of the Sabbath rests upon the lines of the Creation. Such is its main *raison d'être*, declared in the fourth Commandment, received into Christian times, accepted conspicuously by the Church in England, and taught by her amongst the rudiments of religion. The observance of the seventh day and marriage are the two positive institutions of Natural Religion, and must be co-extensive with natural religion. The presumption is that in a high sense they must flourish or wane together.

2. What is the essence, and what are the accidents of the institution? It is essential that one day in seven—not one day in eight, or one day in ten, as the French thought at their Revolution of keeping—should be observed. Which the day should be, whether the seventh or the first, is accidental.

3. Moses added the sanction of the memory of the deliverance from Egypt, and the rigours of Jewish observance. But while the commemoration of Almighty God's rest after the Creation must remain as long as Creation lasts, there is nothing in the superadded part to show that it would outlive the first dispensation.

4. The tendency of our Lord's own remarks shadowed the change that was coming.

5. The Apostles—probably in obedience to our Lord's commands, as His *actions* after His Resurrection seem to show—introduced the observance of the first day of the week. And in course of time, the Church gave up the observance of the seventh day, which naturally remained for some time by the side of the other, and kept the first day alone: thus doing three things:

(1) Abolishing the observance of the seventh day.
(2) Keeping one day in seven.
(3) Introducing the first day into the vacant place.

6. The doctrine of the Early Fathers, as Dr. Pusey sums up, teaches us that the Apostles did not "transfer" the Sabbath, but "substituted" the Lord's Day, and thus in accordance with the idea derived from the Creation, abstinence from business was the universal tradition, and was expressed by the laws of the Church, and of the State as enforcing the Church's laws. Such is the witness of the Council of Laodicea, of the Fourth Council of Carthage, and of the edicts of Constantine and Theodosius.

7. The day is therefore a day of HOLY REST—of rest from toil, anxiety, and the world: of holiness in all aspects, of high self-restraint and spiritual aspirations, of worship and meditation, of love and charity to neighbours. If people would recollect that there can be no real holiness without the second table, and that, if rest and worship in one's self end

in the prevention of these amongst other people by actual demand, by example, by influence, or by tendency, the blessing of the day is defeated, surely they would see the necessity of refraining from what they fancy is innocent amusement, if it keep, or tend to keep, their neighbours from reaping the harvest of this blessed day.

May we preserve, and hand on, all the invaluable advantages which have descended to our time in this great observance!

The Church Congress at Carlisle seems to have been in many ways successful. The attendance was large; there was little of controversial bitterness; the subjects were worthy; the readers and the speakers were well and fairly chosen; and the Bishop, as everybody expected, made an admirable chairman.[1] The *Record* says:

From beginning to end there has been no hitch, no unpleasantness; and if the Carlisle Congress has not come up to some of its twenty-three predecessors in point of numbers, it has surpassed them all in the harmony and business-like character which pervaded the meetings. There was a total absence of the silly attempts to shout down all sentiments that were not approved. The schoolboy cleric was fortunately conspicuous by his absence. . . . This most satisfactory result was not attained by the compromise of any principle on the part of either speakers or hearers. As boldly as at any other Congress did the "plurality of schools of thought," to which the Bishop alluded in his opening address, give utterance to their several persuasions; but these utterances, being delivered with modesty, were received even by those who differed from them with good-humour and courtesy. . . . A goodly gathering of Evangelical men showed their appreciation of the fairness with which the programme had been arranged this year, and their papers read and speeches made formed an important contribution to the valuable information and instruction that the official Report will contain.

The papers read, and the debates, upon such subjects as the advantages of an Established Church, Religious Education, and "the influence of the Reformation upon England, with especial reference to the work and writings of John Wiclif," were both interesting and informing, and of no small importance at the present time.

---

[1] The *Guardian* says: "There was a great number of North-country parsons present, not seldom with their 'belongings,' and a good many laymen also, to whom Congress ways were novel. These persons listened with marked attention and sustained interest; and it was their steady devotion to 'business' which produced that absence of restlessness and that almost uniform quietness which distinguished the audiences at this Congress. Probably there never was any one of the twenty-four gatherings at which the cry of 'Order, order,' was so seldom heard or needed. It cannot be doubted that many hundreds will have gone back to their work, mostly we imagine in rural or at any rate remote districts, with new spirit and with new ideas. And if the Church Congress of 1884 has done this, it has prospered in one of its most important functions."