
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

DECEMBER, 1884.

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

THE great problem which is stirring the heart of the Christian Church of this age is, How to bring the healing and refining influences of the Gospel upon the great mass of spiritual destitution and ignorance which prevails throughout the length and breadth of the land. The deadly and injurious effects of scepticism and other kindred forms of opposition to the Christian faith are felt in every quarter and class of society; but great as these evils are, it seems still more hopeless to battle against the wide-spread indifference to any phase of religious life.

The Church of England has not failed to recognise the existence and enormity of these hindrances to the spread of the Gospel and the advancement of religious education among the people; she has not under-valued the great difficulties of the case, nor has she flinched from efforts of self-sacrifice in endeavouring to meet them. It has often been thought and said, no doubt, that the machinery of the Church was too antiquated and ill-adjusted to deal with the peculiar wants of modern times; but such a conclusion is obviously and fully disproved by the methods which have been resorted to in order to render the institutions and work of the Church suitable to our present needs.

It will be interesting, and it is the principal object of this paper, to illustrate some of the efforts which are now being made to simplify and popularize the services of the Church, and in other ways to advance the highest welfare of the people.

I. It is not unnatural, in the first instance, to turn to our

cathedrals, the great historic monuments of the spiritual life and devotion of the Christian Church in past ages.

In days gone by, it has been said that they failed adequately to respond to the great opportunities which they possessed of promoting religious life throughout the nation; but such a charge in these days would utterly fall to the ground. There is not a single cathedral which does not systematically provide its round of daily services with other multiplied spiritual privileges. In addition to the opportunities which the cathedral affords to those in the immediate neighbourhood, these buildings have been freely thrown open for the encouragement and edification of every agency created to assist Church life and work in the diocese. By way of showing the peculiar readiness to make these grand buildings available to every class and want of the community, one or two illustrations may be given.

At Bangor, a Saturday morning children's service is held at ten o'clock during eight months of the year, some 500 or 600 children attending. At Bristol, special Sunday afternoon services are frequently held for the volunteers, cadets, and naval reserve, post-office and telegraph clerks, police and fire brigade. Week-day evening lectures on the Psalms have been given to men and women separately and to mixed congregations. At Ely, on the Feast of the Epiphany, a special service is held for children, the congregation frequently reaching 1,100. Special services for men and women, separately, were held during the last Lenten season, the congregation numbering 200 or 300. At Lichfield the communicants of the diocese, forming themselves into guilds, were last year welcomed in the cathedral, and a service specially arranged for them. A service of a somewhat similar character was held in Newcastle Cathedral, the congregation numbering more than 3,000. At Worcester special services have been held for men only, with congregations of 300 and more. It remains to point to the very remarkable efforts which have been made by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, to render the services helpful to the varying needs of the great metropolitan population. Most of our readers will remember the days when the usual hour of evening prayer under the dome saw but comparatively few present, but how marvellous is the change now! One can scarcely ever go there without casting one's eye upon what we may venture to call a crowd of worshippers; and in marking the evident signs of devotion, it is clear that these once neglected services have now become a source of comfort to many hearts feeling the burden and strain of City business life. Has anyone witnessed those grand gatherings under the dome during the Lenten season, so largely composed of men,

without heartily thanking God for the quickened life of the Church? Nor should it be forgotten how zealously and generously the Dean and Chapter have sought to render the cathedral available to those who are giving their services to the Church as lay helpers, whether men or women. Throughout the winter months at least 100 men are systematically brought under Bible-teaching by some of the Minor Canons, who also give instruction in the Greek Testament. Lectures to women have been regularly given, and more than 120 have continuously attended these classes.

These illustrations surely afford evidence enough of an anxiety and readiness to throw the cathedrals open as widely as possible, and to make them, as we venture to assert they are, the centres of godly zeal and spiritual activity, their influence radiating through every corner of the diocese.

II. Passing to the subject of Parochial Missions, we note one of the most remarkable and encouraging witnesses to the spirit of enterprise which would leave no stone unturned in reclaiming the ungodly, and leading back into the fold of the Church, those who have wandered into sin.

It is not within the scope of this paper to trace the history of this movement. It is enough to show that "Mission Work" is not only a recognised part of the Church machinery, but that it has proved of untold worth in its effect upon the spiritual life of the people.

The whole subject of how best and most quickly to stem the overwhelming tides of ungodliness around us, has for some time occupied the careful attention of the Councils of the Church. It is clear from their conclusions that they fully recognise the urgent necessity of active steps to utilize every possible agency, whether clerical or lay, for widening the borders of Christ's Kingdom throughout the world. One cannot doubt but that in a few years each diocese will have formed some systematic plan for reaching the masses of non-churchgoing people by means of simpler services than we are accustomed to, and of a distinctly missionary and evangelistic character. Already such organizations exist in the Dioceses of Lichfield, Peterborough, Lincoln, Salisbury, and Truro. These societies have gathered together a staff of clergy fitted by experience and popular gifts for conducting Parochial Missions; they have also supplemented their work by arranging for special services in various parishes during the Advent and Lenten seasons. In the Dioceses of London, Exeter, Norwich, and Manchester, steps have also been taken to follow a similar course.

It is natural here to mention the Church Parochial Mission Society, which has for some years devoted itself with so much

wisdom and labour to this branch of Church work. This society has been instrumental in organizing over 700 Parochial Missions in different parishes and districts.

Patiently and prayerfully prepared for, it is perhaps impossible to exaggerate the importance of a Mission in its bearing upon the spiritual and moral life of a particular parish or neighbourhood.

It affords a striking evidence of the power and attractiveness of the Gospel, when the hearts of thousands in some of our large towns are stirred by Mission agencies to long for the peace and joy of true life in Christ Jesus. We may imagine, for instance, how the case stood in Leeds, when some eighty churches, for a week or more, threw wide open their doors to welcome men and women wearied with all the sad disappointments and bitter heart-aching sorrows of their God-forgetful life; and we may picture many of these as bent in sorrow for the past before the Cross of Christ, and quickened there by the word of His forgiving love and the regenerating breath of the Holy Spirit. Those who have taken their part in unfolding the story of the Cross, can tell of the lifelong joy which the Parochial Mission has brought to many who thought their souls uncared for; how many, will be known only at "that day." What was done with such power and hopefulness in Leeds, has been repeated, as is well known, in other great centres of population, as, for instance, in Preston, Wolverhampton, Northampton, Huddersfield, and Norwich.

One of the most useful and hopeful outcomes of this movement has been the Special Services held for Working Men. It is very commonly said that the Church has entirely lost her hold upon the artisan classes; but is this altogether true? The vast crowd assembled for Mission Services at Norwich and Lichfield, would surely incline us to hope that there is no real breach between the English working man and his Church. There are many signs, indeed, that by patient and self-sacrificing work, and painstaking labour to understand them, the clergy may win the respect and affection of our artisans, and even enlist them in the highest sphere of service in the Church.

An illustration is furnished in the working men's meeting at Church Congresses. In no single instance has this great effort failed; but in every town where the Congress has been held, and the working men have been invited, the invitation has been accepted with an enthusiasm evidenced by numbers and kindly feeling, showing plainly no real want of goodwill between the Church and the working classes.

III. In connection with the special function and working of Parochial Missions, it may be well to make some mention of the efforts made to follow up and deepen the spiritual impres-

sions left upon the minds of those who have come under these exceptional influences, and who, in response to the awakenings of God's Holy Spirit, have actively united themselves with the work of the Church. It is impossible, of course, to give anything like an exhaustive statement of the guilds and unions which now exist for the advancement of devotional life among communicants and Church-workers; we can only, therefore, quote one or two instances as illustrations of similar efforts. Last year a special service was held in Canterbury Cathedral, to which the clergy and Church-workers of the city and neighbourhood had been previously invited. The Bishop of Sydney gave the address at the service; a meeting followed in the assembly-rooms, and subjects of natural interest to Churchmen were brought under discussion. This movement was originated by the late Archbishop Tait, who was anxious to foster a desire for Christian work among the younger communicants of the Church after their confirmation, and to give some formal sanction to the offering of their service. In the Diocese of Lichfield for two years past the members of the Diocesan Guild Union have assembled in the cathedral for a service of prayer and praise united with instruction. The Bishop has encouraged this movement by his presence, and some fifty clergy or more have joined in the service with a thousand communicants. The intention of this Guild Union is to bind communicants together for holiness, work, and prayer. An organization exactly similar in character exists in the Diocese of Truro; it is known by the name of "The Church Society for the Advancement of Holy Living." More than forty parishes in the diocese have joined the society, which has now a roll of members exceeding 1,500.

In the grand old parish church of Newcastle, now the cathedral of the diocese, two thousand Church-workers assembled last year at an evening service specially designed for them; the choir on the occasion consisted of 500 trained voices. A very large number of working men, it was observed, were present, showing not only their practical sympathy with the objects of such a gathering, but their willingness to make sacrifices of time and ease for the active service of the Church.

Undue importance can hardly be attached to such movements as these. They have already done much to encourage workers who have too often had but little help given them in the way of realizing a common bond of union among all who pray to make their lives a service to Christ in ministry to others.

In several large towns the district visitors, Sunday-school teachers, and others, have been invited to what we may call a retreat, or quiet day: a service has been held in the church;

and instructions upon the spiritual life have been given, with intervals for meditation and prayer.

In the Diocese of St. Albans, during the last Lenten season, special devotional services for clergy and Sunday-school teachers were held in four appointed centres.[1]

It is needless to point out the peculiar value of such opportunities as we have now described, for giving spiritual direction and encouragement to the labours of those who are offering their gifts to God in the service of His Church. The obvious tendency of an awakened earnestness is to lead many who are under the impulse of religious feelings to devote themselves to Christian enterprises of one kind or another; but the danger is that the enthusiasm may be chilled, and the work laid down. It is needful, therefore, that opportunities should present themselves for fixing upon the mind the highest conception of what Christian service really is, and for the setting forth the ever-opening sources of that Divine grace, which enables the soul to continue unmoved in its desire to labour for God and man.

IV. We have touched upon Parochial Missions designed chiefly to arouse those who are careless and indifferent. It may be well to allude to some of the most prominent and avowed hindrances to the spread of the Gospel of Christ which the Church has to face, and toil, if possible, to remove. The existence of a wide-spread infidelity among the masses is one of the most painful obstacles the Church has to overcome. On the right and left hand of us, attempts are being openly and persistently made by infidels and secularists to undermine the Christian faith: the Church has not been wanting in her efforts to resist this hurtful tendency. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has for some considerable time recognised the urgent necessity of facing the prevalent scepticism of the present day. Under the direction of the Evidence Committee, a number of most valuable manuals have been published, compiled by those who have taken an active part in the strife of Christianity with infidelity. By the publication and distribution of these manuals, which seem to cover the whole ground, immense good has been already accomplished. In other ways the Christian Evidence Society is seeking to do a similar work. Its method of procedure is that its appointed agents should as frequently as possible visit our large towns for the purpose of holding conferences, open-air lectures in

[1] The service consisted of a shortened form of prayer followed by three addresses: after each address a short interval was reserved for meditation and secret prayer, a subject for intercession being suggested. The response to an invitation to attend these services was most encouraging, both on the part of the clergy and Sunday-school teachers.

parks and crowded thoroughfares, with opportunities given for discussion; the formation of classes for the instruction of young people in Christian evidences. There is scarcely a diocese in which this kind of work has not been carried on with more or less success, but it is chiefly perhaps in London and our large northern towns that these efforts have been made. Open-air lectures have been given under St. Pancras Railway arches, in Clerkenwell, Whitechapel, Victoria Park, and other centres in the metropolis. At Halifax, Leeds, Manchester, Bury, Burnley, and other towns in the north, active steps have been taken to cope with the terrible evils of existing forms of unbelief; large bodies of working men have been drawn together in friendly conference, and great good has unquestionably followed.

Another great adversary to the cause of Christ throughout the land presents itself in the prevalence of intemperance and impurity.

The crusade of the Church against drunkenness, and the habits and temptations which encourage it, has been of a very decided character, and has met with considerable success. Whilst some will be inclined to draw comparisons between the agencies which the Church has employed for checking the intemperate habits of the nation, and the means which others have adopted in the like cause, it is impossible to gainsay the fact that the most solid reformation is being wrought out by the quiet systematic labours of our Parochial Temperance Societies rather than by impulsive efforts of a less personal and permament character.

Any great change in the habits of the people can only be looked for as the result of prayerful and persistent toil pursued, especially among the young, with a view to remove the causes which have tended to foster intemperance. The witness of the Church of England Temperance Society has been powerful and emphatic, and has left its mark for good upon the Church and our national life in the formation of so many parochial organizations for coping with this great sin which has so long been England's shame.

It may perhaps be safely said, of the two evils, impurity is even greater than intemperance, though it cannot make its existence so openly felt. The revelations of the Report made to Convocation upon this subject some few years since were awful in the extreme; and it must be a matter of thankfulness that the conscience of the Church has been aroused, and that she is now exerting herself to abate the overwhelming misery and disgrace of this great national reproach; and all must earnestly wish that the Church of England Purity Society may be wisely guided in the methods which it may adopt for

dealing with a subject calling for so much courage and judgment.

Whilst giving prominent mention to this newly created agency, which the special circumstances of so great and widespread an evil have urgently called into existence, it would be a great omission were we to fail to point out what great efforts the Church of England has made to rescue the thousands who are exposed to the snares of seductive vice. There is scarcely a Diocese which has not organized its Industrial School, its Refuge, and Penitentiary; and though it is always difficult to tabulate the actual results for good achieved by these institutions, those who are acquainted with their history and working well know how powerfully they have made their influence felt in the renewal and purifying of lives which would otherwise have been lost in the yawning gulfs of sin.[1]

A work which would seem to be of especial value is found in the associations which now exist throughout the country for attempting to cut off this great evil in the bud. These preventive Societies seek to accomplish their work by establishing free registry offices, clothing clubs, careful visitation, the foundation of clubs for factory-girls, addresses to working mothers upon the early training of their children, the rescuing of those placed in circumstances of exceptional temptation, and by other kindred means. There are now seventy-two such Societies existing, and they are continually increasing in number.

A kindred effort has been made by the Church of England Central Home for Waifs and Strays. Under the direction of this Society, Homes for boys and girls have been established at Clapton and Dulwich, and others are in course of formation. There is perhaps no work that calls more urgently for the self-sacrificing labours of the Church than that which is suggested by these various agencies for training the rising generation in the love and habits of purity; nor has any work a greater promise of reward than that of helping thousands of our fellow-creatures to come out from the darkness of their sin into the light of a renewed and purer life.

V. This may seem a fitting opportunity for touching upon the position and value of women's work in the Church. It is generally admitted that the sphere is very wide indeed for the employment of women's gifts in this service. Whatever difference of opinion may exist as to the constitution of Sisterhoods, and of the principles upon which their work has been carried out, no one will refuse to admit that they have been,

[1] The actual extent of the work accomplished may be gathered from the statistical returns furnished in the "Official Year Book," pp. 128-139.

and still continue to be, channels of especial and abounding mercy. The deaconesses' work and institutions for nurses indicate another form in which the ministry of women has developed itself. In the Dioceses of Canterbury, London, Winchester, Ely, Salisbury, and Chester, efforts have for some time been made to find systematic employment for women, duly trained and solemnly set apart for the most part by Episcopal authority, as authorized Church Deaconesses, thus practically reviving the primitive order. Their work is to visit and nurse the sick and poor, to conduct Mothers' Meetings, and to assist in other ways in parish work as the incumbent may direct. Anyone having practical acquaintance with the domestic sorrows and difficulties of the poorer classes will understand how to value the inestimable boon of efficient nursing; it is, perhaps, one of the most useful services which can be rendered in times of need, and it is, certainly to the comprehension of the poor, one of the most practical expressions of the life and spirit of Christianity. The difficulties in many cases of nursing the poor in their own homes, and of placing them in conditions conducive to a complete recovery, have doubtless in a very great degree led to the formation of cottage hospitals and convalescent homes; a reference to the tabular records of these charities presented in the "Official Year-Book" will show how actively the Church of England has taken her part in the development of this specially valuable work. Those who have visited these homes, and have heard from the patients their testimony to the benefits which they have received, will be able to appreciate the great advantage and the real necessity of considerably multiplying their number.

So far it has been our endeavour to survey the agencies which the Church has constituted, and is still employing, for carrying on what we may describe as the home mission work. Though the distinct mission of the Church is to preach the Gospel to the poor, has she not yet to show that beautiful side of the Redeemer's life which was spent in ceaseless works of mercy to the sick and suffering? Is it not possibly true that the work of the Church has presented itself to the minds of great masses of the people as a counterpart of that painful misrepresentation of the Christian life which St. James describes in such striking words: "If a brother or a sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" Surely the attractive and convincing power of the Gospel will be as forcibly unfolded by deeds as words; and it is a matter for great thankfulness that so many hands and hearts are now pressed into the service,

and are so cheerfully responding to the call to carry "food to the hungry and clothing to the naked."

VI. We pass to the subject of education. In spite of all the difficulties which have surrounded this great question, and in which it is still involved, the Church has striven boldly to hold her own and to preserve our national life from the hurtful and corrupting influence of a mere secular and godless education. The disadvantages under which we labour in competition with School Boards are very great indeed, and are certain to increase rather than to diminish; bearing this in mind, the results of the Church's labour in the great cause of education during the previous year were most encouraging.

The accommodation in Church schools rose from 2,385,374 in 1882 to 2,413,676 in 1883, whilst the average attendance increased from 1,538,408 to 1,562,507. The Church educated last year half as many again as the Board schools; and contributed voluntarily during the year nearly £580,000 towards the support of Church schools, besides the large sum required for new buildings and improvements. During the year 1882, the Church spent the sum of £928,608 upon elementary education.

Looking at these figures, and at the devotion to the cause which they represent, we cannot be without hope for the future, whilst at the same time the aggressive character of the Board-School system lays a most solemn claim upon the conscience of the Church to leave no stone unturned in endeavouring to secure for the children an education founded upon the laws of God, which we must ever regard as the only safeguard for our national liberty, prosperity, and honour.

In duly estimating the contributions of the Church to the great cause of national education, we should not overlook the liberality with which the training colleges have been founded and maintained out of her revenues through many years past, nor should we forget how largely they have assisted elementary education throughout the land by the staff of experienced and well-trained teachers they have supplied from time to time. It will be known to many, that of such institutions there are thirteen existing for male and sixteen for female teachers; these colleges, though receiving assistance from Government grants, yet continue to be maintained very largely out of Church funds. The action of the State, in withdrawing its official inspection in religious subjects, has thrown upon the Church a further responsibility which has been readily accepted. The Church schools in every Diocese are now voluntarily placed under the supervision of experienced inspectors, who, acting with the authority of the Bishop, systematically overlook the religious instruction. This provision has been universally ac-

cepted, and in several instances the managers of Board Schools have applied for the services of the Diocesan Inspector.[1]

The Diocesan Boards contribute the sum of at least £15,000 annually towards the maintenance of the Inspectors, and in many cases receive large supplementary contributions from the National Society. The work of this Society is far too widely known and valued to need any commendation. Its wise and energetic administration has laid the Church under a deep and lasting obligation.

The adoption of the principle involved in the mere secular training of the young has naturally thrown an increased burden and responsibility upon the Sunday-school system, and it is clear that we shall have very largely to rely upon this agency in the future for the maintenance of religious education of the children. Great as the debt is which we owe to the work of Sunday-schools, it is generally allowed that they are very far from reaching the standard of efficiency which is needful to enable them to exercise the influence that they should and must do throughout the Church. To render them equal to our present necessities, much more to the demands which will surely be made upon them in the future, it is obvious that every effort must be made to ensure a largely increased staff of Sunday-school teachers, and above all to raise the intellectual standard of their teaching.

The Church of England Sunday-School Institute has rendered invaluable service in both directions; the work of this Society in continually organizing meetings of a devotional character, and conferences for the mutual interchange of thought, has unquestionably done much not only to give encouragement to those already occupied in teaching, but to awaken a desire in the hearts of many more to devote themselves to this work. Very material assistance has been given in raising the intellectual standard of Sunday-school teaching generally, by the model lessons and examinations held under the direction of the Institute Committee. These examinations are held annually under the sanction of the Archbishops, and they have received more or less encouragement from nearly every Diocese. From intimate acquaintance with the results achieved, we are assured they have exerted a very direct and permanent influence.

Great as is the help which has been rendered by the Sunday-School Institute, it is yet evident that the Sunday-school system must receive its strength primarily from diocesan organization.

[1] The practical working of this department of our educational machinery is represented in tabular form in the "Official Year Book" of 1884, p. 163.

The Church in each diocese must, in other words, see that the Sunday-school is effectively fulfilling its proper functions. This necessity has been recognised in the Dioceses of Ely, Chichester, Carlisle, Lincoln, St. Albans, Peterborough, and Truro. In each case a committee has been appointed at the instance of the Diocesan Conference, and is more or less giving encouragement to the Sunday-school work.[1]

In the case of other Dioceses, Sunday-school teachers have been invited to attend examinations arranged by the Diocesan Boards of Education. Thus it is evident that this subject is occupying the watchful consideration of the Church, and that practical methods are being employed to enable the Sunday-schools of the country to fulfil with power and intelligence their own peculiar functions.

The necessity of a much wider development of the provisions made by the Church for the education of the middle classes, is now prominently under consideration. The subject has been discussed in many Diocesan Conferences during the past few years, and in every case there has been a unanimous approval of the claims upon the Church, to extend the existing institutions for advancing education upon distinctive Church principles among the children of the middle classes. It is well known that several efforts have been made in this direction with more or less success. The schools which owe their origin primarily to the efforts of Canon Woodard have already done extensive service. An organization under the direction of Canon Holland is labouring to provide an education for girls, based upon the teaching of the Church of England. It is proposed, with a like object in view, to erect one or more schools in memory of the honoured and useful life of the late Dean Close; and the Dean of Canterbury has lately founded the South-Eastern College at Ramsgate. In the hope of giving a very large increase and responding still more effectually to the want so widely felt, the Church Schools Company has recently been formed, and in the two years of its existence has given proof not only of the growing necessity for its work, but of its practical power to fulfil it. Already through the efforts of the Council, several schools have been opened, and have received very encouraging support.

In drawing this paper to its close,[2] it is natural to admit

---

[1] In Ely such an organization has certainly shewn its vitality, and has rendered very valuable service in giving greater prominence to the importance of this branch of Church-work. Under the direction of this Committee a Triennial Festival for the Clergy and Teachers of the Diocese is held in the cathedral, and the very large number attending have undoubtedly given an impulse that has made itself very widely felt.

[2] The first portion of the paper appeared in the June CHURCHMAN.

that, traversing over so wide a range, the sketch which has been given must be regarded as more or less imperfect. Many indications of the growth of the Church could not within the allowed limits be touched upon, as, for instance, the development of the Home and Foreign Episcopate—the wider opportunity afforded for mutual counsel between clergy and laity upon matters affecting the position of the National Church and her increased usefulness. There is now but one Diocese which has not its Diocesan Conference; and the Central Council has already shown its power to awaken enthusiasm and to remove some existing difficulties in the way of Church progress by its thoughtful discussions and practical suggestions. Again; the Church Congress, which has lived twenty-four years, by the large and influential character of its meetings, is a living witness not only to the renewed and awakened life of the Church, but to a greater willingness to sink "party" differences in an earnest desire to encompass the common good. The recent proposal of the Archbishop of Canterbury to form a House of Laymen, in connection with Convocation, is another indication of the readiness to invite the laity to take part in the councils and administrations of the Church.

The records of the Church's progress in the Foreign Mission field have not come within the scope of this paper, but by reference to the "Official Year-Book," pp. 197-273, those who desire such information may be able to form a very accurate idea of the work of the Church abroad from the short reports furnished by the Colonial Bishops and the official summaries of the Foreign Missionary Societies.

In endeavouring to form an estimate of Church life and progress, it should be remembered that by no human standard is it possible to gauge the secret and deeper work which God is ever carrying on in the souls of men through the appointed ministry: this will best be seen and known in the light of the future. Meanwhile we may rejoice to see all around us in the multiplied energy of the Church and practical methods for bringing the great masses of our people under the blessing of God's saving mercy and love, so much to strengthen the conviction that the life-giving Spirit is in the midst of us, and that God in a very powerful and visible way is making the Church of England the instrument of communicating His life and light to the world.

ART. II.—CURIOSITIES OF CLERICAL EXPERIENCE.

IV.

THE man who has seen better days, and who, from whatever cause, has come down in the world, frequently becomes morbid, if not soured in his disposition. He retains the delicate susceptibilities of a gentleman, and, notwithstanding his reduced circumstances, he unconsciously exhibits in his conduct and conversation those little niceties which are so agreeable to every well-bred man. Once a gentleman, always a gentleman. Whatever such a man may be in the substance of his character, he very seldom loses that habit of mind which makes all the difference between vulgarity and refinement. When Marie Antoinette swept the floor of the dungeon where the low-bred radicalism of an upstart race of politicians had confined her, she betrayed the queen even when employed in such unaccustomed drudgery. No amount of wealth will ever make a gentleman except in name. No rank, however exalted, to which any person may be raised through the force of circumstances can ever impart that easy, well-bred air of courtesy which consists in a kind consideration for the feelings of others. A man may be poor, and yet have self-respect. He may be rich, and yet be deficient in it.

The Irish peasant of the olden time, before the rise of that revolutionary movement which has of late years swept over the country, possessed intuitively those qualities which enter so largely into the element of politeness. There are still to be found, in that island, old men who, in spite of all the disadvantages under which they labour from the perverted ingenuity of unprincipled demagogues, retain the habits of thought which inspired their early life. They are the gentlemen of Nature—a fact to which every stranger who has ever visited those shores has almost universally borne witness. The French peasant is also, in his way, polite; but it is a formal process. He will take off his hat to a lady if he should happen to pass her on a common stair, or in a narrow pathway. The Irish peasant, however, will put himself to personal inconvenience to oblige you; he will go out of his way to do you a service.

The true gentleman will not be influenced by the social position of the person to whom he extends an act of courtesy. He will stop in the street to help the poor apple-woman to pick up her scattered fruit, simply because she is a woman, and not because she is a beauty, or a wit, or possessed of a fortune. In a word, the man endowed with the gentlemanly temperament will, at all times and in every place, show attention to rich and poor alike, regardless of social distinctions.

Such men are, generally, of a sensitive and retiring disposition. They are always ready, in little things as well as in great things, to be attentive to the wants of others, just because it is their nature to do so. There are men, and women too, in high life whose vulgarity is manifest; and there are persons in humble life whose habit of politeness and obliging good-nature is equally manifest, and is exercised unconsciously just because it is a habit. Their very looks betray them. On their tongues is "the law of kindness." There is nothing artificial, nothing hollow-hearted in their manner. In all ranks of life such men and women are to be found. High and low, rich and poor, furnish examples of them. The following narrative presents a notable instance of one who, having been born in easy circumstances, and brought up amid all the surroundings of wealth, was, in middle life, reduced to very straitened circumstances, unhappily by his own misconduct.

One day, when visiting at a small house in a side-street in a London parish, the landlady informed me that there was a lodger upstairs who had recently taken a room "on the top floor back." She was sure "he was a gentleman, although he seemed to be very hard up." There was an air of quiet self-possession about him which convinced her that "he was not a butler out of place." Having ascertained the hour when he was likely to be at home, I called on him a few days afterwards. Having sent up my card, I waited in the hall to see if he cared to see me. In a few minutes he came down, and having satisfied himself that I was one of the parochial clergy, he invited me up to what he called "his den." When we were quite alone he thanked me for having visited him, presuming that he was indebted for the pleasure of seeing me to his landlady for making his name known to me.

What particularly struck me was his quiet self-possession, and the absence of anything like an apology for his asking me into the only room he possessed—partly a sitting-room, and partly a bedroom. His manner was easy and pleasant. We conversed on the general topics of the day, and after about fifteen minutes I took leave of him, expressing a hope that he would do me the favour of calling on me at his convenience. Next day I received the following note:

DEAR SIR,

Pray allow me to thank you for your obliging courtesy in visiting me yesterday. You were good enough to ask me to call upon you, and it would give me much pleasure to do so. But I hope you will pardon me for my frankness if I ask you to be kind enough to excuse me. The fact is, I came here hoping that I might be enabled to live in perfect retirement. Owing to the good-natured weakness of my landlady in mentioning my name, you did me the honour of calling, for which I am exceedingly obliged. But my circumstances having undergone a very great

change, it suits me, in my present condition, to lead the life of a recluse—unknowing and unknown. At the same time, I shall be always very glad to see you, if you will be so good as to call, whenever you may find a spare moment to look in upon me.

I am, dear sir,
Yours very faithfully,
JOHN D——.

A week elapsed before I again saw Mr. D——, and, in order to make sure of finding him at home, I wrote a short note to know if it would be quite convenient for him to see me if I were to call at a time appointed. Being assured of the fact, I paid him my second visit. On this occasion we became better acquainted with each other, and we succeeded to some extent in overcoming that natural estrangement which, from our cold and formal usages of society, has become a fixed habit in the ordinary intercourse between strangers. Finding that my new acquaintance possessed two pre-eminent traits of a well-bred man—never speaking of himself, and never asking questions—I confined my remarks, as before, to things in general. Whether fortunately or unfortunately, I never had the gift of introducing religion mechanically when placed in such circumstances, so far as to make a personal appeal to a man of such an exquisitely sensitive nature as that of Mr. D——. The religious influence which one man exercises upon another may be considered from two points of view. It may be considered as it is *the effect of an endeavour*, or as it is *the result of observation;* in other words, as it flows from what the one man *says*, or as it arises from what the other man *sees*. To make a direct and personal appeal to a man of gentlemanly susceptibilities in order to ascertain what may be his spiritual condition may have the effect of completely putting an end to all further interviews. A shy and reserved man might resent such a liberty. Besides, we are all to some extent transparent, easily seen through, and those whom we visit judge of us more by the unconscious influence of our whole man and manner than by any conventional talking about religion. The electricity of the human face and voice has a wonderful effect in the delineation of character. If "the fruits of the Spirit" be shed abroad in a man's heart, we may be sure they will mingle with his thoughts and feelings, and produce a far deeper and a more permanent impression upon the minds of those who hear him, than if he were to open fire upon them with some abrupt and personal questions, which, however well intended, may fall very far short of the desired mark. Consideration for the feelings of others is one of the first evidences of the faith which inspires a man's daily life. Where that is the moving power in a clergyman's dealings with his parishioners, there

will be no lack of opportunity for a direct attempt to stir up their minds "by way of remembrance."

With regard to my interviews with Mr. D——, I am perfectly satisfied that, had I begun by asking him, "Are you saved, sir?"—a question which well-meaning and piously-disposed persons sometimes put to comparative strangers—he would have politely declined to give any definite reply to such a query. I did not obtrude upon his individualism in such a personal way, and the consequence was that he gradually became more and more confiding, and in the end he gave me the history of the vicissitudes of his life, which was both interesting and instructive.

His income was exactly £80 a year—a miserable pittance for one who once had been in the possession of ample means. And yet, on that modest allowance, he lived like a gentleman, for he paid his way as he went along, and never got into debt. One day, when we were chatting together upon the difference between the popularity which money, or the want of it, gains for a man from the world, he suddenly stopped short, and said, with an evident allusion to his own experience: "When you pay away your last shilling, and don't know where you are going to get another till you work for it, you cannot help being a little bit anxious as regards the morrow."

"Surely you never have had to work for your living?"

"Indeed! is that your idea of my career in the past? I can tell you that many a long weary day, and often through many a sleepless night, I have worked with my pen to try to eke out a precarious subsistence in the undignified occupation of a penny-a-liner."

"For the newspapers, do you mean?"

"No; as a copying clerk. I used to 'devil' for a fellow who paid me a penny for every seventy-two words, for which he was paid three-ha'pence, and right glad I was to have the job to do."

"How, may I ask, if you will not think me rude in asking, do you now manage?"

"Ah! thereby hangs a tale; but it would take me too long to tell you all. If you care to hear it, I shall be glad to let you know some other time, only I fear to incur the risk of becoming a bore. Has it ever occurred to you to ask what rules the world? Kings? Emperors? the powers that be? Are those the sources of human energy? Nothing of the sort. The power that rules the world is what the author of the French play, known as 'Les Pauvres de Paris,' has expressed it, '*C'est le Biftek*,' in plain English—the beefsteak. That, sir, is the ruler of mankind. Individual effort to 'keep body and soul together' is the propelling power that keeps the world in

motion. Why, there are men in London alone whose efforts are so absorbed in the mere struggle for existence, that they have neither time nor thought for anything else. What is it to me who sways the destiny of the nation, if the dire necessity of earning my bread keeps me in a perpetual state of pre-occupation? The boatman who rowed the King across the river on the morning of the battle, ventured to express his earnest hopes for the success of his Majesty in the fight. The King's answer was not only a practical suggestion, but it conveyed, in playful irony, a piece of genuine philosophy. He said, 'Thank you—thank you, my man, but, success or no success, you shall be a ferry-man still.' Exactly so. Let kings and queens rule as they please, the great bulk of the people have to earn their daily bread in the best way they can. They have to be hewers of wood and drawers of water."

"But you are not working for your livelihood at the present?"

"No; I enjoy—shall I say?—an annuity purchased for me by a near relative, whose benevolent intentions were mainly directed to save the family prestige from scandal. It would never do to have me in the workhouse, while my rich relations were moving in the best society. Here, in an obscure lodging, I am out of their way, and can be no cause of offence to any of them. It was not without a pang that I was obliged to accept this arrangement, for I was incapacitated from work in consequence of having been afflicted with what is called 'Scrivener's paralysis.' My hand became disabled for further work, and there was nothing left for me but the pauper's last resource. But I must not weary you with my troubles. Everyone has his own, and I shrink from airing mine. Every stove should consume its own smoke; every man should keep his troubles to himself."

Having expressed a strong desire to know the whole story of his chequered life, he kindly consented, when next we met, to give me the principal outlines of it. They were a curious mixture of light and shade, smiles and tears, trials and triumphs.

The first false step he made was an improvident marriage. He committed the unpardonable offence, from a social point of view, of marrying below his station in life. A young and pretty milliner's daughter engaged his affection, and, in spite of every remonstrance from parents, relatives and friends, he resolved to have his own way—and he had it. He was just twenty-two years of age, and she in the bloom of sweet seventeen. She was "all his fancy painted her," and, by the artistic and judicious aid of dress, with all its mysterious fol-de-rols and fiz-gigs, she managed, according to his account, to make her personal attractions, which seem to have been considerable, too bewitching for the inexperience of

her young and ardent admirer. They were married quite privately, no one being present except her mother and two sisters on her side, and a college friend who acted as his best-man. His description of the wedding and all its details were curiously suggestive of the anomalous mixture of incongruities. He walked to the church, attended by his friend. She did the same, in company with her mother and sisters. After the ceremony, they retreated in the same order; his wife to her home with her mother, and he to his temporary lodgings taken for the occasion, so as to comply with the marriage law of residence. In the afternoon they met by appointment at the railway station, the starting-point for their wedding-trip to the Continent.

Everything went on smoothly for the first six or seven weeks, about which time differences of opinion arising from differences of taste began to set in.

Their first quarrel arose from a strongly expressed desire on the lady's part not to go back to England until she had seen more of the gay life of the French capital. He pleaded a return home, but to no purpose. His wife had a will of her own, and she was determined to exercise it. For peace' sake he gave in. But from time to time he noticed that sundry parcels were making their appearance, and that a corresponding demand was made upon his purse. Her acquired taste in the article of dress had ample scope in the metropolis of fashion. In fact, it was here that the young lady's trousseau was being elaborately prepared—an omission on her mother's part for which plausible excuses were not wanting. At length he found that he had to pay more than £150 for what should have been the bridal costume under more favourable auspices. He was devotedly attached to his wife, and though he demurred to her increasing love of finery which was being every day gradually augmented by indulgence, still he humoured her to the top of her bent, and paid "willingly, though with an unwilling mind,' for all the freaks of folly which this young aspirant after the newest fashions had so thoughtlessly forced upon him.

"Well," he said, as he was recounting this episode in his early married life, "I could have borne all this had my wife been only fairly disposed to be guided by my advice in her general conduct and deportment. At dinner I was terribly shocked by her utter want of manners. My good advice, when alone, was met by ill-tempered remarks, so that I was unable to be of any practical benefit to her in the matter of social etiquette. Gradually the period of disenchantment arrived. At the end of six months my daily life became almost insupportable in consequence of the extravagant habits

and the vulgar frivolity of my wife. Things were every day approaching a crisis which at length decided my course of action. I told her that I had been long enough abroad, and that if she would not return with me, I should go away without her."

"'As you like,' was her arrogant reply. 'I will not return to country life in England; but we can live in London.'"

Mr. D—— agreed to this proposal, and they left Paris the next day.

"The story of my subsequent life for five years," he continued, "may be briefly summed up in these words: My wife's tastes were so dissimilar to mine that we could not get along for hardly a single day without unpleasant scenes. One fine morning, to my surprise, she bolted from my house, taking with her our only child, a little daughter, of four years of age. My child I recovered, but her mother I have never seen since. The last I heard of her was that she had gone to Australia. She wrote me one letter, which speaks for itself:

"You will, I fear, be pained at my going away. But there was no other course open to me. I felt that we could not hit it off. We do not think alike on anything, and for your sake, as for my own, we are better apart. You were kind and indulgent to me, too much perhaps. Farewell—kiss Julia for her mother's sake, and try to think of me as favourably as you can."

"That was a lesson to me as to the egregious folly of a man marrying a woman whose social position is so inferior to his own. This ill-assorted alliance seriously marred my prospects, apart from having cut me off from my family. I had then about £1,200 a year, an ample income for myself and child. It was an allowance from my father, dependent solely on his good pleasure. To his eternal credit be it said, that though I nearly broke his heart by my wilful disobedience, he still continued his allowance by leaving me in the undisturbed enjoyment of my income till his death, an event which took place soon after. By his will he left everything he was possessed of to my mother for her life, with remainder to my two nieces, charging his property with £500 a year for me during life."

The sequel is soon told. Mr. D—— was induced to mortgage his annuity of £500, and with the capital thus realized he invested in railway stock. Gradually his investments, not by any means judiciously laid out, melted away a good portion of his ready money. His private expenses exceeded his regular income, and as he had recourse to his capital to supply any deficiency, he soon found himself in a position of hopeless entanglement in his pecuniary affairs.[1] The time at last came

[1] *Fortunately his daughter was carefully educated and cared for by a maiden aunt whose means were limited.*

when he parted literally with his last shilling—the fact to which he had so feelingly alluded in the quotation already given.

When narrating this portion of his life, he said: "I had now two courses before me, and so far as I could see, two only—the workhouse, or death. I would not beg, and I could not work. I knew no handicraft. I was unable to handle the pen of a ready writer. There was nothing left for me to choose except genteel starvation or the pauper's home—the first the more acceptable to me if only I could die without it being known. Did you ever," said Mr. D——, "know what it is to be hungry—*very* hungry—without as much as one penny in your pocket to buy bread with? Ah! that is an experience which, for a gentleman born in affluence, and brought up in luxury, is terrible. To pass by shops in every street with bread enough and to spare, and you perishing with hunger, because you cannot descend so low in the scale of degradation as to go in and beg for a morsel of food, that is something more depressing than I can describe. If I could only have died from natural causes, I felt that I could thank God for allowing me to depart in peace. The idea that I was doomed to live on in this world through summer after summer with its wealth of flowers, and winter after winter with its frosts and snows, while I was to be the inmate of a workhouse, drove me almost mad."

"But why did you not make known the actual facts of the case to your relatives, as the last plank after shipwreck. Surely there was a third course which you might have tried before you courted the approach of death, or resigned yourself to the workhouse?"

"They had all cast me off because of my improvident marriage; and there is something in a very sensitive nature that will not allow a man to knock under, or place himself in the position of being reminded that he is the fulfilment of the prophetic warnings of his indignant relatives. When a man is on his last legs, in despair, utterly smashed up, and not knowing what to do, or where to look for a generous hand or feeling heart, to be told that you brought it all upon yourself—that is the last ounce that breaks the camel's back. This is the style of thing: 'Well, you know, I told you from the first that ruin would overtake you; and you now see that I spoke the truth. You would take no advice, listen to no word of warning; you were determined to take your own course, and you see the end of it. You made your own bed, and with your own hands put the thorns into it. You can blame no one but yourself if you find it an uneasy couch.'

"That is cold comfort, is it not? How could I, then, apply to them? A waif and stray, I was illustrating, according to the sombre reproaches of my friends, the very principle

which was bound up with cause and effect, both in the natural and moral worlds. No doubt about it. My friends told me that it was good for me to be afflicted; a truth that my inner conscience could corroborate, and which no one knew better than myself."

"Finding myself cast adrift," continued Mr. D——, "I took up the advertisement-sheet of the *Times*. and carefully read up every case in which some one was wanted to do something or other. At last I hit upon one which required the services of a gentleman to read to a blind man two hours a day; references of character and position required: personal application only would be attended to. I called and saw the blind man; there was a female relative with him. She was one of those hard, angular type of women, tall, austere, and ungenial. She wore spectacles. She had a head-gear of faultless whiteness, the cap itself being kept in position by means of strings which met under the chin. Everything was correct, very much so. Her dress was the essence of neatness: colour, dark grey; texture, some sort of compromise between wool and goat's hair. She let me know that she was doing the faithfully severe task of choosing 'a gentleman' as companion for her nephew, as the blind man turned out to be. Evidently she looked upon me with suspicion, from the very fact that being, or supposed to be, a gentleman, I was ready to accept the subordinate position of reader to her nephew for the modest remuneration of five shillings a day, which was rendered more tempting from the fact that it was to be paid with undeviating punctuality on every occasion of my visit. This was done with an eye to business and economy. There would be no necessity to give me a week's notice if necessary. All that was required was an appointment from day to day. My antecedents were asked for, my present mode of life, my connections, and so forth. I replied with courteous caution; and I fancy that on one occasion the grim visage of the blind man's guardian slightly relaxed into an abortive smile. It was when I said, in reply to some home-thrusts as to whether I was married or single, and, if married, what family, when I said that I had been married, but was now living as a bachelor in private apartments, had one daughter provided for by an aunt, in whose care she had been for some years. Then it was that Minerva—for that was the soubriquet I gave the lady—exhibited just a shade of feeling, but in what direction it was impossible for me to say. All I know is that out of twenty-seven candidates I was selected."

"It would form an amusing narrative," continued Mr. D——, "if I were to tell you my literary experience with this blind man. I need only add that I retained this lucrative position

for two years and a half.[1] The lady's brother was a solicitor, and through his influence I was introduced to some of the law-scriveners who helped me to earn something by copying legal documents, as I have already mentioned to you. At last I was obliged to give up this source of earning my bread. A friend of the family who knew the facts wrote to my relatives, and put my case before them. The result was that they agreed to allow me eighty pounds a year, on which I strive hard, and only by very judicious management, to keep on my legs. These are the general outlines of my story—dark enough, you will say."

Mr. D—— had learned, by bitter experience, how one false step in early life sometimes renders it impossible for a man to regain his lost ground. There are few things which give a greater shock to family pride than a mésalliance in the way of marriage. The male portion of the family get over it easily enough after a time, though they never perhaps have the same cordiality for the offender as before. But the female side of the household rarely forgive. It is looked upon by them almost in the light of a crime. It is well known that a man will be received into the best society by "high-born ladies," and flattered—if he be worth flattery—though they know right well that their honoured guest is leading a life very far below the ordinary standard of propriety. But if the man marries beneath him, many are apt to regard his conduct as an outrage against good-breeding. True nobility, however, resides in the soul, and though, unquestionably, rank and position are very great advantages, it is a mistake to look down upon those not "born in the purple," as if the temperament of the true gentleman or gentlewoman were limited to the upper ten thousand. There is no monopoly in the matter of courtesy, and wherever it is real, no matter in what condition of life, the possessor of it, man or woman, will always make their kindly influence felt among all with whom they come into contact in the ordinary concerns of life.

In some respects, no doubt, Society is false and hollow; but in other respects it is the embodiment of the inherited good sense of our predecessors, who, by practical tests, have handed down to us the result of their matured experience.

The moral of Mr. D——'s failure in life suggests a useful warning. The young man of good family who marries a woman whose neglected education and vulgar surroundings unfit her for maintaining her proper position in society is very

[1] In reply to the question: "How came you to leave the blind man?" Mr. D—— said: "Because my opinion frequently differed from the lady guardian's. This divergence of interpretation evidently annoyed her, because she was not in the habit of being contradicted."

likely to entail a lifelong disappointment upon himself, while he runs the risk of imperilling the happiness of his wife. Whatever is not according to the fitness of things is seldom attended with happy results. There are unwritten laws in the social as well as in the natural world, whose operation is fixed and uniform. Whenever these laws are wantonly violated, we are made to feel, by bitter experience, that our sowing and our reaping are in relative proportions. No one can defiantly turn his back on the sacred sanctities of "home" and "father" without being made to realize, in bitterness of spirit, that our very delusions are often chosen by an over-ruling Providence to be our worst tormentors. "The stars in their courses" fight against those who wilfully disregard the loving counsel and the delegated authority of home-rule. Intolerance of control, and an imperious disdain of those whose faithfulness and devotion to our best interests entitle them to our respectful and loyal obedience, seldom go unpunished. Sooner or later they draw down upon the transgressor a penalty commensurate with the offence. The outer world may not see how the righteous reaction of retributive Providence recoils upon the sinner's head. Appearances are very deceptive: men are not what they seem. In the brilliant homes of splendour, as well as in the humblest hovels of the poor, there are individuals, in the former case, supremely miserable, and, in the latter, perfectly content. Conscience is the moral regulator of our lives until it has become entirely seared. Its accusing, or else excusing, verdict is heard in secret, and as such is known only to the individual himself. Memory is a faithful witness, and the best book-keeper on earth. Its records are written by a hand whose characters are indelible; and they supply to the reckless, the wayward, and the self-willed a sorrowful retrospect of wasted opportunities and blighted hopes. This, and no more, was the history and character of the subject of our sketch. He determined to follow his own way, and to carry out his own devices. Being "wise in his own conceits," he considered that he was the best judge of his own affairs. He wilfuly disobeyed his father; he married a worthless and vulgar, but a very attractive woman; and he squandered or muddled away his money until he was reduced to his last shilling, after which he had ample time for leisurely but unavailing regret.

G. W. WELDON.

ART. III.—THE EASTWARD POSITION

OPPOSED TO THE GENERAL USAGE OF THREE HUNDRED YEARS, AND AT VARIANCE WITH THE RUBRIC OF 1662, WHICH DIRECTS THE MINISTER TO BREAK THE BREAD BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

THIS question has been recently brought again into prominence by the action of Dr. Stubbs, the new Bishop of Chester, who, against the wish and practice of the Dean of Chester, has adopted the Eastward position in the cathedral whilst reading the Prayer of Consecration.

The question is asked, Has not the Bishop of Chester the same right to adopt the *Eastward position* in Chester Cathedral, though in opposition to the practice of the Dean, as another Bishop has to adopt the *North-side* position in a cathedral where the Dean uses the *Eastward* position? Whilst it must be admitted that since the Ridsdale Judgment gave, on certain conditions, legal sanction to the Eastward position, the Bishop of Chester, so long as he is careful to observe the specified conditions, is acting within his legal rights; yet a little reflection will show that there is a wide difference between the two cases.

The Eastward position, says the Bishop of St. Andrews, since 1662, has been unknown in any one of our cathedrals. "It is certain," he says,[1] "that *before* the Reformation the Eastward position was the invariable use *in them all;* and it is no less certain that *since* the Reformation the use of the North-end position has been in them *equally universal;* and it is so still, except that, of late years, in *three or four cathedrals*, the Eastward position has been partially introduced." He states, in the following words, the reason for the change:

> At the Reformation, the Mass, with its doctrine of Sacrifice and Adoration, was given up, and Holy Communion introduced. *Nothing else will account for the universal disuse of the position formerly used.* The change, therefore, was made on principle.

Can it therefore be maintained that one Bishop has the same right to *restore* a practice of doctrinal significance, unknown for two, if not for three hundred years, as another Bishop has for declining to comply with a modern innovation—an innovation which is associated with a doctrine that was discarded at the time the practice was changed? Moreover, the tribunal which gave *conditional* sanction to the Eastward position, at

[1] Letter to Mr. Beresford Hope.

the same time declared that the North-side position "is not only lawful, but is that which would, under ordinary circumstances, enable the minister, with the greatest certainty and convenience, to fulfil the requirements of all the rubrics."

There are, then, clearly marked and important differences between the case of a Bishop who, against the known wish of the Dean, restores a practice which three hundred years ago was discarded by the whole Church of England, because of its association with a doctrine which our Church at that time deliberately rejected, and that of another Bishop who adheres to the usage of three hundred years in a cathedral where that usage has been but recently set aside. Not only is there a marked difference in the two cases, but it is difficult to conceive how anyone can allege that there is any real similarity between them. Bishop Stubbs, by conforming, in deference to the wish of the Dean, to the usage of Chester Cathedral, would not thereby deny the doctrine which is supposed to be symbolized by the Eastward position; but the Bishop who adopts it gives countenance to a doctrine which the Church of England rejected at the time she abandoned the Eastward position. The one act is *negative*, whilst the other is *positive;* the one does not necessarily involve the denial of a doctrine, but the other is avowedly used to symbolize a doctrine; the one is likely to frustrate the chief design of the rubric, viz., to enable the minister "with the more readiness and decency to break the bread before the people," etc., whilst the other, as already stated on the authority of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, enables him "with the greatest certainty and convenience, to fulfil the requirements of all the rubrics."

It will no doubt be said in reply to these statements, that they are founded on assumptions which should not be made without strong and clear evidence.

Is it, then, a fact that the Eastward position was abandoned at the Reformation, and that the North-side position was, for three hundred years, recognised by men of all parties in the Church as the one required by the Prayer Book? Is it equally clear that at the time the Eastward position was susperseded by the North-side position, the doctrine of the Mass was expunged from our formularies, and that, with the restoration of the Eastward position in our own times, there has been reintroduced a doctrine in *some* of our churches hardly distinguishable from the Romish doctrine of the Mass?

It will be found interesting and instructive to consider this question in the light of history. We ask, therefore:

(1) Was the Eastward position abandoned at the Reformation in consequence of changes made in the rubrics of our Prayer Book?

(2) Was the rubric introduced in 1662, which *precedes* the Prayer of Consecration, intended *to authorize* the Eastward position while reading that prayer?

I. In the Prayer Book of 1549, the words, "The priest standing humbly *afore the midst of the Altar*, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect," were superseded in 1552 by the following rubric:

> The Table having at the Communion-time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the priest, standing at *the North side of the table*, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with the Collect following.

Here no one can fail to observe that "*the Altar*" has given place to "*the Table*;" and "the priest standing humbly afore the midst of the altar," has given place to his "standing *at the north side* of the table." From 1552, when this important change was made, up to within the last few years, except during the short reign of Queen Mary, the recognised position of the minister when reading the Communion Service, including the Prayer of Consecration, has been on the North side of the table. Bishop Wordsworth of St. Andrews, who has made this subject his special study, offers the following remarks on the alteration made in the rubric in 1552:

> I consider, as my brother—the present Bishop of Lincoln—does, that the Purchas Judgment, which, if I remember right, forbids *in toto* the Eastward position, is simply the true one, notwithstanding the bold assertion of Canon Gregory and others to the contrary. And among other reasons for thinking so, the following appears to me unanswerable: I assume the practice of our twenty-four English cathedrals as giving us the surest rule, because the practice, being not of an individual but of a corporation, is least liable to change. Now it is certain that *before* the Reformation the Eastward position was the invariable use in them all: and it is no less certain that *since* the Reformation the use of the North-end position has been in them equally universal, and is so still, except that of late years in three or four cathedrals the Eastward position has been partially introduced. How did that universal change come about? Because the doctrine was changed. At the Reformation, the Mass, with its doctrine of Sacrifice and Adoration, was given up, and Holy Communion introduced. Nothing else will account for the universal disuse of the position formerly used. The change was therefore made on principle.—(Letter from Bishop Wordsworth of St. Andrews to Mr. Beresford Hope, June 4, 1874.)

There are but few names, if any, of higher authority in the Church of England than the name of Bishop Jewel; and certainly no one knew better than he did what change of practice followed the change made in the rubric of 1552. If the Eastward position was known in our Church in Jewel's day, it is unaccountable that, when speaking of the various superstitions of the Mass, he should ask, "What Father or Doctor taught us that Christ's body is in a hundred thousand places at once?

that the priest should hold the bread over his head, *and turn his back to the people?*"

Among the charges brought against Archbishop Laud in 1640, by the Scottish Commissioners, was that through the Scottish Liturgy, for which he was held to be mainly responsible, the minister was allowed, "without warrant of the Book of England," to go "from the north end of the table," and "stand during the time of Consecration with his hinder parts to the people." To this charge the Archbishop replied: "Truly, this charge is, as it seems, no great matter. And yet here again they are offended that this is done without warrant of the Book of England. How comes this Book of England to be so much in their esteem, that nothing must be done without warrant from it?" In the charge it is distinctly affirmed, and in the Archbishop's answer it is clearly implied, that for the minister to leave the North of the table, and read the prayer of Consecration with his back to the people, was without warrant of the English Book of Common Prayer. This is further confirmed by the fact named by Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews, in his letter to Mr. Beresford Hope: "My brother (the Bishop of Lincoln) notices the engraving which Laud's bitter enemy, William Prynne, published in 1644, of the arrangements of the Archbishop's chapel, where the cushion for the celebrant is placed at the North end of the table."

That this was the recognised practice according to the Prayer Book, from the change of the rubric in 1552, previous to its last revision in 1662, we have the most conclusive evidence in Hanson L'Estrange's "Alliance of Divine Offices," first published in 1659:

> As for the priest standing at the north side of the table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion of the priest's standing with his face towards the east, as is the popish practice. So the MS. collections of a learned man.—("Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology," p. 245.)

Now if we look at the change made in the rubric in 1552; if we weigh the words of Bishop Jewel written some years afterwards; if we consider the charge brought against Archbishop Laud, and his reply to that charge; and if we further notice the statement of L'Estrange, written in 1659, that the Church of England had directed the priest to stand on the North of the table, to avoid the popish practice; can there be any room for doubt as to the teaching and practice of the Church of England between 1552 to 1662?

II. "Standing *before the table.*" Many will admit that the minister's *normal* position during the Communion Service is on the North side of the table, but they plead that during the Prayer of Consecration he is to stand before the table; and in

support of their contention they adduce the rubric which precedes that prayer. The rubric runs thus: "When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth." Are the words "*standing before the table*" to be associated with the direction "*he shall say the Prayer of Consecration,*" or with the words "*hath so ordered the bread and wine*"? When we find Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Morton Shaw, Canon Malcolm MacColl, Canon Gregory, Bishop Jenner and others, supporting the first construction of the rubric, and when we see the late Professor Blunt, the late Canon Selwyn, Canon Swainson, Dean Howson, Bishop Wordsworth, and a host of authorities supporting the second, it seems obvious that, if we have regard to the grammatical construction only, the rubric is susceptible of both interpretations. If the rubric had said that the minister, while "*standing before the table,*" "shall say the Prayer of Consecration," the Eastward position would be clearly established. But by the other construction of the rubric, the minister is instructed to stand before the table while ordering the bread and wine; and having done this, he is afterwards so to stand as to enable him "with the more readiness and decency to break the bread before the people" while saying the Prayer of Consecration. Now which of the two interpretations enables the minister to do what the rubric requires? If he interposes his body between the people and the elements, *how can he possibly "break the bread before the people"?* But if, having ordered the bread and wine while standing before the table, he then returns to his normal position, viz., the North side, as directed by the fourth rubric in the Communion Service, he can there break the bread before the people while saying the Prayer of Consecration. This interpretation gives consistency to the whole rubric, and is in harmony with all but the universal practice and explanations given by Church authorities for nearly two hundred years.

Let us notice the circumstances under which this rubric was framed. It was inserted in the Prayer Book at the last revision in 1662. The late Canon Selwyn, in his letter to the Dean of York, drew attention to the following points, which have an important bearing upon this rubric. At the Savoy Conference (May, 1661), the Presbyterian divines proposed (as part of their Reformed Liturgy), "Then let the minister take the bread and break it in sight of the people;" and again they complained in their exceptions to various parts of the Liturgy, "that the manner of consecration of the elements is not here explicit and distinct enough, and the minister's breaking of

bread is not so much as mentioned" Later in the year the Prayer Book was revised, and the rubric under discussion was added, together with the marginal rubrics to the Consecration Prayer; among which are the following: "*And here to break the bread;*" "*And here to lay his hand upon all the bread;*" "*And here to lay his hand upon every vessel,*" etc. Having cited these and some other particulars, Canon Selwyn asks:

Is it not, then, very clear that this rubric was intended to prepare for the solemn commemorative act of breaking the bread, and blessing the cup, that it might be done with the more readiness and decency before the people?

And does not "*before the people*" mean the same as "*in the sight of the people,*" as proposed by the Presbyterian divines? The Judicial Committee of Privy Council declare this as their opinion.

In a letter which appeared in the *Standard* on the first of October, the subjoined passage was quoted from the Bishop of St. Andrews in support of Dean Howson's statement, that not a single Bishop of Chester had adopted the Eastward position since 1662. Bishop Jenner, in a letter to the *Standard* of October 4th, remarked that he could not see how Dean Howson could prove the correctness of this statement. The Bishop of St. Andrews having been led to inquire into the practice of our cathedrals, wrote thus in 1876:

We may feel perfectly sure that in no one cathedral was the rubric so understood or so acted on from 1662 downwards, *i.e.*, from the time it first appeared in the Prayer Book—*i.e.*, within the last thirty years. This I say in consequence of inquiries which circumstances induced me to make in regard to the Ritual practice of every English cathedral a few years ago.—("Three Conclusive Proofs," Rivington.)

This testimony is all the stronger coming from one who for ten years had more or less previously adopted the Eastward position; but, as the result of careful investigation, had been convinced that the meaning and intention of the rubric have been reflected in the practice of our cathedrals.

Bishop Jenner says he does not see that this proves anything. It certainly proves something; viz., that the investigations of a learned Bishop made him "perfectly sure that in no one cathedral" was the Eastward position adopted from 1662 to within the last forty years. But Bishop Jenner asks for "documentary evidence as regards the practice of Bishops, Deans, and Canons since 1662. One would like to know, *e.g.*, whether Bishop Pearson was a North-ender."

It must be admitted that a separate record has not been kept of the practice of each Bishop, Dean, and Canon in Chester Cathedral since 1662. It is, however, known what was the practice of Bishops Blomfield, Sumner, Graham, and Jacobson; for whatever be the reason why Archbishop Sumner

adopted the Eastward position at Canterbury on the occasion referred to by Bishop Jenner, it is a well-known fact that both at Chester and Canterbury his habitual practice was to read the Prayer of Consecration while standing on the North side of the table. No wonder Bishop Jenner made a note in his diary when, from some unexplained cause, an Evangelical Bishop assumed the Eastward position in his own cathedral, at a time when this "position was not customarily adopted by the Cathedral clergy"! Archbishop Sumner's act on this occasion will strike people as the more surprising when it is remembered that only a few years before Bishop Blomfield had required the British chaplain at Madeira to "*discontinue*" the practice of standing with his back to the congregation during a part of the Communion Service." That an Evangelical Bishop should adopt what had been abolished as "the popish fashion," when a "High-Church" Bishop required one of his clergy to discontinue it, is truly surprising.

But Bishop Jenner "would like to know whether Bishop Pearson was a North-ender." Dr. Pearson became Bishop of Chester in 1672, and died in 1686. In 1674, two years after Bishop Pearson's consecration, a book was published, entitled "A Course of Catechizing, etc." Its contents were "gathered" from Gauden, Andrews, Hall, Taylor, Prideaux, Morton, Hammond, Pearson, etc. In this book we find the following question and answer:

> *Q.* Why doth the priest stand on the North side of the table?
> *A.* To avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the East.

These are the words of a book the teaching of which is "gathered" from Pearson, Andrews, Taylor, Heylin, and other divines. The question raised does not relate to any matter of difference among Churchmen, but solely as one between English Churchmen and Roman Catholics. It assumes, as a matter beyond controversy, that the Church of England had settled that her ministers should be "North-enders" in order "to avoid popish superstition." We have thus clear evidence that at the beginning of Dr. Pearson's episcopate the North side was the "celebrant's position." We have equally clear evidence that this was the minister's recognised position at the close of Bishop Pearson's life. L'Estrange published his book, to which reference has already been made, in 1659, from which it is evident that the North-side position was the only recognised one from 1552 to 1662. Previous to his death, in 1705, his book was reprinted in 1690 and 1699; but his statement, quoted from a learned man, about the minister's position remained the same as before, viz., "as for the priest's standing at the North side of the table, this seemeth to avoid the fashion

of the priest's standing with his face towards the East, as is the popish fashion." The very essence of both these quotations consists in their assuming that the English Church had deliberately adopted the North-side position in opposition to the usage of the Church of Rome. Until some one can produce a note from the diary of a contemporary of Bishop Pearson, that this distinguished prelate adopted what so advanced a Churchman as L'Estrange called in those days "The popish fashion," I think we may fairly conclude from the above evidence, which covers the whole period of Dr. Pearson's episcopate, that his lordship "was a North-ender."

We have seen what was the interpretation placed upon the rubrics relating to the minister's position up to the end of the seventeenth century. The testimony is equally explicit in regard to the early part of the eighteenth century, as passages from Nicholls and Wheatly will abundantly prove.

Dr. Nicholls's "Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, with notes on all the rubrics," was first published in 1710. Having furnished a history of all the changes made in the rubrics from 1552, up to the insertion of this in 1661, which have a bearing upon the minister's position at the table, he proceeds to interpret this rubric. "The Papists," he says,

thought it the best way to screen their pretended miracle from the people's eyes by the intervention of the priest's body. But our Church enjoins the direct contrary, and that for a direct contrary reason. He is to stand before the table, indeed, just so long as he is ordering the bread and wine; but after that he is to go to some place where he is to break the bread before the people, which must be the North side of the table.

Wheatly, who wrote about the same time, gives a similar interpretation, and assigns the same reasons. He says:

It is asked whether the priest is to say the Prayer of Consecration standing before the table, or at the North end of it. I answer at the North end of it. . . . . In the Romish Church, indeed, they always stand BEFORE *the altar during the time of Consecration, in order to prevent the people from being eye-witnesses of their operations in working their pretended miracle. . . . . But our Church, that pretends no such miracle, enjoins, we see, the direct contrary to this, by ordering the priest so to order the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread, and take the cup into his hands before the people.*

It will be seen by those who examine these passages from the works of two eminent "High-Church" Liturgical authorities, that the North-side position had been deliberately adopted by our Church in opposition to the Romish practice. The words are too plain to call for comment.

The secession from our Church of the Non-jurors indirectly supplies additional evidence, if needed, as to the accepted meaning of the rubric in the early part of the eighteenth century. Most of their leading men held high sacramental views,

yet we find the following direction touching the minister's position:

> Note, that wherever in this Office the priest is directed to turn to the altar, or to stand or kneel before it, or with his face towards it, it is always meant that he should stand or kneel on the North side thereof.

It may be said that it does not necessarily follow that this direction was founded on the accepted meaning of our Communion rubrics. A letter of Dr. Brett, who is declared by Canon Malcolm MacColl to have compiled the Non-jurors' Liturgy, makes it quite clear that it was intended in this particular to continue the recognised practice of the Church of England. Dr. Brett says: "In the first place, I desire that the priest may *still* be directed to stand at the North side of the table, and not at the place which we at this time call 'before the table,' that is the West side, with his back to the people." Dean Howson, in the supplement to his admirable, and, as seems to me, unanswerable book, "Before the Table," says: "I must ask attention to the word '*still*' in this passage;" for, from the use of this word, "it is evident that this was at that time the prescribed and customary position in the Church of England."

Coming down a few years later still, we have the testimony of Archdeacon Yardley, who, even in our day, would be called a very High Churchman. In his book, first published in 1728, on some of the offices, under the head, "The Rational Communicant," he writes thus:

> He (the minister) doth not stand before the altar as the Romish priests do; nor like them pronounce the words with a low voice, to countenance their pretended miracle of transubstantiation. . . . . But the priest in the Church of England says the prayer with an *audible* voice . . . and stands so as he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands.—(Ed. 1763.)

Now there can be no doubt what these writers upon the Prayer Book, or its rubrics—and they were among the first after the last revision—understood the words to mean; and from the days in which they lived they must have had opportunities of learning what was the mind and intention of the framers of the rubric, as well as of the practice at the time. Let the interpretation by Nicholls, Wheatly, Brett, and Yardley be considered in connection with the time and circumstances under which the rubric was inserted, as shown by Canon Selwyn, and I think its meaning cannot remain a matter of doubt.

Archdeacon Sharp, son of Archbishop Sharp, published his views on some of the rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer, etc., in 1753. He discusses the position of the holy table; and in regard to that of the minister, he tells his readers that the

rubric which says, "the priest shall stand at the North side of the table, when he performs any part of the Communion Service," is one of "those rubrics which expressly and positively require the minister to observe this or that particular in his ministration;" and neglect of it, he says, cannot be excused by the Bishop.—(Sharp on "The Rubrics," p. 55, ed. 1834.)

To the above authorities relating to the interpretation of the rubrics, and to the practice which prevailed in our Church from 1662 to 1753, let due weight be given. Further, there is the testimony of three eminent men, who had the means of knowing what usage prevailed during the first half of this century. I refer to Bishop Mant, Bishop Blomfield, and Professor Blunt.

The Bishop of St. Andrews (Dr. Charles Wordsworth) gives a brief sketch of Bishop Mant's life. With a view to show that he had "a long and varied and extensive experience in the ministry of our Church," he mentions that he was elected Fellow of Oriel, 1798; became Vicar of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, London, in 1815; was consecrated, in 1820, Bishop of Killaloe, and translated to Down and Connor in 1823. Bishop Mant's work on the Book of Common Prayer is avowedly a compilation "from approved writers of the Church of England." Now who are the *approved* writers quoted to set forth the meaning and intention of the two rubrics bearing on our subject? They are Wheatly and L'Estrange, as given above. It would seem that Bishop Mant, "a man of extensive learning and of sound judgment," of "a long and varied and extensive experience," had not so much as become acquainted with any "*approved writers of the Church of England*," who taught that the rubrics sanctioned the Eastward position.[1]

But few men, if any, have devoted more time to the study of this and kindred subjects than the late Professor Blunt.

[1] How little in our Church the practice of consecrating with the face to the East prevailed until very recently may be gathered from the following statement. Mr. Lowe, British Chaplain at Madeira, in 1846, was accused by the Treasurer and two of the Trustees of the Protestant Episcopal Chapel, on behalf of twenty-nine of the permanent residents, of having introduced certain changes into the services of their church. Nine charges were brought against him, the first being that of "*Praying with his back to the people.*" These complaints were made to Bishop Blomfield, by whom Mr. Lowe had been licensed. The Bishop, in reference to this particular charge, said in reply: "Mr. Lowe has discontinued, *in compliance with my direction*, the practice of standing with his back to the congregation during a part of the Communion Service." In reference to four of the grounds of complaint, the Bishop approved of the changes Mr. Lowe had made, *because they were in accordance with the rubrics.* This only makes it the more abundantly clear, from the Bishop's statement, that he considered the Eastward position was *not* in accordance with the rubrics.

When Proctor published his work on the Book of Common Prayer, he dedicated it to Professor Blunt as a "*volume intended to promote the studies over which he especially presides.*" It is not probably too much to say that the late Professor Blunt is acknowledged to have been one of the most learned High Church authorities of this generation: so we may suitably close our list of testimonies to the meaning and intention of the rubric preceding the Prayer of Consecration, by citing his clear and distinct explanation:

This rubric, again, has ministered cause of debate. "The priest standing before the table," you will take notice, is a different phrase from "standing at the North side of the table," and implies a different thing: viz., that he shall stand in front of the table, with his back to the people, till he has "ordered" the elements, and prepared them for the rite, interposing his person between the congregation and the table till whatsoever is merely mechanical in the act shall have been completed, the Church not wishing to make that meaner part of the service a spectacle. This done, he returns to the North side, and breaks the bread, and takes the cup "before the people," *i.e.*, in their sight, the Church not wishing to make the manner of Consecration, as the Romish priest does, a mystery. Thus the former position was merely taken up in order to the subsequent act, that the priest "may with more readiness and decency break the bread." So that they mistake this rubric altogether, I apprehend, and violate both its letter and spirit, who consecrate the elements with their backs to the people, after the manner of the Church of Rome.—(Blunt's "Duties of the Parish Priest," p. 334.)

It would be a great injustice to many loyal Churchmen who have adopted the Eastward position, to say that they have done so for the purpose of symbolizing doctrine; and it would be a still greater injustice to suggest that they have any sympathy with the Romish doctrine of the Mass; yet it is a simple matter of fact that nearly all the authorities which have been cited, from Bishop Jewel to the late Professor Blunt, declare that the Eastward position is associated with the Romish doctrine of the Mass, and was on this account discarded by the Church of England at the Reformation. And it is also an undoubted fact that some of those who have taken an active part in promoting the so-called "Catholic Revival" have adopted and recommended the Eastward position for the express purpose of symbolizing doctrine. They have thus unhappily raised the issue whether we are to have the Holy Communion or the Sacrifice of the Mass; a Scriptural Ministry or a Sacrificing Priesthood. Surely, then, loyal Churchmen cannot but regard the question of the Eastward position as one of great importance.

JOSEPH BARDSLEY.

Art. IV.—JOHN WYCLIFFE.

JOHN WYCLIFFE entered into rest on the 31st of December, 1384. Five hundred years have passed away since Wycliffe closed his grand career, and it is only just now we have begun in some degree to recognise the debt of gratitude we owe to the great Reformer. The Metropolis has celebrated the Wycliffe Quincentenary. The University of Oxford has just discovered "his place in history," and one of her learned professors, in his three lectures on Wycliffe delivered in the schools, has thus summarized our obligations to his memory: "To Wycliffe we owe more than to any one person that can be mentioned—our English LANGUAGE (for his translation of the Bible is a 'rich well' of old English), our English BIBLE, and our Reformed Religion."[1] Wycliffe (he added) founded no colleges, for he had no means. No human fabric enshrines his ideas, no great institution bears his name, and yet so vast is the debt the country owes his memory—so overpowering the claim, it might be thought no very extravagant recognition, Professor Montagu Burrows affirms, if every town in England had a monument to his memory, and every university a college named in his honour.[2]

Yet neither in London, nor in Oxford, nor in York, nor in Yorkshire, not even in Wycliffe Parish Church, does a statue or a tablet record Wycliffe's name. Only in Lutterworth Church, his former rectory, has a monument been erected to his memory, and that tribute he received only fifty years ago. The site of his birth-place in Wycliffe Parish is now unknown.[3] The ancient parish church in which the great Reformer was probably baptized contains, indeed, memorial brasses, exhibiting the arms of the Wycliffe family, and recording the names of various individuals, including William Wycliffe, Lord of the Manor of Wycliffe, A.D. 1537. There is also a stone, built into the outer wall of the church on the south side, having a large foliated cross, richly sculptured, with some other memorials of the family. But JOHN WYCLIFFE, the Morning Star of the Reformation, to whom England owes so much, is not mentioned. Yet Wycliffe is not forgotten! His record is on high. And He Who "gave some to be apostles, some prophets, and some pastors and teachers," gave John Wycliffe to England some five hundred years ago, "a burning and a shining light," in whose light—the light of his English Bible—we now rejoice!

---

[1] Professor Montagu Burrows.

[2] Professor Burrows, Lecture I., pp. 6, 7.

[3] The present paper is substantially a sermon preached on occasion of the commemoration of the Quincentenary in Wycliffe Parish Church. (John v. 35: "*He was a burning and a shining light.*")

Of the MAN himself we have not much to say. Almost all we know of Wycliffe is gathered from his own writings, few of which have been printed and published; or from the writings of his adversaries, whose statements must be received with reserve and caution. A portrait of the great Reformer is preserved at Lutterworth; a second I have gazed upon with great interest in the Rectory of Wycliffe Parish, his native village; and a third is to be seen at Balliol College, Oxford, of which Wycliffe was the Master. Of their respective merits I cannot speak. But of that at Lutterworth, whatever may be its value as a portrait, Chambers, in his "Book of Days" (31 Dec.) writes: "It fulfils the ideal of the man. We behold, in what was said to be his 'spare, frail, emaciated frame,' the countenance of a Yorkshireman, firm and nervous; of one who could form his own opinion and hold it against the world; and all the more resolutely because against the world."

Of his WORK I have much to say. And here a curious and clever picture may be referred to, describing as it does so graphically Wycliffe's work as a Reformer in conjunction with that of Huss and Luther. For, in a richly illuminated copy of an old Hussite Prayer Book at Prague, Wycliffe may be seen at the top of the page lighting a spark; Huss, below him, blowing it into a flame; Luther, still lower down, waving on high the lighted torch!

I. Wycliffe was a great scholar, and in scholarship he shone as the Evangelic Doctor.

The first notice we have of Wycliffe's early days is his appearance as a Commoner in Queen's College, Oxford, in 1340. Thence he was soon removed to Merton, the most distinguished college of that day. In 1361 he was promoted to the Mastership of Balliol, and in 1365 he accepted the office of Warden of Canterbury Hall, now Christ Church, Oxford, being appointed by Simon Islip, the Archbishop of Canterbury and founder of that society. His university life was distinguished by contention against the Mendicant Friars, who were to Popery, before the Reformation, pretty much what the Jesuits have been ever since.[1] The eminent attainments of many of them in Canon Law and Scholastic Theology had obtained for them some of the most important offices in the university.[2] Fitzralph, the Chancellor of the University, had entered the lists against

[1] Bagster, "Hexapla," p. 9.

[2] Availing themselves of the influence they had acquired, the friars soon violated their vows of poverty, piling up, as the historian (Matthew Paris) says, their mansions to a royal altitude, exhibiting treasures within their spacious edifices and lofty walls, and applying the arts of flattery, the stings of rebuke, or the terrors of confession as the agents of Papal extortion. (Le Bas, p. 108.)

them on their own ground, and with their own weapons; but Wycliffe grasped the Sword of the Spirit (which is the Word of God), and the more he used that weapon, the greater his skill in controversy and his love and reverence for Holy Scripture.

Nevertheless, Wycliffe preached, and disputed, and wrote as a scholar. In his day, the schools were in high repute. Then there were, in truth, but two professions—arms and the Church! Most lawyers, physicians, and even statesmen, were ecclesiastics. The universities were, therefore, thronged with crowds of students, and among them Wycliffe shone as a scholar, and as a scholar made his mark, among the learned and talented and influential of his day; his enemies themselves being witness. Knighton, a monk who abhorred him, wrote: "He was second to none in philosophy, and in the discipline of the schools he was incomparable."

Fitzralph, the Chancellor, was a learned disputant, but he fought on the low level of scholastic divinity, and never rose to a higher standard. Wycliffe, like Luther, attacked Papal corruption *with the Bible in his hand*, while he knew also how to use the learning of his day, and so to commend the truth by argument suited to gain the ear and to attract the scholarship of his hearers. Thus he made both Revelation and Scholarship serve his purpose, and, I suppose, but for *both*—and both combined, and both in their appropriate spheres—Wycliffe would never have proved the champion for Christ and His Gospel this Quincentenary acknowledges him to have been.

Here let us treasure up a practical lesson seasonable for the day in which we live. Theology as a science and study has its own place and use. Acquaintance with the writings of the learned Fathers of the Christian Church is a valuable attainment, as also the ability to quote their writings and expound their teaching. Further, how to argue, and how to apply an argument in a scholarly way, is a qualification most valuable of its kind. But this is not all. These are only means to an end. Behind Patristic theology there towers aloft the Old and New Testament itself. It has a Voice of its own clear and unmistakable and of unimpeachable authority, because God's own Voice. That treasure of Divine wisdom and truth, Wycliffe knew the value of, and he made it his own; and all beside, whether of ancient or of modern interpretation, was tried and tested by the words of Holy Scripture. Here, as a theologian, was Wycliffe's power, and as a controversialist, the secret of his wonderful influence and success. He was the *Evangelic Doctor*. Thus he showed himself to be "the burning and the shining light"! He was the "Morning Star," himself illu-

minated by the great sun of heavenly light and joy—*the Bible* that he loved—*the Bible* he translated—*the Bible* that he gave to the men of his generation.

II. Let us change our point of view, and now regard Wycliffe as a patriot loyal to his king and country.

Englishmen can never think of King John's surrender of the British crown to Pope Innocent III., and of all its attendant circumstances, without a blush of shame! The submission, while it lasted, was always most bitterly reluctant; the formality of the homage was constantly evaded, and the annual tribute of 1,000 marks (£12,000) oftentimes interrupted! In 1365, no less than thirty-three years had elapsed since the last payment had been made. Pope Urban V. then thought fit to revive the Papal claim of 1,000 marks from England, in token of Rome's supremacy, together with the arrears of the thirty-three preceding years! History tells us the result. Edward III. laid the case before Parliament, and defied enforcement of the exaction.[1]

The adherents of Pontifical supremacy were greatly amazed at this bold protest. Their displeasure was soon expressed by an anonymous monk, who published a vindication of the Papal claims, and called on Wycliffe, by name, as the Protestant champion of the day, to reply.

His reply was as ingenious as it was conclusive. The argument is debated in his "Trialogus" by certain secular Lords, by whom the unreasonable claim is thoroughly examined and exposed. Thus Wycliffe attacked Papal supremacy, and that, too, in a manner (as Webb Le Bas says) which must have elated the soul of any loyal Englishman, and ensured the reading and study of his arguments just in those very quarters where their acceptance was most desirable. If the style of his so-called "Determination" (*i.e.*, of the question) was rugged, and it wanted the finish (as the Roman Catholic Lingard implies) of the scholar and divine, nevertheless (as Lingard himself confesses) it does honour *to his loyalty* as a subject of the realm, and, we may add, it is a grand testimony to his great abilities as a successful controversialist.

Two years after, we find Wycliffe in a new character, as "commissioner with the Bishop of Bangor, to conduct a nego-

[1] The answer of the King and his Parliament is too courageous not to be remembered to their credit: "Forasmuch as neither King John, nor any other king, could bring this realm and kingdom into such thraldom but by the common consent of Parliament, *the which was not done!* therefore, that which he did was against his oath at coronation. If, therefore, the Pope should attempt anything against the King by process, or other matters in deed the King with all his subjects should, with all their force and power, resist the same."

tiation with the Papal embassy at Bruges, relative to the Reservation of Benefices" (Bagster). The popes were in the habit of granting benefices during the *lifetime* of incumbents, and in fact (Geikie, p. 39) claimed the right to dispose of all benefices in Christendom. Wycliffe spent nearly two years at Bruges in negotiation of these questions, and we presume a *successful* negotiation; for, as a reward for his services, he received the Prebendary of Aust and Rectory of Lutterworth.

I mention these two important public services that Wycliffe rendered to his country and his sovereign, with a twofold purpose: (1) To show how honoured and highly-trusted a public servant Wycliffe had become; and (2) to remind you what Papal supremacy really means—a branch of theological learning not to be forgotten in our Protestant Reformation schools and colleges. Those amongst us who in the present day simply regard the Church of Rome as an erring sister Church, with whose faults charity would bid us deal so tenderly, forget the testimony of universal history. History represents the Church of Rome as the usurper of both political and ecclesiastical liberty—nay, more! the liberty of *mankind* —wherever occasion favours her pretensions. If Dr. Isaac Barrow's unanswerable treatise on "Papal Supremacy" is but little known nowadays, you have only to study its pages (say from pp. 115 to 119), and Barrow will teach you how incompatible is loyalty to a Protestant Sovereign with loyalty to the Pope of Rome. The Pope's claim is supremacy! It all along has been so. It is so now, and though perhaps ostensibly modified by circumstances, it is known and felt, if not acknowledged so to be. Rome's doctrinal errors, as a Church, is one thing! Rome's claims to supremacy, wherever she gains a footing, is another? If we overlook the fact which all history and experience affirm, that Rome is a Confederation—an Antichristian Confederation against civil and religious liberty, we jeopardise our safety both in Church and State. I appeal on this subject, from what I have no doubt is the sincere protest of many a respectable and honourable Roman Catholic, to the past history and the present canon law of his Church.

III. From this notice of Wycliffe's ecclesiastical contentions, in which we have found him the faithful subject of his Sovereign, and a patriotic champion of his country's freedom, let us proceed to a brief consideration of Wycliffe as a theologian. And here we must not forget the midnight darkness whence this "Morning Star" arose. The historian (Foxe, book v., p. 224) tells us how "the state of religion amongst the divines [of Wycliffe's day] was that of a deep lethargy, and past all the help and remedy of man. Only the *name* of Christ remained

among Christians. His true and lively doctrine was as far unknown to most men as His name was common to *all* men. As to faith, consolation, the end and use of the law, the offices of Christ, our impotency and weakness, the Holy Ghost, the greatness and strength of sin, true works, grace, and free justification by faith, the liberty of a Christian,—of all these things [Fox writes] wherein consists the sum of our profession, scarcely a word was spoken. Scripture-learning and divinity were known but to a few, and that in the Schools only; and *there* it was almost all turned into sophistry. Instead of the Epistles of Peter and Paul, men occupied their time in studying Aquinas and Duns Scotus. The world was altogether led and blinded by outward ceremonies and human traditions . . . The people were taught to worship nothing but what thy saw, and they saw almost nothing which they did not worship."

Turn your eyes, now, from this dark picture of Wycliffe's day, and, with his Bible in his hand and Bible truth upon his lip, was not Wycliffe as "a light shining in a dark place"?

Wycliffe's apologist, Dr. Thomas James, names the theologians whom Wycliffe studied: "By Abelard he was grounded in the right faith of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By Bradwardine, in the nature of a soul-justifying faith against merit-mongers and pardoners, Pelagians and Papists. By reading Grossteste's Works, with which he seemed most conversant, he descried the Pope to be Antichrist." But Dr. James thus prefaces this statement: "God gave Dr. Wycliffe grace to see the truth of His Gospel, and by seeing it to lothe all superstition and popery." And we may inquire, how did God give him that grace? Surely, we may reply, in the study of that Bible Wycliffe loved so well and translated into English for the use of his fellow-men.

And that he conducted his study not only of theologians of repute *in a right spirit*, but Holy Scripture also, let the very solemn declaration of Wycliffe, contained in his tract "De Veritate S. Scrip.," testify—words so humble, so ingenuous, so truly Christian, we cannot but admire them:

> Let God be my witness that I principally intend the honour of God and the good of the Church, from a spirit of veneration to the Divine Word and of obedience to the law of Christ. But if with that intention a sinister view of vain glory, of secular gain, or of vindictive malice hath crept in unknown to myself, I sincerely grieve on that account, and by the grace of God will guard against it.

But here let me be somewhat more particular. I ask you to admire Wycliffe's views: 1st. On the authority of our Canonical Scriptures. Like his Master, so with Wycliffe, his one appeal was, "What saith the Scriptures?" Scripture-

proof settled all, any difficulty notwithstanding! And what a sensible exhortation is the following, in reference to the Apocryphal books:

> I think it absurd to be warm in defence of the Apocryphal books when we have so many that are undeniably authentic. In order to distinguish Canonical books from such as are Apocryphal, use the following rules: (1) Look into the New Testament and see what books of the Old Testament are therein cited and authenticated by the Holy Ghost. (2) Consider whether the like doctrine be delivered by the Holy Ghost elsewhere in the Scripture.

Notice, too, some good rules that Wycliffe lays down for an expositor or a preacher of the Word: "He should be constantly engaged in comparing one part of Scripture with another. The student should be a man of prayer, and his disposition should be upright. He needs the internal instruction of the Primary Teacher." Wycliffe knew something of the blindness and depravity of the natural heart, and in reference to the illumination of the Holy Ghost, he records his estimate of the inestimable benefit and privilege that an expositor or student enjoys who is *led and taught by the Spirit of God.* Further, as Wycliffe contended for the authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture as the test of truth and rule of life, and gave the Bible to the people of his day in the tongue they understood, so he valiantly contended for *the right of the people* themselves to possess and read and study the Holy Scriptures.

(2) We must record Wycliffe's open protest in the Schools[1] that his principal design was to recover the Church from idolatry—especially in regard to the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.* With all his might Wycliffe opposed the papistical doctrine of transubstantiation, and (even Dean Milner admits) "he maintained the ancient and Scriptural truth of the Lord's Supper." With this view, Wycliffe published sixteen conclusions, the first of which is thus expressed: "The consecrated host which we see upon the altar is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but an effectual sign of Him." Wycliffe offered to defend this and his other conclusions in *public* disputation. But the University of Oxford prohibited the attempt. Wycliffe's doctrine on this crucial subject was *that* of our Church Articles. He did not drop from transubstantiation into consubstantiation as Luther did; and therein, for Scripture orthodoxy as a Reformer (though so many years his predecessor) we give Wycliffe the palm of merit in preference to Luther. Christ's presence, according to Wycliffe, was Christ in the heart, and not in the hand! "The Baptist [argues Wycliffe] was made Elias *by virtue of Christ's words,* in Matthew xi., yet

[1] Foxe, vol. i., 485; and Milner, p. 594.

he did not cease to be John the Baptist. And [Wycliffe proceeds to argue] St. Austin observes that the Scripture does not say that seven ears of corn and seven fat kine *signify* seven years of plenty, but that they *are* those years. Such expressions [Wycliffe adds] denote that the subject is ordained of God to *figure* the thing predicated according to its fitness."

(3) Would you know Wycliffe's opinion upon *Image Worship?* He thus disposes of the old defence, "We worship not the image, but the Being represented by the image." Wycliffe rejoins: "Suffice it to say, idolatrous heathens said the same."

(4) Would you know his opinion on the *Invocation of the Saints and observance of festivals?* "The festival of the day is to no purpose, if it do not tend to magnify the Lord Jesus, and induce men to love HIM."

(5) Would you know his opinion on Simony and the sale of *indulgences?* "Those stupid Simonists imagine that grace may be bought and sold like an ox or an ass."

(6) Would you know his views on *Redemption?* "The merit of Christ is of itself sufficient to redeem every man from hell. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ is sufficient for salvation, and without faith it is impossible to please God."

(7) On *Justification?* "Unbelievers [writes Wycliffe] though they might perform works good in their matter, still are they not to be accounted righteous men. All who follow Christ become righteous through the participation of His righteousness, and are saved."

(8) On our *fall in Adam?* "Have mind that when thou wert a child of wrath and hell, for the sin of Adam Christ laid His life to pledge, to bring thee out of that prison; and He gave not, as a ransom for thee, either gold or silver, or any other jewel, but His own precious blood that ran out of His heart. This should move all men to have mind of God, and to worship Him in thought, word and deed.[1]

Wycliffe taught that "*human nature* is wholly at enmity with God." "All men [he wrote] are originally sinners, not only from the womb, but in the womb;" as our Church Catechism says, "Born in sin, and by *nature* a child of wrath."

Here may well be quoted the following words, well worthy of an Evangelic Doctor—the secret of his power as a preacher—and the great Evangelist of his day:

> We cannot think a good thought unless Jesus send it. We cannot perform a good work unless it be *properly* HIS good work. His mercy *prevents* us, so that we may receive grace! Heal us, good Lord! we have no merit! Give us grace to know that all Thy gifts be of Thy goodness only!

[1] Bonar, "Words Old and New," p. 49.

Thus Wycliffe laid the sinner in the dust, and exalted Christ upon His throne.

IV. We have spoken of Wycliffe as a skilful controversialist and great theologian. I must add, that he was a great PREACHER. In the earlier days of his ministry, both at Oxford and in London, Wycliffe was a preacher of considerable note. Crowds of students hung upon his lips when he occupied the University pulpit.[1] But it was in Wycliffe's later days, especially when Rector of Lutterworth, he became the *preacher!* It was his own personal love of God's Word, his diligent study of it, and instruction therein of his "poor priests"—who became his evangelists throughout the Midland Counties—that made Wycliffe not only, as at Oxford, the Evangelical Doctor, but now, in his parish pulpit, the Evangelical Preacher. His gospel was emphatically the Gospel of the Grace of God, distinguished by that Scriptural theology I have already attempted to delineate. And this he preached faithfully, invariably, vigorously, with homely telling illustration, in plain and simple language.[2]

V. And this great preacher in the Church—whether St. Mary's, Oxford, or the London churches, or a country church as at Lutterworth—was a most diligent *pastor* to his flock. Canon Pennington says:[3] "Tradition informs us that every morning, after he had himself taught and trained and superintended the movements of his poor priests" (who were to the County of Leicester pretty much what our City Missionaries are to London, and our Scripture Readers to town and country), "clad probably like his preachers, in his russet gown, with sandals on his feet—this man, who shook the pillars of the

---

[1] Canon Pennington tells us (p. 106) that Wycliffe was occasionally a preacher in London, and that in the London pulpits, as in the disputations of the university, he spoke out boldly against the evils of his day. His accusers thus reported him to Courtenay, the Bishop of London. He was "an eloquent man" who, by his eloquence, drew after him many great lords, who hardened him to blunt the sword of St. Peter, and draw after him "many citizens of London into the bottomless pit of error."

[2] Thus, *e.g.*, would Wycliffe impress on the farmers of Lutterworth, and the young men who sat before him at church, the distractions and vexations the novel ceremonies introduced into the services of his day occasioned. His illustration is taken from the ploughed field and the harrow, and from their games on the village green: "Antichrist [he cried] turneth Christian men from serving Christ in Christian freedom; so much so, that *they* might well say, as the poet saith in his fable *the frogs said to the harrow, 'Cursed be so many masters!'* for in this day Christian men are oppressed—now with Popes, and now with Bishops! now with Cardinals under Popes, and now with Prelates under Bishops! And now their head is assailed with *censures!* In short [said Wycliffe] buffeted are they, as men would serve a football." (Le Bas, pp. 206, 207.)

[3] "Life, Times, and Teaching of Wycliffe," p. 225.

Papacy, on whom the eyes of the King, the Pope, statesmen, prelates, and priests were fixed, might be seen in Lutterworth entering their rude dwellings, and engaging in friendly conversation with the inmates. If they are notorious offenders, he addresses to them words of warning or of exhortation; if they are suffering from sickness or sorrow, he pours the oil and wine of heavenly consolation into the wounded spirit; if their spirits are about to quit their earthly tabernacle, he speaks to them words of peace and joy. . . . He preached also to his flock by the silent eloquence of a holy life, remembering his own words, that 'they who live well in purity of thought and speech and deed . . . are very prophets of God, and holy angels (ambassadors) of God, and the spiritual lights of the world.'"

VI. Besides the Preacher, the Pastor, the Evangelist, and Trainer of Evangelists I have described him, Wycliffe was a very distinguished *Tract-writer;* and (as the art of printing was then unknown) he must have had a small army of scribes at his disposal to multiply his tracts, written some in English and some in Latin. Two hundred and more in number we know the titles of, though many now are lost.

VII. Omitting all reference to his other writings, I must touch upon Wycliffe's greatest work of all—the work that made him the foremost Reformer of the Church of Christ, and the greatest benefactor of his countrymen—his translation from the Vulgate into English of the Holy Bible. Wycliffe gave to his countrymen the Bible, the whole Bible, in the language they could read and study. *That Wycliffe was the first translator of the whole Bible into English, and that he so multiplied copies throughout the land that the Bible was no longer a sealed book,* this is his chiefest praise!

In what light did his *avowed enemies* regard this work? If some Protestant writers (strange to say), as Foxe, the Martyrologist, have forgotten it or passed it by in silence; and if others, for reasons of their own it would be hard to imagine, have written in sparing commendation of such a work, listen to what his bitter enemy, Henry Knighton, the Roman Catholic Canon of Leicester, had to say concerning it. Knighton's censure is Wycliffe's glory! "The Gospel which Christ committed to the clergy and the Doctors of the Church that *they* might sweetly dispense it to the laity and weaker persons according to the exigency of the times and the wants of the people hungering after it in their mind, this John Wycliffe hath translated out of Latin into the *Anglican*—not Angelic language; whence through him it has been published and disclosed more openly to laymen and women able to read than it used to be to the most learned and diligent of the clergy. And

so the Gospel pearl is cast abroad and trodden under feet of swine; and what was dear to clergy and laity is now rendered, as it were, the common jest of both, so that the gem of the Church becomes the derision of laymen, and *that* is now *theirs for ever*, which before was the special property of the clergy and Doctors."

Translators of portions of the Bible into Saxon and into English had preceded Wycliffe.[1] When Saxon gave place to English we hear of an English translation by an unknown scholar, dated by Archbishop Usher A.D. 1290; and then, towards the close of the following century, John de Trevisa, Vicar of Berkeley in Gloucestershire, is spoken of as a translator of the Scriptures into English; but this translation is supposed to have been confined to a few texts which were painted on the walls of his patron's chapel at Berkeley Castle, or scattered in some of his writings known to exist in MS. Nearly one hundred years after John de Trevisa came John Wycliffe, whose translation is a translation into good English, sentence by sentence, of the Old and New Testaments from the Latin Vulgate.[2]

It is a distinguishing feature of Wycliffe's translation that it never was shut up in the libraries of the learned, but as it was made it was transcribed and put into the hands of the people—a book for the people, whose right to possess it, and read and study it, and understand and interpret it.

When Wycliffe commenced his work of translation, how long it took him, and what help he had, are questions not so easily answered. I believe he was a student and a translator

---

[1] All honour to those learned men. We will not forget the work of Cædmon the monk, who, about A.D. 680, produced a religious poem (the most ancient specimen of Saxon poetry), the materials of which were taken from the Scriptures. But this was not a translation. Then Adelme, the first Bishop of Sherborne, translated the Psalms into the Saxon tongue about A.D. 706. A Saxon version of the four Gospels was made by Egbert, Bishop of Lindisfarn, who died A.D. 721. A few years after, the Venerable Bede translated the Bible, or the greater part thereof, into that language. Nearly two hundred years after Bede, our learned and noble King Alfred, executed another translation of the Psalms, and probably of the Decalogue, which he made the basis of the Statute Book of England. And lastly, as far as the Saxon tongue is concerned, Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 995, made a translation of the Pentateuch, and some other parts of the Old Testament. Then (Hartwell Horne, vol. ii., p. 235) a chasm of centuries ensued, during which the Scriptures seem to have been buried in oblivion.

[2] Bagster's "Hexapla" gives us: Wycliffe's translation of 1380 from the Vulgate, Tyndale's of 1534 from the Greek, Cranmer's of 1539, the Geneva of 1557, the Rheims of 1582, the Authorized of 1611. The revised version of 1881 is a book of common reference.

of the Vulgate Bible from his earliest days. Certainly from the time he became a public controversialist and an effective preacher. His power was the power of Scripture. It was his acquaintance and familiarity therewith, and his knowledge how to use it both in quotation and application, that made Wycliffe five hundred years ago the power in Christendom he was acknowledged to be, and the upright, bold, and holy man, whose Christian character his very enemies were unable to assail. He drew his light straight from the fountain of Light; and his strength and courage, his wisdom and superiority to the men of his day were his "heritage" as a man of prayer and faith, whose "delight was in the law of the Lord, wherein he meditated day and night." What a book of peace and comfort must his Bible have proved to Wycliffe amid the many and great dangers of his honoured yet anxious career!—*e.g.*, when summoned before Bishops and Archbishops and Papal delegates; when deprived of his honours as Warden of Canterbury Hall; when publicly assailed even in the Oxford Schools as a heretic; when, as he was supposed to be upon his deathbed, and the friars called on him to recant, and his servant raised him on his couch, Wycliffe told them: "I shall not die, but live and declare the evil deeds of the friars." Bold and courageous man! His blessed Master was as "a wall of fire" around him to protect him, or short work would Rome have made of Wycliffe. Rome hated Wycliffe with a special hatred as the translator of the Bible and the unfolder to his countrymen of every rank and age of the words of eternal life. While *living*, Rome could not burn him, but when dead, Rome disinterred his bones, "consigned them to the flames, and cast them (as the inscription on his monument in Lutterworth church records) into the waters of the adjoining stream." Mad rage! Futile revenge! All the while, though dead, Wycliffe spake; and he speaks to-day in the Bible he translated. The translations into the many languages of earth which are the glory of our own day, Wycliffe's translation is to all as the morning star ushering in a day of Gospel light on this dark world.

C. R. ALFORD, D.D.
(Bishop).

Art. V.—WORKING-MEN IN EVANGELISTIC MOVEMENTS.

"How to reach the Masses of the People by additional Ministrations of Laymen or of Deacons, and by Services suitable to their Habits and Education."[1]

THE subject for consideration is one which, in the main, has occupied the minds of Churchmen for some years. It has been discussed with great earnestness and ability in Convocation, at Church Congresses, Diocesan Conferences, and Parochial Councils; but in most of these debates it has seemed to me that existing agencies have been lost sight of.

Men have spoken as if no means had been adopted for reaching the masses of our people, whereas in nearly all our great towns and cities, and throughout our country districts, extraordinary efforts of almost every kind have been put forth. Special Services and courses of sermons in our churches have been tried; Services in theatres, music-halls, mission-halls, in the open air, in warehouses, in large works, in the homes of the people, and even down in our mines! Besides all these, other agencies, equally important in their way, have been in operation, such as Mothers' Meetings, Day Schools, Sunday Schools, Night Schools, Bible Readings, Young Men and Women's Associations, Church of England Temperance Societies, the distribution of pure literature, and above all the visitation from house to house by the Clergy, Scripture Readers, Bible Women, and male and female District Visitors. Go where we may, visit most of our parishes from one end of the land to the other, and some or all of these agencies will be found at work; and as a result, a considerable portion of the masses are being won back to the Church, and the whole body of our people more or less influenced. I may mention that in the rural deanery of Sheffield, at least 75 per cent. of those who attend church are working-class people.

Still, according to the religious census which was taken in some of our large towns a few years ago, it was discovered that on a certain Sunday the majority of our population was not found in any place of worship.

The question is, how can the National Church affect these masses who appear to be outside Christian influence? I would say, by all means let the existing agencies be carried on in a prayerful spirit. Let all the extraordinary efforts which are

[1] The Venerable the Archdeacon of Sheffield has kindly supplied us with that portion of his paper read at the Diocesan Conference at York (October 29) which relates to the co-operation of working-men.—Ed.

now being put forth be continued, if possible, with increased energy and zeal. But experience leads me to believe that we must enlist the co-operation of other agents hitherto but little recognised in the Church of England. I allude to those who may themselves be said to be among the masses. The Clergy, Scripture Readers, Bible Women, Lay Readers, Tract Distributors, Lay Evangelists, have done, and are doing, a blessed work, but there is a power amongst working-men which, if it can be added to the work of those just named, would, I feel convinced, have a marvellous influence in bringing the truths of Christianity to bear upon that class of the community which it has been found so difficult to move. This idea was brought out at the late Church Congress which was held in Carlisle, and was urged with much force as a means for the Church to adopt. I am thankful to be able to say that the experiment has been tried, with very cheering results, in my own parish.

A few years ago a mission-hall, capable of holding 700 or 800, was erected in the most thickly populated part of the parish. A clergyman was appointed to take charge of it and conduct the services. He was also to visit in the district surrounding the building, with a view of inducing people who attended no place of worship to avail themselves of the services which were established at their very doors. He was a young man of talent and energy, and had the assistance of a Bible Woman and a number of District Visitors, who worked with diligence and zeal, and visited from house to house. He had a bright and cheerful service, and his sermons were of a popular character. He succeeded in gathering around him a congregation of those who were either in the habit of attending church, or who could have been persuaded to do so: but the class of people for whose benefit the services had been established were not to be seen there. From time to time special efforts were made to get them in, yet all to no purpose. About twelve months ago, however, it was thought advisable to secure the assistance of some working-men who were members of a Bible Class, which numbers about two hundred and fifty, and which meets from eight to ten every Sunday morning in the same building. This idea was brought before them, and a considerable number volunteered their services. They undertook to try and influence their neighbours and friends. A large choir was formed of those who were musical, and it was arranged that certain members should assist in giving addresses and in other ways. The men became greatly interested in the work, a system of visitation was organized, and in a short time the room began to fill with the right class of people. This has continued now for many months with unabated success, so that on Sunday evenings working-men

(many of whom had not been for years in any place of worship) are seen with their wives and families crowding into the hall. Fourteen of the men were presented last March to his Grace the Archbishop for confirmation, and they have ever since been constant attendants at the Holy Communion in the old parish church.

This movement, I believe, will grow, and become very influential for good, as many of the men thus brought in will become centres of Christian influence, in the workshop, in the warehouse, in the forge, and indeed in every department of manual or skilled labour. As we all know, when once a working-man is influenced by true religion, he becomes very real and downright in his profession of Christ. It is astonishing to see the force and power which he displays in addressing his own class. There is a point and reality in what he says often lacking in those who have had more advantages in training and mental culture. His grammar may not be the most correct, his diction the most refined, nor his manner of speech the most polished; but there is a directness in his utterances and a sincerity in his manner which go straight home to the hearts of his hearers. I do not for a moment wish to advocate the indiscriminate employment of working men in evangelistic work; but I do say that wherever a man be found with natural gifts, and his heart influenced by God's Holy Spirit, there is an agent which the Church would do well to enlist in her service.

The Salvation Army, about which I do not wish to express an opinion, favourable or otherwise, has shown what can be achieved by working-men, and how they influence their fellows. There is a latent power among working-men which, if only drawn forth, would, with the blessing of God, move the thousands and tens of thousands of those who are not so much opposed to the Church as they are indifferent to its work.

We want every kind of agency to meet the demands of the times. We want our scholarly and able Divines, our eloquent and impressive Preachers, our diligent and earnest Pastors, our hard-working and persevering Lay Readers, our self-denying and loving female Visitors, our devoted and sympathizing Sunday and Ragged-School Teachers; but in addition to all these we want the experience and common-sense of our hard-headed working-men to reach the masses of our people. By all means let us have our well-ordered and impressive services in our parish churches. Let everything there be done decently and in order. Let the music be congregational and hearty, let the prayers of our services be fervently offered up, let the preaching be heartfelt and Scriptural. Let all the various

parochial organizations be made as complete as possible, and be systematically worked; let the gospel be preached in the open air, in our courts and lanes, in our highways and byways; but by all means let us enlist the co-operation of the great army of Christian working-men. Let us establish services in which they can assist, and which the poorest and most ignorant can understand and appreciate. Then, I believe, with the blessing of God, will the masses be reached and the kingdom of Christ advanced.

J. E. BLAKENEY.

ART. VI.—THE PROPHET JEREMIAH, AND HIS WRITINGS.

THE name of Jeremiah stands, if not highest, yet dearest to his race in the honoured list of their ancient prophets. His voice rises from amidst the ruins of Jerusalem in its first terrible overthrow by the Chaldæans, bewailing the sorrows of his countrymen led off into captivity, but in the midst of his bitter grief cheering them with the promise of a joyful return after the purifying exile of seventy years. In his lifetime the stern censor of his contemporaries, he had to bear the opposition and ill-treatment inevitably allotted to all true and earnest reformers; but with his death there came the usual reaction. Persecuted while alive, he was erelong almost worshipped when gone. The justice of his rebukes was admitted by the sons of those who had resented them; his tender patriotism was recognised; his yearning solicitude for the future restoration of his people seemed to point him out as still, from a higher sphere, their guardian and friend. Legends respecting him multiplied apace. He had hidden away the ark in security till the days of the Messiah. He would return as the herald of the Anointed of God. He was the patron-saint of the nation.

The prophet was born in the village of Anathoth, three miles north of Jerusalem—a spot belonging to the priests, as part of the Church lands—and being a child of a priest, was consequently by birth a priest himself. His father's name was Hilkiah, and it may be that he was thus the son of the high-priest under Josiah, so famous as the counsellor and friend of that famous king. The respect which the prophet as a rule received from the princes and kings of Judah—the contrast between his treatment and that of his contemporary Urijah, who was put to death for uttering the same opinions as those ceaselessly advanced by Jeremiah, and the fact that Baruch

the brother of Seraiah, a high official of Zedekiah's court, willingly acted as his copyist, seem to make this probable. If he were really thus of high birth, the best society of Jerusalem would be open to him, and his prospects in life would be exceptionally bright. But worldly attractions had no weight with his pure and disinterested spirit. The loss of all things, and the endurance of a life of trouble, were accepted as the natural accompaniments of fidelity to his mission.

The influences that formed the character of the future prophet are unknown. That he was of priestly blood must have been a great advantage, however, for it would secure him a good education, including, or rather consisting in, a thorough acquaintance with the sacred books of his people. All the culture and religious worth of the capital, moreover, would be within his reach, for Hilkiah the high-priest, if he were the lad's father, was not only the head of the Church, but a sincere worshipper of Jehovah. From the gentle height on which his native village stood, the very landscape would excite and feed religious impressions in a thoughtful mind. The grey hills of Benjamin, Nob, Gibea of Saul, Mizpeh, Gibeon, Ramah, and Geba, rose in a half-circle to the west and north-west, at different points. The chasm of the Jordan and the mountains of Gilead were visible on the east, while, as the eye turned southward, it rested on the purple hills of Moab, and the blue waters of the Dead Sea at their feet. We do not know the name of Jeremiah's mother, but she may well have helped to mould the character of her boy, by repeating to him the famous stories with which these localities were associated: stories of the greatness of Jehovah, His loving care of Israel, and the mighty deliverances He had wrought on its behalf.

The state of Judea in the boyhood and youth of Jeremiah were well fitted to make him thoughtful as he grew older. As a child he saw the culmination of heathenism under Manasseh, when an image of Baal was worshipped in the Temple, and the foul worship of a symbol of Ashtaroth stood under the trees in the Temple courts. He must have known the lewdness of the feasts and ritual of these foreign idols, and the neglect of all homage to Jehovah. Perhaps he saw the closing years of the persecution of those still faithful to the religion of their fathers. Manasseh's deportation to Babylon, and his return as a humble penitent, must have occurred in his early years. The reign of Amon had then followed—with its revival of idolatry, perhaps in spite of the king's efforts, for he was murdered, it may be for opposing the heathen party, within two years. As a sign of the times, Jeremiah would remember that this king actually bore the name of an Egyptian god—the only Jewish sovereign who was ever thus dishonoured. He

may have seen children offered to Moloch in the valley of Hinnom, under the very walls of Jerusalem, amidst all the horrors of such an awful fanaticism. If he visited friends in different parts of the country, he would notice different local gods in every town or district; for there were as many different idols as there were cities. The morality of the day was such as this condition of affairs induced. It seemed vain to look for an upright or honest man: small and great appeared bent only on making money: prophet and priest were alike corrupt.[1]

An outward reformation begun by Josiah, and continued till long after the prophet had entered on his high office, changed the surface of things for a time. Idolatry was forcibly abolished; the Temple services restored; a great passover held; the nation once more pledged to Jehovah by a solemn covenant; and the long-lost Book of the Law accepted by them as their rule of public and private life. But he evidently had little faith in a religious revolution carried out by authority, for his name is not even mentioned in connection with it. In his eyes the change was only superficial; the corruption as profound as ever.

Nor were the foreign relations of the feeble Jewish state more encouraging. Not larger than an English county, it was perfectly helpless in the fierce political struggles between the great powers on the Euphrates and the Nile. Esarhaddon had removed Manasseh, and had thus shown the ease with which Assyria could crush the kingdom if it chose. Egypt had been subdued by the same monarch, and put under Assyrian governors. Assurbanipal, his son, had a second time trampled under foot the might of the Pharaohs, but the fierce rebellions in his empire, and especially the struggles which led ultimately to the rise of Babylon, had so weakened Nineveh that the death of the great warrior was the signal for its final overthrow. That this tremendous result was for a time delayed had been due to a cause no one could have foreseen—an irruption of barbarian tribes from the plains of Southern Russia. Before the terrible hordes of the Scythians the hosts bent on crushing Assyria had to retreat, contenting themselves with a struggle for their own existence. All Western Asia had suffered from this overflowing scourge, but it had spent itself, after desolating great part of the immense regions between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean. Attempting the invasion of Egypt, it was forced to draw back, and from that moment continued its retreat till it

[1] Jer. ii. 28; xi. 13; v. 1-5; vi. 13.

had finally vanished into the regions from which it had first issued.

The mortal struggle between Nineveh and its antagonists now burst out afresh. The Medes, aided by the still subordinate Persian tribes and a host of obscure allies, assailed it from the East. Egypt, now under Pharaoh Necho, determined to have a share of its vast territories on the west. From this world-conflagration a new political era emerged. Babylon, in the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, as the successor of his father, rose to supreme power. Egypt was hurled back to the Nile, and then, again, humbled and broken into petty sovereignties.

In such a general breaking up of the great kingdoms of the age, it was natural that, in helplessly dependent states like Judea, opposite opinions should be formed as to the final result. Assyria having fallen, and Pharaoh Necho, like his predecessor Psammetichus I., showing himself at once warlike and able, the weight of confidence in higher Jewish society inclined towards the Nile. A strong party believed that the future belonged to Egypt, and urged on the king at Jerusalem a close alliance with that country. To the keener eyes of the prophets, however, aided as they were by divine illumination, the sceptre of the world was seen to be passing into the hands of Babylon; and the earnest assertion of this belief, so contrary to that of the great Egyptian faction in the capital, placed Jeremiah in the position of their irreconcilable opponents, and drew on him a lifelong persecution.

The formal "call" of the prophet to his great office took place on the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah, apparently without any outward accompaniment of a vision such as marked that of Isaiah or of Ezekiel. Though still a young man, he had doubtless pondered the interests of religion in every aspect, personal, social, and national. It is possible that his mind may have been turned specially into a theological channel by a formal training in one of the schools of the prophets at Ramah, Bethel, Jericho, Gilgal, or elsewhere; but the great impulse which the discovery of the Book of the Law must have given him did not come till some years after he had publicly entered on his office. It is certain, however, that to be summoned to the official service of Jehovah as a prophet, was only possible when the mind and heart intensely sympathized with the Divine Will. Religious enthusiasm, which dominated all the natural powers, can alone explain the ecstasies of prophetic inspiration. The influence from without was only an exaltation for the time of the habitual spiritual condition. The fire from heaven fell on a heart ready to burst into a divine glow. The shrinking modesty with which Jeremiah drew back from the dignity of a speaker for God is

itself evidence of an appreciation of the stupendous responsibility of such an office, possible only to a deeply religious soul.

Eighteen years passed from the time of the prophet's consecration to his high duties, and the death of King Josiah. During that long period, the staple of his preaching was the necessity for hearty moral reform if the favour of Jehovah was to be preserved to the nation. The worship of Baal and Astarte, with the sensual abominations of which it was the centre, were denounced in every form of earnest oratory. That he stood well-nigh alone was of no moment to the faithful preacher. He refused to be silent. Public sin, however popular, was the object of his unsparing and stern exposure. Nor did the restoration of the Temple, or the celebration of the Passover, with its formal renewal of the national covenant with Jehovah, divert his mind from the fact that these were only external reforms. What was wanted, he cried, was not the worship of the outward act, but the regeneration of the spirit. The newly-found Book of the Law had threatened a terrible judgment on the nation, if it were unfaithful to God; and that calamity, the prophet ceaselessly told his countrymen, must come on them if they did not repent and thoroughly amend their ways. He had no fixed place for his ministrations. The courts of the Temple, the streets, the open space at the city gate—any place where men congregated served for his preaching stations. His work, indeed, was mainly done in the open air—a lesson to us to-day. The earliest morning heard his voice, and, in spite of daily reproach and derision, he continually returned to his self-sacrificing task. No class escaped him—the priests, of whom he was one, as little as others. Forgetting the sacredness of their calling, they even went beyond others in their hostility, and tried to kill him.[1] Never was a more forlorn hope than that of Jeremiah's ministry. Jeers, hatred, treachery, almost made him despair and leave things to take their course.[2] His heart was crushed by the well-nigh universal aversion he incurred, for, beyond most, he was a man of tender heart and easily-touched feelings.

The specially political aspect of Jeremiah's preaching dates from the closing years of Josiah, when the vigour of Pharaoh Necho on the one hand, and of the young Nebuchadnezzar, the general for his father Nabopolassar, on the other, raised the question whether Judah should seek an alliance on the Nile or at Babylon. The prophet earnestly urged the latter course, and fiercely pronounced against Egypt. Neutrality seems to have been his idea, though Josiah, not contented with this,

[1] Jer. xi. 21. [2] *Ibid.*, xv. 10.

and seeking, in his enthusiasm, to oppose the Pharaoh, perished at Megiddo, a catastrophe that was the beginning of the final ruin of Judah.

Sorely troubled times followed the death of Josiah. Jehoahaz, his son and successor, was allowed to reign only three months, his election by the people in their ancient manner having excited the displeasure of Necho, now lord-paramount of Judah. Carried off to Egypt, he lingered there till death, lamented by his people. "Weep sore for him," cried Jeremiah, "that goeth away, for he shall return no more, nor see his native country."[1]

Jehoiakim, an elder brother of the banished prince, who was nominated to his place by the king of Egypt, played an important part in the fortunes of the sinking land. The heathen party was once more in the ascendant, and with its impiety other evils went hand in hand. Forgetting the poverty of the little state, Jehoiakim sought to emulate the glory of a great king. Palaces on the grandest scale were built by him, at the cost of intolerable taxation in money and labour on the part of his people. Such a course met with the most undaunted opposition from Jeremiah. "Woe to him," he calls aloud, in one of his discourses, "that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbour's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work: that saith, I will build me a wide house and large chambers, and cutteth him out windows; and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion."[2] Such fearlessness towards even the king, was in keeping with his bearing towards all classes, in the utterance of disagreeable truth, exposing their sins. The priests and false prophets especially were exasperated at his biting words, and sought to have him put to death, on pretence that the opposition he gave to an Egyptian alliance was disloyalty to the State; but the judges, who had probably been appointed in the time of Josiah, threw out the charge.

Two years followed, during which Jeremiah was ceaselessly before the people as a preacher of righteousness, and an opponent of the league with Pharaoh. Babylon, he said, would assuredly prevail, and Judah would be broken in pieces by its hosts if it did not repent, as a potter's vessel, thrown by him on the ground as he spoke, was shattered to pieces.[3] The first violence shown the prophet followed this vivid prediction of the ruin of the state;[4] but his words were soon vindicated in part by the destruction of Pharaoh's army at Carchemish by Nebuchadnezzar, who forthwith pressed forward to Palestine

---

[1] Jer. xxii. 10.
[2] *Ibid.*, xxii. 13, 14.
[3] *Ibid.*, xviii., xix.
[4] *Ibid.*, xx. 2 *et seq.*

on his way to the Nile, and carried off a number of citizens to Babylon, with a large proportion of the vessels and treasures of the Temple.[1]

Jeremiah had fled from Jerusalem some time before this, but returned a year after the withdrawal of the Chaldæans. Once more before his countrymen, his bearing was marked by the same calm fidelity as in past years. Causing Baruch, his secretary, to write out a copy of all his deliverances respecting Judah, and read them at a great public feast, Jehoiakim summoned the offender to appear at the palace. The terrible threats of the prophet were more, however, than he could brook, and snatching the roll he burned it piece by piece in the brasier then alight in the room. Jeremiah and Baruch had once more to flee; this time apparently to Babylon.[2] The king received no more warnings; his doom was approaching. Three years later he lay a dishonoured corpse outside the gates, slain apparently in some fray with bands from other parts of Palestine, sent by the Chaldæan Sultan.

Jehoiachin, or Jeconiah, son and successor of Jehoiakim, had reigned only three months when Jerusalem was forced to yield to Nebuchadnezzar, who carried off the young prince, with the best of the people and all the treasure he could gather, to Babylon, and set up the last king of Judah, Zedekiah. Well meaning but weak, this unhappy man was the plaything of the different factions into which the little state was torn. In vain Jeremiah warned him against offending Chaldæa. His chief men supported Egypt, and he had not resolution enough to oppose them. The end was inevitable. After eleven years of shame and humiliation, during which the prophet had suffered much, Jerusalem was once more taken by Nebuchadnezzar; Zedekiah blinded and led off to Babylon; his sons slain before him; his city burned; all the prisoners taken by the enemy carried off to Babylon, and Judah left desolate. The resistance had been brave, and the punishment was in proportion severe. During the siege Jeremiah had suffered the most cruel treatment. Shut up at one time in a subterranean dungeon under the Temple grounds, at another he was cast into a huge rain-cistern, dug out in the ground, and would have died there but for timely interference. Detention in the barrack-court of the king's guard was the least he had to endure.

After the siege it was the prophet's intention to stay in Judah and do what he could towards building up some kind of community to perpetuate the nation. The murder of Gedaliah, the governor appointed by Nebuchadnezzar, was, however, fatal

[1] 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 7; Dan. i. 1.

[2] Jer. xiii.

to this plan. In their terror a great number of the Jews still left in the country fled to Egypt, and forcibly took Jeremiah with them. From that time he vanishes from history, excepting in two brief notices of his foretelling the erection of Nebuchadnezzar's throne at the entry of Pharaoh's palace at Tahpanhes, on the Delta, when the Jewish colony was settled, and of his dying protest against the idolatry of his countrymen at a great heathen feast which he attended.[1] He is said to have been stoned to death for this or a similar attempt to turn the transgressors from their evil ways.

The style of Jeremiah was suited to the times. Glowing appeals like those of Isaiah or Micah would have been out of place when almost all hope of national repentance was lost. Living in an age when the cup of his people's iniquity was nearly full, the later prophet was required rather to warn and denounce, if, by any possibility, the doom impending over Judah might be averted. The deep shadow thus hanging over his beloved country filled his soul with a touching sorrow which runs like a deep sigh through all his utterances. Gifted with genius capable of lofty flights, he seldom gives the reins to it, contenting himself with plain and forcible addresses, as free as possible from poetical flights, which might have diverted his audiences from the stern facts of their position.

Gentle, sensitive, and yielding, Jeremiah seemed ill-fitted for the office of a true prophet in such times. He might count on bitter mockery and insult. Misapprehension was certain to follow his attempts to bend his countrymen from their chosen courses, for the grounds he advanced seemed unpatriotic and harsh. Yearning for peace and love, averse by nature from strife and controversy, he was yet forced by his office to put himself in antagonism to his generation, till the opposition he raised made him long for a home in the wilderness, to be away from the strife of tongues.

But with all his tenderness, Jeremiah was a man of the rarest courage. No difficulties moved him. He was ready to dare the fury of the king or the nobles, or the madness of the people, with equal calmness. In private he might regret that he had ever been born, but in public he was always a hero.

The limits of an article force me to omit many details of the greatest interest. Modern criticism has disturbed the waters of life less as they flow through the channel of Jeremiah's inspiration than in some other parts of the Ancient Scriptures. But it would be a hopeless and wretched task to follow the destructives in their airy speculations and bold assertions, nor would the readers of a magazine like this thank me for weary-

[1] Jer. xliii., xliv.

ing them with an essay on a subject so inevitably dry. May I be pardoned if I refer my readers to my "Hours with the Bible," in the fifth volume of which they will find not only a full picture of the man and his times, but a translation of his prophecies inserted in the narrative at the proper historical date of each.

CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE.

Correspondence.

THE DIVINE PRESENCE IN THE CHURCH.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

I feel obliged to Archdeacon Perowne for directing my attention to some statements in a paper of which as a whole he seems to approve, but these portions of which he thinks not worded so exactly as they might be, and needing explanation. They relate to one of the most abstruse and difficult points in theology—the Divine Presence in the Church; perhaps in itself unfathomable, but full also of exegetical difficulties. An attempt at too great brevity in the paper alluded to has probably produced some obscurity (*brevis esse laboro*, etc.); but, however full the discussion may be, it may fail of having satisfactorily solved the problem. A writer must at last fall back on Bramhall's profession, "It is not impossible that some unwilling error may have escaped me, but certainly I am most free from the wilful love of error. In questions of inferior nature, Christ regards a charitable intention more than a right opinion." As the subject is of general interest, I propose to make some observations upon it; which I hope, too, may lend greater precision to the statements in the paper. I wish it, however, to be understood, that I rather seek to elicit the opinions of others than to impose one of my own.

The first thing will be to state the bare elements of the problem as they lie on the surface of Scripture.

I. It will not, I presume, be questioned that, as the paper has it, "Christ the incarnate Son" is, in a very real sense, "no longer upon earth, but has passed into the heavens." He Himself explicitly announced His impending departure to His disciples: "I go to prepare a place for you" (John xiv. 2); "Now I go My way to Him that sent Me" (*ibid.*, xvi. 5); "I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more" (*ibid.*, 10); and, what is sometimes not sufficiently noted, this His departure was actually the condition of a greater blessing. Not the presence of the incarnate Son on earth, but His absence, insured the gift of the Holy Ghost.[1] "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send Him unto you" (John xvi. 7). And we read in Acts i. that Christ did actually thus depart.

II. Yet the same incarnate Son promises or announces, surely in some important sense, His continual presence in and with the Church. "I

[1] Even Dean Alford on Matt. xxviii. 20 can say "The presence of the Spirit is the effect of the presence of Christ;" of the absence, Christ Himself says.

will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you" (John xiv. 18); can we confine this to the resurrection, or the *Parousia*? "We," *i.e.*, the Father and I, "will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (*ibid.*, 23). "Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you" (*ibid.*, 28). In seeming agreement with this language are the promises, "Where two or three are gathered in My name, there am I in the midst" (Matt. xviii. 20), and "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (*ibid.*, xxviii. 20); which seem to imply not a temporary but an abiding presence of Christ Himself in the Church. Accordingly, we find later on such expressions as, "Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith" (Ephes. iii. 17); "Christ in us the hope of glory" (Col. i. 27); "Christ living in us" (Gal. ii. 21); "Christ formed in us" (*ibid.*, iv. 19); "Christ our life" (Col. iii. 4), evidently our spiritual life; "I will come to him, and sup with him, and he with Me" (Rev. iii. 20).

III. We have yet a third element to introduce. Christ promises that though as the incarnate Son He should depart, He nevertheless would "send," or vouchsafe to His Church, not merely a Comforter, or Paraclete, but "another Comforter," a real Vicar, to take His place, and discharge offices which He Himself would have discharged had He remained on earth. This Paraclete is not the Father, for the Father is said to send Him (John xiv. 26). He is called the Holy Ghost. He accordingly came on the day of Pentecost, and thenceforward appears as the active administrator on earth of this dispensation, *i.e.*, in the offices connected with calling, quickening, enlightening, imparting spiritual gifts, etc. He evidently acts as a Person, not a mere influence (Acts xiii., Rom. viii.); the Church is His temple (1 Cor. vi. 19, Ephes. ii. 22); and the bodies of the saints will rise again because of His indwelling in them (Rom. viii. 11).

Here then, evidently, are portions of divine truth not easy of adjustment. Christ seems absent, yet present; present, yet absent; present, yet represented by a divine Vicar; and *Vicarius*, in common parlance, *est absentis*. Even the Father seems to be present in the Church as Christ is, and as the Holy Ghost is. Is there any hypothesis by which this apparent inaccuracy of language may be explained? If the Trinitarian doctrine is true it accounts for it. For if the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are one God as regards "the substance," then where the Father is the Son must be, and where the Son is the Holy Ghost must be, and *vice versâ*. God dwells in the Church, and if He does so, each Trinitarian Person does so too. And so far, *i.e.*, in reference to the divine indwelling, it seems that Christ may be said to be the Holy Ghost, and *vice versâ*; and if, on the ground of the Trinitarian doctrine, there may be this interchange between them, it explains how Christ might say at one time, "I go away," and at another, "I come again." It is, in fact, an application of the old canon, *Opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt:* works such as creation, redemption, sanctification, are works of the whole Trinity as regards "the substance;" God creates, God redeems, God sanctifies: while works *ad intra* (generation, procession) can only be predicated of the Person to whom they belong. It does not follow, then, that if a writer should say, "Christ dwelling in the Church is the Holy Ghost," he confounds the Persons, any more than St. Paul can be supposed to do when in Rom. viii. 9 he says, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His," and then in the very next verse, by an almost unconscious transition, says, "And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin," etc. He seems to have considered the two Persons, not in reference to works *ad intra*—in which point of view it would be improper to say, The Father is the Son, or the Son is the Holy Ghost—but in reference to works *ad extra*, of which sanctification is one; which works, though the Church in her dogmatic statements, founded on those of Scripture,

makes them "terminate in," *i.e.*, specifically ascribes them to, one Person (as our Catechism has it, "God the Son who redeemed me," "God the Holy Ghost who sanctifieth me"), yet being performed by the Godhead, "the substance" of the Trinity, admit, as will have been seen in the Scripture-statements, of greater laxity of ascription. And it must be remembered that the Trinity of Scripture, though it implies and ultimately rests on the ontological Trinity, the Trinity *in* and *per se*, is always the œconomical Trinity, the Trinity of redemption, as befits the practical aim of revelation. Thus, if I am not mistaken, no expression is more common in good authors than "Christ dwells in the Church by His Spirit;" which involves three statements: 1. That Christ dwells in the Church; 2. That He does so by His divine Vicar the Spirit; 3. That, *in this point of view*, Christ and the Spirit may be said to be one. Yet no one supposes the writers intend to confound the Persons. To take another striking example from Scripture itself, Archdeacon Perowne asks, "Where does it ever say that Christ is the Holy Ghost?" Perhaps nowhere in express terms. But let me refer him to the remarkable passage, 2 Cor. iii. 17, "The Lord is the Spirit" (*τὸ πνεῦμα*). It seems generally agreed among commentators that by "the Lord" is meant Christ; and there is little doubt in my mind, judging from the context, that by "the Spirit" is meant the Holy Ghost. Here, then, we have St. Paul using, in slightly different terms, the very expression complained of; and he seems to have done so because he had in his mind not the ontological Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as abstract immanent relations, but the Trinity of redemption, our Saviour-God in His various redeeming acts; in short, it was "the substance" which the Apostle, in such a statement, had chiefly in view. It must always be remembered that what we mean by personality—*i.e.*, will, intelligence, etc.—belongs to "the substance," the Godhead, not to "the Persons," who are not persons in the sense which we usually attach to that word, but merely *modi subsistendi*, or relations, though immanent and eternal.

And in this sense, *i.e.*, as referring to the Trinity of redemption, the expressions in THE CHURCHMAN paper must be taken. The question was not whether the Son and the Holy Ghost, *ad intra*, are one (which they are not), but whether as regards the *opus ad extra* of dwelling in the Church we may not say that Christ dwells in the Church by His divine Vicar, the Spirit, or even that the Holy Ghost is Christ in the Church. Nevertheless, however Scripture may seem, from time to time, to overleap these distinctions, it behoves uninspired writers to be careful what language they use. Let then the passages in the paper be thus worded: "So far forth as the Holy Ghost is Christ's divine Vicar, He is a Vicar; but as divine, He must be one with the Principal; the same Christ, therefore, as regards the Godhead, Who comforted and instructed the apostles ('He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you'), but under another form" (the expression *modus subsistendi* had better be avoided, as it is a technical expression belonging to the ontological Trinity). That is, in effect, Christ dwells in us, or in the Church, by His Spirit. This is all that I intended to convey, and all that is necessary to the argument; which was that the Redeemer Christ, or the Son incarnate, is not on earth but in heaven, and therefore cannot be said to be the active administrator in the Church, and yet is represented by a Vicar Who is virtually Himself. And it seems as if the language of Scripture were purposely constructed to lead to this solution of the problem. Nor do I see how the statements in the paper, thus explained, differ materially from those of one of our most cautious divines—Waterland. "This" (the promise of Christ, John xvi. 13), he says, "is not to be so understood as if the Holy Ghost were now our sole Conductor, exclusive of the other two divine persons;

for our blessed Lord, in the very same place where He promises to send the Comforter to 'abide with us for ever,' promises also that the Father and Himself shall make the like abode with us. Elsewhere He promises to His disciples His own spiritual presence, to continue with them as long as the Church or the world should last (Matt. xxviii. 20). From all which it is plain that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost are equally present to good men in all ages of the Church; and that when our Lord spake of His departing, and leaving the world, He meant it merely of His bodily absence; and because, from the time of the Ascension, He was to be present only in a spiritual and invisible way, as a spirit, and together with the Holy Spirit;[1] therefore He considered His Church from thenceforwards as being peculiarly under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, though, strictly speaking, it is under the spiritual guidance of all the three Persons. Hence it is that such spiritual guidance is sometimes ascribed to the Father, sometimes to the Son, sometimes to the Holy Ghost, as it is the common work of all; and may be indifferently and promiscuously attributed *to any of them singly*, or to all of them together."[2] Waterland would be the last man to "confound the Persons;" but if he can say that an effect, *i.e.*, a work *ad extra*, may be "indifferently and promiscuously attributed to any of them singly," it seems he might almost say, in a popular way, *that so far as the effect is concerned*, one Person is virtually the same as another, or occupies the place of that other.

The readers of these remarks of Waterland will perhaps perceive a point in them not sufficiently cleared up, though their general purport is plain. "His own spiritual presence;" does this mean His presence by the Holy Ghost, or a spiritual presence *besides* that of the Holy Ghost? From the expression "together with the Holy Spirit," we might infer the latter. "He was to be present only in a spiritual and invisible way, as a spirit;" as the Holy Spirit, or as another spirit? (See note 2.) These points Waterland does not define for us. Passing from personal explanations, I conclude this letter with a few remarks on them.

It will have been seen that throughout the foregoing observations I proceed upon the rubric of the Church of England in what appears to be its plain and literal sense; "The natural" (even glorified) "body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one" (Communion Service); and my attempt has been to show that we do not need any presence of Christ the Redeemer on earth to reconcile the varying statements of Scripture; they being reconcilable by the hypothesis that Christ may be said to be present, or to dwell, in the Church in and by the Holy Ghost. Yet it is well known that a large proportion of Christendom not only does teach that there is a presence of Christ besides that of the Holy Ghost upon earth, but that the Redeemer Christ thus present is the principal direct source of spiritual life. Every reader of modern Romish theology must have noted the emphasis which it lays on the Incarnation, as distinguished from other facts of redemption. The Church, says Möhler, is the continued Incarnation of Christ. The Sacraments are "an extension of the Incarnation." This language has been frequently used by certain writers of our own communion. It is to be regretted that even Hooker (always "judicious"?) gives occasional countenance to these physical theories: *e.g.*, "His Church He frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of

---

[1] How can He be present as a *divine* spirit, together with the Holy Ghost, another divine spirit, unless both are one?

[2] Sermon XXVI., on Romans viii. 14.

Man ;" "Even from the flesh of Christ our bodies do receive the life that shall make them glorious" (E. P., c. 56). St. Paul, on the contrary, says that we shall rise again because of the Holy Spirit Who dwells in us (Rom. viii. 11). In this system the *Redeemer* Christ becomes the direct source of spiritual life (He is indeed so indirectly), and the office of the Holy Ghost seems very much reduced to the bringing of Christ down again to earth, to discharge the offices of quickening, sanctifying, etc. Thus the Greek Church, and the ancient liturgies, teach that it is the Holy Ghost Who changes the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which body and blood are the true nourishment of the soul unto life eternal. May we not say that in this, and kindred theories, the office of the Holy Ghost, as set forth in Scripture, is, if not ignored, very much "lost sight of"?

It is open, however, to question whether the words of Christ respecting Himself do not imply, as Waterland seems to suggest, a double divine presence in the Church, one of Christ Himself, the other of the Holy Ghost. The Lutherans, Protestants as they are, hold an *illocalis præsentia* of Christ, a presence exempt from the laws of space, on which the doctrine of consubstantiation rests. That is, it may be a question whether the presence of Christ as God, which all acknowledge, "the essential deity" of the paper, by virtue of which He is everywhere present, exhausts and explains these promises of Christ respecting Himself, "I will come," etc. On this point I do not venture to speak with confidence. Being myself inclined, in accordance, as I believe, with the rubric quoted, to the opinion that there is no presence of the incarnate Son on earth, except through the Holy Ghost, I am compelled to understand Christ's statements respecting *Himself*, as the incarnate Son, as fulfilled in the presence of the Holy Ghost; for which fact I can find no better expression than, "The Holy Ghost is Christ's divine Vicar." All language, indeed, must on this point be more or less inaccurate.

One thing seems plain: They who adopt the theory of a presence of Christ as well as that of the Holy Ghost, and yet are disinclined to the "physical theories" mentioned in the paper (*i.e.*, assign their full force and meaning to what Scripture states respecting the work of the Holy Ghost amongst us), must regard Christ's presence as a comparatively otiose, inoperative one, so as to avoid an appearance of the clashing of the two Presences. Under this aspect, the doctrine is hardly of much dogmatical import. We may admit it, and yet also admit that the Holy Ghost is the active administrator on earth of this dispensation. Thus, *e.g.*, if we attenuate the promises of Christ respecting Himself so as to mean, as the same Hooker, as quoted by Archdeacon Perowne, strangely enough seems to do, the image or memory of Christ in the mind produced by the teaching of the Holy Ghost—like the image of a ship in the mind, while the reality is on the waves—we certainly do obtain a sort of presence of Christ, but hardly an active operative one; at least hardly so active a one as seems implied in the passages of Scripture above alluded to. An inmate in my house may so interest me respecting an absent friend as to raise in my mind a very vivid conception of him; but does this amount to the friend's coming "to sup with me, and I with him"?

Such are some of the difficulties that beset the subject. Discuss them we may and ought; solve them we probably never shall. Meanwhile, by the statement of them, something is gained; it may draw attention to the subject, elicit opinions, and perhaps eventually lead to some light being thrown on the mystery.

I am, yours truly,
E. A. Litton.

Naunton Rectory, *Nov. 4th.*

THE *CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW* AND WICLIF.

SIR,

I should be much obliged to you to allow me to make some observations in THE CHURCHMAN on an article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October, entitled "Cardinal Repyngdon and the Followers of Wiclif." The writer, after having noticed Professor Burrows' work, and my own "Life of Wiclif," which has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, writes: "There has been nothing to supersede or improve upon the well-known volumes of Lewis, Vaughan, Shirley, and Lechler." Now, I may say for myself and for Professor Burrows, that we have no wish to supersede them in so far as they are reliable authorities. But while we admit that Lewis's, and perhaps Vaughan's, works may still, on a few points, be used with advantage, we must at the same time maintain that, since they wrote in 1720 and 1853, we have obtained information about Wiclif which renders part of their works inaccurate. The works are, therefore, to some extent, superseded. We wish to do all honour to Dr. Shirley on account of his catalogue of the works of Wiclif, which he has ascertained to be genuine, with the dates of the years when they were written, as well as on account of his preface to the "Fasciculi Zizaniorum." But the latter, though valuable as far as it goes, is necessarily imperfect, as it is only a sketch of Wiclif's life. All these lives may, therefore, easily be improved upon. Dr. Lechler has indeed given a valuable life of Wiclif, partly the result of the examination of the Vienna manuscripts, but it is not adapted for popular reading. Our object was to improve upon that "life," and the other "lives," by giving, in a popular form, and in a small volume, the information drawn from them, and from all the available sources, including Wiclif's works. The Reviewer admits that I have been, to some extent, successful, when he says that the work "contains considerable information." He charges me, however (n. 1, p. 61), with inaccuracy in having described Richard the Hermit "as a chantry priest of Hampole," and with having stated (p. 72, n. 3) that Hereford, who aided Wiclif in the translation of the Bible, did *not* recant. I can only say that the learned editors of the Wiclifite versions of the Bible are my authority for the first statement, and that Dr. Vaughan has given good evidence of the truth of the latter assertion.

My book is described as "somewhat of a medley." I can only say in reply that everyone says that there is a logical coherence between the different parts, and that all the information commended by the Reviewer tends to illustrate the subject.

Again, we are told (p. 61) that Wiclif "was not the first to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular"!

Again, we are told (p. 61) that there "was nothing new or unheard-of in the utterances put forth by Wiclif." This is an incorrect statement. Bernard of Clairvaux, Arnold of Brescia, William of Ockham, Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh, and others, had indeed lifted up their voices against the Mendicant brothers, or one or more of the following abuses and corruptions: the temporal power of the Popes, the simony, the usury, the venality, the worldliness, the vices and crimes of the Church and Court of Rome. But they did not assail the doctrinal system of the Papacy. Wiclif, however, occupies a grander position than Grossteste or any of his predecessors, because he not only assailed every one of the abuses and corruptions already mentioned, but also because he was the first who, with the sacred Scriptures in his hands, pushed his inquiries into every part of her doctrinal system, and showed that she

had corrupted as well as mutilated "the faith once delivered unto the saints."

Again, we are told (p. 61) that "it is idle to hope to construct a system of doctrine from his writings, or to find there a dogmatic theology which may be trusted." We have here another erroneous statement. I have shown by quotations from his works in my "Life of Wiclif" (pp. 251-267), that Wiclif held all the truths of Holy Scripture, and opposed all the errors of the Church of Rome, brought forward in the Articles and formularies of our Church, with the single exception of purgatory, on which he speaks with a hesitating utterance; that he declares distinctly his belief in the real spiritual presence of Christ in the Eucharist, justification by faith, original sin, and man's moral inability to turn to God: and that he condemns the invocation of the saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary, indulgences, works of supererogation, image worship, and, in a modified sense, the sacrifice of the Mass.

ARTHUR R. PENNINGTON
(Canon of Lincoln).

UTTERBY, NEAR LOUTH, LINCOLNSHIRE,
November 7th, 1884.

Short Notices.

A Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Liverpool. Delivered in St. Peter's Cathedral on Tuesday, October 21, 1884, at his second visitation. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. London: Hunt. Liverpool: Holden, 48, Church Street.

COPIOUS extracts from this Charge have been given in the *Record* and the *Guardian;* and we may content ourselves with touching upon two or three points in its review of diocesan work and progress.

As regards the diocese, the Charge contains much valuable information, in small compass, and expressed with the Bishop's usual force and clearness. He speaks of unfavourable and unfair criticisms to which Churchmen of the new See are frequently subjected; and he shows that there is not a diocese in England or Wales in which the Established Church has to work under such disadvantages and difficulties as in the new Diocese of Liverpool. For instance, there is a lamentable lack of clergy. "The West Derby "Hundred of Lancashire," says the Bishop, "which forms the new See of "Liverpool, contains a population of little less than 1,200,000. For this "immense mass of people we have only 187 incumbents with Parochial "Districts. Let this proportion be compared with that of the six dioceses "which exceed Liverpool in population. In York there are 630 incum- "bents for 1,300,000 people; in Manchester, 490 for 2,300,000; in Ripon, "490 for 1,600,000; in Worcester, 480 for 1,200,000; in London, 500 for "3,000,000; and in Rochester, more than 300 for 1,600,000. Of course I "have used round numbers. Nor is this all. Out of the 187 consecrated "churches in our new diocese, no less than 137 have been built since the "year 1800, and are churches practically without endowment, and "dependent upon pew rents and voluntary offerings. As to livings well "endowed with rectorial tithes or lands, such as you may find by hundreds "in some counties of England, I cannot find twenty in the whole West

"Derby Hundred. And, to crown all, out of the 187 incumbencies, the "income of at least 100 does not exceed £300 a year; and in many cases "an incumbent with £300 a year has 8,000 or 10,000 people, or even more, "under his charge! I doubt whether there is anything like this state of "things in the Church of England from the Isle of Wight up to Berwick-"on-Tweed." Again, the peculiar and exceptional character of the population is a difficulty; and thirdly, much of the usual diocesan machinery is in Liverpool conspicuous by its absence. The Bishop, *e.g.*, has scarcely any patronage. In short, the diocese is thoroughly undermanned and imperfectly equipped. But the Bishop has not the slightest feeling of despondency. He asks only for time; and with the blessing of God, the diocese will yield her increase. The wants, indeed, are great and pressing—more money, and more men. Yet, in looking around, the Bishop notes increasing energy, and tokens of zealous, sound, and successful work. He thanks God and takes courage.

His lordship refers to the Premier's remark in the House of Commons as to the "extremely disgraceful religious census" of Liverpool; and he says: "Intentionally or not, I think Mr. Gladstone may have done us good service by giving wide publicity to a startling fact." He points out the causes of such a census, and adds:

> The plain truth is, that in the last two or three generations the Established Church has allowed many districts in Liverpool to slip completely out of its fingers, and a population has grown up of people who are practically no man's parishioners. I declare I know no more pitiable condition than that of a Liverpool incumbent at the north or south ends of our city, with eight, or ten, or twelve thousand working people under his charge, and an income of about £300 a year.

What is the remedy for such a deplorable state of things? *The multiplication of living agents* (paid agents and volunteers), *and an organized system of aggressive evangelization.* But a really important point is this—a superannuation fund for worn-out incumbents. What can you expect in a parish, say of five thousand souls, where the incumbent is old, or infirm, or a chronic invalid, or pressed down by poverty?

The Bishop of Liverpool, a man of commanding abilities, is now and then censoriously criticized. His Protestantism is not squeezable—a great offence to some—and in ecclesiastical matters he takes his own line. Nevertheless, in spite of a clique, he is staunchly supported in his diocese; and his influence within it, as well as outside it, has steadily increased.

The Empire of the Hittites. By WILLIAM WRIGHT, B.A., D.D. With Decipherment of Hittite Inscriptions, by Professor A. H. SAYCE. Pp. 200. Nisbet and Co.

Attention was directed to this book as soon as it was published, a week or two ago, by an interesting letter from the Prime Minister. A worthy review will appear, we hope, in an early CHURCHMAN. In the meantime we may touch upon a single point. On page 84 we read:

> Professor Sayce feels very confident that the Hittite sculptures, as well as their language, stamps them as a non-Semitic people. "The Hittite proper names," he says, "preserved on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, show that the Hittites did not speak a Semitic language. The Hittite sculptures further show that they did not belong to a Semitic race. Their features and physical type are those of a northern people; and their northern origin is confirmed by their use of boots, which is at least as old as their writing, since the boot is one of the commonest of the Hittite hieroglyphics. The boots are always represented with turned-up toes, like the mountaineers of Asia Minor and Greece at the present day."

In the Preface, upon this point, we find the following important communication, sent to Dr. Wright while the book was in type, a discovery

completing the chain of evidence which binds the recently discovered inscriptions to the Hittites. Professor Sayce wrote :

When visiting the Ramesseum at Thebes with two friends one day last winter, I noticed that in the great *tableau* which represents the conquest of the Hittites at Kadesh, by Rameses II., many of the Hittite warriors were depicted with boots, the ends of which were turned-up. Neither Rosellini, who copied the sculpture, nor the numerous visitors, including myself, who had previously examined it, had ever observed this fact before. We were unable to do more at the time than note the fact ; but a week or two afterwards I returned to the spot with Mr. W. Myers, and made a careful survey of the picture. I then found that, on the right hand (or southern) side of the tableau, all the Hittites who were clothed, or whose feet were uninjured by the weather, wore boots with turned-up ends, while this was the case with none of the figures on the left-hand side. Either, therefore, two different artists must have been employed on the works, or else different races were intended to be represented in the Hittite army. While I was looking at the picture, Mr. Myers called me away to a smaller tableau of the same event, carved on an inner wall of the temple. Here the Hittites were all of them provided with boots, the toes of which were turned up in an exaggerated way. Evidently, therefore, it was a characteristic which had especially struck the Egyptian artist. It is curious to find that this portion of the old national costume survived among the Hittites, who had settled in the warm valley of the Orontes ; such boots, or rather snow-shoes, admirably adapted as they were for the snow-clad ranges of the Taurus, being wholly out of place in Syria.

Weapons of Christian Warfare. Sermons by the late Rev. WILLIAM THORNTON, M.A., of Kingsthorpe Hall. With Preface by the Rev. B. F. SMITH, M.A., Rector of Crayford, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Hatchards.

"Many of these Sermons," writes Canon Smith, "were addressed to the congregation of my former church, St. Paul's, Rusthall, as part of that voluntary ministry which it was Mr. Thornton's delight to exercise." Canon Smith refers to the noble Christian character of his friend, and remarks that he had "a mind of singular grasp and culture." Certainly, these sermons—earnest, thoughtful, and to a large extent expository—will be read with profit by many outside the circle (a wide one) of Mr. Thornton's friends.

Bramble Cloisters. By J. W. PITCHFORD. Pp. 120. Elliot Stock.

A year or two ago we had the pleasure of receiving a volume by Mr. Pitchford ; and we are pleased to recommend the work before us. Poetry, of literary grace and power, which is both soothing and suggestive, breathing Christian trust and patience—

A book of rest, of quiet pleasant thoughts,

is always welcome. This volume, too, has rare attractions, in the way of cover, paper, type, and so forth (that dainty antique for which Mr. Elliot Stock is famed), and makes a truly beautiful gift-book. We must give a bit of the poet's prelude, thus :

Conned in the ingle light or corner seat
When shine the roofs with rain, and windows stream,
Or haply stretched upon the hillside thyme,
In the dear quiet of the summer day—
There may my book be read ; there let it breathe
Deep restfulness, and unexacting peace :
For I would have it like to a tangled wood,
Down whose sweet silences and dim arcades
Trip gentlest echoes of the rippling wind
Among the trees, with quiet, slumbrous hush,
And piny smell, flutter and chirp of bird,

Glimpse of fields and woods and dim blue hills;
While near, in nature's sweet disorder found,
Brambles and bines and many a lurking flower:
A book of rest, of quiet pleasant thoughts.

Life in the White Bear's Den. By A. L. O. E. With illustrations. Gall and Inglis.

This Tale of Labrador, by A. L. O. E., needs scarcely a line of commendation. It was written, we read, as a pair to "Life in the Eagle's Nest" (which we have not seen); it is full of interest and of spiritual power. The work of the Moravians is justly lauded.

Obiter Dicta. Second edition. Elliot Stock. 1884.

This collection of essays—a dainty book—was lately praised in the *Times*, and we are not surprised to see a second edition. With the flattering notice of the leading journal, as regards the literary merits of the work, we are not disposed to find fault. The author's style has many charms; but here and there, in the midst of what is "brilliant," pointed, witty, appears something that is flippant. Sometimes, too, the argument is weak. The reference to perversions seems to us especially superficial. The author says:

It used to be thought a sufficient explanation to say either that the man was "an ass," or that it was "all those Ritualists." But gradually it became apparent that the pervert was not always an ass, and that the ritualists had nothing to do with it.

How does the author account for it? Why thus: A person of religious spirit is alarmed at the prevalence of infidelity; the Church of Rome says: "I, and I alone, have never coquetted with the spirit of the age." The person submits, and has rest. But how many perverts, we ask, were thus alarmed? Let anyone look at the list of perverts published by (Roman Catholic) authority, and he will find that the great mass of the perverts "went over" through Tractarian teaching. There isn't a doubt about it. Some, like Mr. Hope Scott, thought of the "one will" (CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 228). Others preferred the Mass to the Communion. And, recently, some, like Lord Ripon, doubted as to Anglican Orders. No doubt, just now, the number of Ritualists going over is not large; but the reason is that they can get nearly all they like within a Protestant Church. Two or three men of intellect, at the present time, probably, go over through feelings which the author of "Obiter Dicta" describes. They have doubts; they are alarmed and restless; they give up their liberty, and swallow a dogma imposed upon a Church (largely opposed to the dogma) by a Jesuit clique; and they say, "Now I have no responsibility; my soul may rest." But if such perverts had duly considered the state of a land where Popery has had full play—say France or Italy—they would have thought twice, nay thrice, before they submitted to the Pope's yoke.

Among the Stars. Wonderful Things in the Sky. By AGNES GIBERNE, author of "Sun, Moon, and Stars," etc. Seeley and Co., 46, Essex Street, Strand.

The author, Miss Giberne, has often been asked (says a prefatory note) for a volume for children on the subject of astronomy—"*much easier* than 'Sun, Moon, and Stars.'" Here it is; and an excellent volume we find it. The coloured illustrations are very helpful. Altogether, this is a capital gift-book. "Sun, Moon, and Stars" was warmly commended in the CHURCHMAN as soon as it appeared, and the present volume equally merits praise. The publishers, Messrs. Seeley, we may take the liberty of pointing out, for the convenience of some of our country friends, have moved from the well-known house in Fleet Street to Essex Street, Strand.

Natural History for Young Folks. With numerous pictures by Giacomelli. By Mrs. C. C. CAMPBELL. T. Nelson and Sons.

This is a very pleasing and instructive book. What is told is just what "young folks" like to hear, and the way of teaching is the story-telling way. But the information is precise and correct. The illustrations are excellent. The book is very tastefully got up. Altogether this is a good specimen volume of the many excellent gift-books for which our boys and girls are indebted to Messrs. Nelson.

Muriel's Two Crosses. The Cross she rejected and the Cross she wore. By ANNETTE LYSTER, author of "The White Gipsy," "Alone in Crowds," etc., etc. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

At this time of the year, probably, not a few of those who rarely read tales, are ready to welcome a tale by Annette Lyster. During the last two or three years the reputation of this writer has been increasing. For there are many who can appreciate and enjoy an attractive story, with literary grace and power, which stands out from the crowd of sickly sentimentals, the well-intentioned, but weak and washy, not to speak of the mischievously sensational, and the sensualist. Among the tales which stand so prominent (and there are many such) Annette Lyster's have taken a good place. They are cleverly written, in a graceful style; the tone is wholesome, and the moral is sound. "Muriel's Two Crosses" will not, we think, diminish the author's reputation. Muriel was a beautiful girl, with strong elements of good; she felt the burden of training brothers and sisters in poverty; she married a wealthy man, who loved her dearly, but who was not a Christian, and privately, indeed, a gambler. How the story ends we will not reveal. An Australian incident is rather improbable. The picture of Muriel's home, with her father (the Rector), seems to us the best part of the book. The characters are well drawn, particularly the self-indulgent sister Lois. (Why *this* name?)

The Mystery of Beechy Grange; or, The Missing Host. A Tale for Boys. By the Rev. H. C. ADAMS, M.A., author of "Schoolboy Honour," etc., etc. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh.

Mr. Adams is well known as a contributor to what is called "light literature" in serial publications; and his story-books are very "popular," especially his stories of adventure and school-life. Few writers can describe a cricket-match or a dispute out of school-hours so well as Mr. Adams. The present tale will be especially welcome to public schoolboys. There are several illustrations, and the volume is "got up" with great taste.

The Lord Mayor: a Tale of London in 1384. By EMILY SARAH HOLT. John F. Shaw and Co.

This excellent tale needs few words of commendation in these pages. Miss Holt's very able and interesting papers in THE CHURCHMAN, during the present year—papers not only readable, amusing, and so forth, but rich in historical knowledge of the highest critical rank—will have spoken for themselves. And her works of fiction have, so to say, the accuracy and fulness of a State Paper expert, as well as the imagination and descriptive power of a story-teller. The Tale of London in 1384 is dedicated to the Lord Mayor of 1884 (Alderman Fowler), and it gives, in a very pleasing form, a large amount of information. John de Northampton, Lord Mayor five hundred years ago, suffered cruelly, and has been greatly slandered, because he attempted to serve his generation according to the will of God. He had embraced the Lollard doctrines. (Vaughan's "Life of Wycliffe," ii. 185), and through the priestly party

he was condemned to death. We most heartily recommend this story, which does him justice, and is just now, as honouring Wycliffe, specially welcome. We may add that the volume is well printed, and has a tasteful cover.

Edward Nangle: the Apostle of Achill. A Memoir and a History. By the Rev. HENRY SEDDALL, LL.D., Rector of Vastina, Diocese of Meath. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. Lord PLUNKET, D.D., Bishop of Meath. Hatchards.

This is a book of peculiar interest; but at present we must content ourselves with a line of recommendation. The Bishop of Meath's admirable Introduction has an especial value touching the Church of Ireland as being a Missionary Church.

Laws of Christ for Common Life. By R. W. DALE, LL.D. Birmingham. Pp. 304. Hodder and Stoughton.

Most of the papers in this volume, it appears, have appeared in *Good Words*, the *Sunday Magazine*, or the *Congregationalist*. They are on such subjects as these: the Sacredness of Property; the Christian Rule of Justice; Temperance; Sympathy; Family Life. That they are ably written and suggestive will be understood. Here is a specimen bit about saintliness:

> It is quite time that we Protestants got rid of the traditional Romish saint—the saint that we see on the walls of every picture-gallery in Europe, the saint that still haunts the imagination of hundreds of thousands of devout men, who regard the Romish apostasy with horror. Everyone knows the kind of figure I mean—the thin, pale face, the eyes red with tears or weary with watching, the transparent hands, the wasted form. That was the Roman Catholic saint, the saint of the Middle Ages, the saint, too, of those early Christian centuries, when the Christian faith was coloured by the dark superstitions and philosophical speculations of races that were just emerging from heathenism. We have given up the theology of Rome; we have forgotten to revise the Romish conception of the religious life.

Fiji and the Fijians. New edition. With Introductory Notice by Miss C. F. GORDON CUMMING. Pp. 580. London: T. Woolmer, 2, Castle Street, City Road, E.C.

The preface to the fourth edition of this excellent history of the Fiji Mission is dated "Croydon, Nov. 1, 1884." For several years, it seems, the third edition had been exhausted; and we heartily welcome a new edition of so remarkable a record by a devoted Missionary. A good many years ago we remember a veteran supporter of the Church Missionary Society remarking that this book led him to become an annual subscriber to the Wesleyan Missionary Society; and the story of the successes in Fiji has supplied many an illustration for Missionary platforms on every side, and strengthened the heart of many a steady, quietly-plodding, prayerful hero in the Mission-field.

Miss Gordon Cumming gracefully expresses the gladness which all who have admired the book must feel that the honoured author, Mr. CALVERT, "should have been spared to enjoy the rich and rare reward of knowing, not only how stedfastly the first recruits bore the brunt of the battle, but also how whole-heartedly they entered into the spirit of the Church militant, so that each early convert became an aggressive force." Miss Gordon Cumming's delightful book, "At Home in Fiji," will dispose many readers, no doubt, to purchase the present volume. Certainly it deserves a place on private shelves and in parochial libraries.

Hand-Book of the Liturgy of the Church of England. By R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D., Rector of Bridlington; Rural Dean; Canon of York. London: Protestant Reformation Society, 20, Berners Street.

All those who have felt the value of Dr. Blakeney's work on the "History and Interpretation of the Prayer Book" (of which, when shall we have to welcome a new edition?) will be prepared to give a cordial welcome to this smaller volume, which is really what it professes to be, a manual, or Hand-book. It has useful matter, concisely put, well arranged, "popular" in form; the book is handy, clearly printed (we can hardly say *correctly*, for on some pages are typographical errors), neatly bound, and very cheap.

In his Introduction Canon Blakeney touches upon a point as to which the views of many are misty and muddled. He quotes, *e.g.*, the assertion of Archdeacon Freeman that the Reformers "expected the people and Church of the day to accept the Services as essentially, and for all practical purposes, the same Services,[1] revised" (as the mediæval offices); "and, what is more, as such the Church and people manifestly did accept them. So clear were the Revisers on this point, that Cranmer (as Jeremy Taylor has recorded) offered to prove that 'the order of the Church of England, set out by authority by Edward the Sixth, was *the same that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred years past*'" (the italics are his). ("Principles of Divine Service," p. 8.) "We are sorry to observe," says Dr. Blakeney, "that Archdeacon Freeman has made a serious mistake as to Cranmer's opinion on this important point. We turn to the place referred to in Taylor's works, and find that he describes Cranmer as offering to prove that 'the order of the Church of England, set out by authority of the innocent and godly Prince Edward VI., in his High Court of Parliament, is the same that *was* used in the Church fifteen hundred years past.' (Taylor's Works, vol. vii., p. 292.) Thus, Taylor does not represent Cranmer as contending that the Communion Service is 'the same that had been used in the Church *for* fifteen hundred years past,' but 'the same that *was* used in the Church fifteen hundred years past;' that is, in apostolic times." Dr. Blakeney gives a quotation from the very document to which Taylor refers, in which Cranmer expresses his readiness to prove that the English Service "is conformable to the order which our Saviour Christ did both observe and command to be observed, and which His Apostles and His Primitive Church used many years." Cranmer proceeds to *denounce the Sarum Office of the Mass, restored by Queen Mary, in the strongest language.* (See Handbook, p. 110.[2]) To Dr. Blakeney's criticism there is no reply.

This Hand-book contains twenty-two chapters. The learned author begins at the beginning—the Primitive Church in Britain; he unfolds the Royal Supremacy; and traces the history of the Prayer Book, touching upon the various Revisions. Acts of Uniformity, Ornaments,

---

[1] Freeman censures Wheatly and others for describing our Reformers as "composers and compilers" of our services. He even censures the Preface to the Prayer Book for its use of the term "compiling" as applied to the Revision of 1549. But that the Reformers, in the construction of our services, both composed and compiled, is simply a matter of fact.

[2] Dr. Blakeney adds: "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge Prayer Book conveys the same misconception in the following note: '"Archbishop Cranmer offered to prove that the first English Prayer Book was the same—*i.e.*, substantially—that had been used in the Church *for* fifteen hundred years."—Freeman's "Principles of Divine Service," i. 9.' We regret much that a work sent forth by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge should be the medium of circulating this serious misrepresentation of Cranmer's views on a fundamental point."

Morning and Evening Prayer, the Communion Office, are some of the titles of his chapters, all of which are interesting and of value to the student. In the chapter on the Catechism appears this note:

> The words "wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," are well explained in Mayer's "Catechism," "published," as Dr. Mozley remarks, "under Laud's Primacy, and a book of some authority." He says: "In our baptism we are *sacramentally* and *instrumentally* made the children of God, and really and truly when we are baptized with the Holy Ghost."—Quoted by Mozley, p. 172, as before.

In connection with this, we may quote the following words of Mr. Scott, which Canon Blakeney (in the chapter on "Baptism") *adopts:*

> "In this *lower*, *external*, and *ecclesiastical* sense, therefore, we may affirm *unconditionally* the regeneration of all to whom baptism is rightly administered.
>
> "But in the *higher* and *spiritual* sense of the term, we can predicate regeneration of baptized persons only *hypothetically;* namely, upon the supposition, in the case of adults, of their sincerity; and in the case of infants, of their possessing that disposition which shall lead them, when they become capable of it, to keep their baptismal vows."—"Inquiry into the Effects of Baptism," p. 163.

We had marked several other passages for quotation; but the limits of our space are overpassed. Dr. Blakeney's book—a thoroughly practical one—is worthy of the eminent liturgialist, as to whose research, ability, and sound churchmanship, nothing need here be said.

Daily Texts for the Little Ones. Religious Tract Society.

A charming volume, with coloured illustrations, and a very tasteful cover. The texts are well chosen. We are much pleased with this dainty little gift-book.

Old Highways in China. By ISABELLE WILLIAMSON, of Chefoo, North China. Pp. 227. Religious Tract Society.

In the company of her husband, Dr. Williamson, the author of this interesting book made several journeys through the province of Cheh-Kiang: and a series of articles entitled "Our Sisters in China," containing her impressions of Chinese women, appeared in the *Leisure Hour* of 1863. Two subsequent journeys are described in the present work; viz., one from Chefoo to Peking, in 1881, and another in 1882, partly on the "Old Highways," and partly on the byways and bridle-paths of the eastern portion of Shantung. Mrs. Williamson has opened the way. There is a good map. The record of travel, with incidents, comments, and descriptions, is very readable. There are several illustrations.

Apples and Oranges. Talks with Children on Fruits. By Mrs. DYSON, author of "Children's Flowers." R. T. S.

A capital book. The "Talks" are really talks; and children will be glad to listen to them. We are pleased to recommend this instructive (and pretty) book.

Little Folks' Out and About Book. By CHATTY CHEERFUL. Cassell and Company.

Among the Christmas Books of this season few, probably, will rank higher than this. It has several full-page pictures, and an illustration of some sort on every page—"*out*" in the rain, in the sunshine, in the fields, etc. Altogether, a remarkably pleasing book for children, it will be a welcome guest in the nursery, or an ornament for the drawing-room table. If "A Parcel of Children"—to which "Out and About" is a companion volume—is equally good, it must be a beautiful book.

Jack o' Lantern, and other Rhymes. By ELEANOR W. TALBOT. Cassell and Company.

How little folks (fortunate enough to get it) will rejoice over this book! Clever pictures, in bright colours, with running rhymes. Every page is a fund of amusement.

The Holy Land. After lithographs by L. HAGHE. From original drawings by DAVID ROBERTS, R.A., with historical descriptions by the Rev. G. CROLY, LL.D. Division III. Idumea and Petra. Cassell and Company.

The present volume completes this excellent edition. The two previous portions of the re-issue having been noticed in THE CHURCHMAN, we need scarcely say much in recommending this very handsome volume, with thirty-six tinted plates. The work is one of permanent interest, and in every way attractive.

A Smaller Biblia Pauperum—conteynynge Thyrtie and Eyghte Wodecuttes Illustratynge the Lyfe, Parablis, and Miraclis off Oure Blessid Lorde and Savioure Jhesus Crist, with the Propre Descrypciouns thereoff extracted frō the Originall Texte of John Wiclif, somtyme Rector of Lutterworth. Preface by the late Verie Rev. ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Imprynted atte the sign of The Grasshopper, bye Unwin Brothers, *The Gresham Presse*, inne Little Brigge Strete, inne the parish off S. Anne, Blakfriars, and to bee solde by T. Fisher Unwin, atte his shoppe, 26, Pater Noster Square, inne the Citie off London. MDCCCLXXXIV.

The new "Biblia Pauperum," as some of our readers are aware, was sent out after the Caxton Celebration in 1877. The present, smaller and much cheaper edition, faithfully retains all the peculiarities of the original blocks (date probably 1540), and has new points of interest.

Heroes of Science: Mechanicians. By T. C. LEWIS, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Professor of Mathematics in the Government College, Lahore. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Watt, Stephenson, Arkwright, Nasmyth, and Crompton, the inventor of the mule, are some of the "heroes" described in this interesting and instructive volume.

In Freedom's Cause. A Story of Wallace and Bruce. By G. A. HENTY. With twelve full-page illustrations by GORDON BROWNE. Pp. 380. Blackie and Son.

Mr. Henty is well known as a very clever writer of stories of adventure for boys. In his "With Clive in India," which we noticed last year, he showed himself as successful in historical tales as upon other lines. This volume will, probably, be very popular.

The November *Quiver* opens a new volume with great promise. The Bishop of Edinburgh, Professor Blaikie, Dean Plumptre, and other eminent writers contribute. The *Quiver*—a well illustrated magazine—has always been interesting, good-toned, and thoroughly sound.

Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have sent to us an excellent gift-book for children, *The Story of the Life of Jesus.* The story is "told in words easy to read and understand." There are forty full-page illustrations. We gladly commend this volume; it has a pretty cover.

The third volume of Dr. Skene's *Gospel History for the Young* (Edinburgh: David Douglas) has been issued: our notice must be delayed.

An excellent edition of *Robinson Crusoe*, admirably printed (Messrs. Blackie and Son), a reprint from the author's edition, 1719, has a hundred illustrations from the pencil of Mr. Gordon Browne. This is a splendid gift-book.

From Messrs. Blackie and Son (49, Old Bailey) we have received several Tales, good gift-books for the present season. *Menhardoc*, a Story of Cornish Nets and Mines, by Mr. G. M. FENN, has eight full-page illustrations; it is very well written, delineates character, and is full of life and spirit.—*The Wreck of the Nancy Bell*; or "Cast away on Kerguelen Land," by the author of that capital book, "Picked up at Sea," is also a well-told Tale.—*Stories of the Sea in Former Days* is an interesting volume; the "Mutiny of the *Bounty*" is one of a dozen narratives.—*Adventures in Field, Flood, and Forest* is another attractive collection of incidents. The editor has had in view, not only the interesting and the amusing, but the informing element; he has desired, *i.e.*, to convey instruction in an agreeable form; and we think he has done his work well.—*Traitor or Patriot?* a Tale of the Rye-House Plot, is cleverly written. It is in some respects a little melancholy.—A book which will be a great favourite with boys is *The Pirate Island*, a story of the South Pacific, by HARRY COLLINGWOOD; stirring, picturesque, and vigorous.

A fifth edition has reached us of that very clever and amusing volume, *The* (illustrated) *Jackdaw of Rheims*. To give the title in full: "*Ye Jackdaw of Rheims: an antient Ballad by Thos. Ingoldsby, with ye old writing and ye new Illustrations, by E. M. Jessop.* Prynted and published by Eyre and Spottiswode." This volume is beautifully got up; and Mr. Jessop's pictures, great and small, wonderfully agree with Barham's "ballad." Everybody knows the lines:

> But what gave rise,
> To no littel surprize,
> Nobody seem'd one pennie the worse!

From Messrs. Gall and Inglis (London: 25, Paternoster Square; Edinburgh: 20, Bernard Terrace) we have received a copy of a new issue of that charming work (of which one never gets tired), Dean Ramsay's *Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character*. This is the twenty-sixth edition. It has, of course, the esteemed author's latest additions, and also the very interesting Memoir. Well printed, with a portrait, and tastefully got up, this is an excellent edition.—From the same firm we have received a new edition of the *Mariners of England*, a very handy little book about our sailors' deeds of daring.

The Land of the Pyramids is a volume of the excellent series published by Messrs. Cassell and Co., "The World in Pictures," and a very good volume it is. The book is very readable, has many illustrations, and is cheap.

From Messrs. T. Nelson and Sons (Paternoster Row) we have received a very cheap and useful little book, *Scripture Illustrated*, "scenes of everyday life in the East," with twenty engravings.—Messrs. Nelson have issued a new edition of *Nearer, my God, to Thee*, illustrated; it has a preface with the well-known initials, H. L. L.—We have received from the same publisher four handsome Cards—Nos. 15, 13, 1, 5; very pleasing landscapes, No. 15 being "Ellen's Isle, Loch Katrine."

Young England, the Annual for 1884, is an attractive (and a cheap) volume, which may be safely recommended. *Young England*, "an illus-

trated magazine for recreation and instruction," which has been noticed in these pages, is published by the Sunday School Union (56, Old Bailey).

We have received from Messrs. Parker and Co. (Oxford, and 4, Southampton Street, Strand) a convenient edition of *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles;* translation, notes, etc., by the Rev. H. DE ROMESTIN. The papers in the *Guardian*, *Contemporary*, CHURCHMAN, etc., and in German and American reviews, are mentioned in the Introduction. It is a helpful little book.—We have also received from Messrs. Parker a good shilling edition of *The Temple.* It is surprising that in a day of hymns and spiritual songs so many pious persons should remain in ignorance of George Herbert. Thus he opens Psalm xxiii.:

> The God of love my shepherd is,
> And He that doth me feed;
> While He is mine, and I am His,
> What can I want or need?

Here is Herbert's "Bitter-Sweet," quoted in the Rev. W. O. Purton's *Songs in Suffering:*

> Ah, my dear angry Lord,
> Since Thou dost love, yet strike;
> Cast down, yet help afford,
> Sure I will do the like;
> I will complain, yet praise,
> I will bewail, approve:
> And all my sour-sweet days
> I will lament and love.

Birdie's Bonnet, a tiny book, is by the author of "Links of Gold," "Heart and Home Songs," and many excellent books (Hatchard).

The Church Missionary Pocket Almanack and Kalendar for 1885, the *Manual Almanack*, etc. (Church Missionary House, Salisbury Square). deserve, as usual, a hearty word of commendation.—The pamphlet, *A Mohammedan brought to Christ*, is the autobiography of the Rev. Imad-ud-din, D.D.—*Suakin, Berber, Khartoum, and to U-ganda*, is the journal of the Nile Missionary party to the Victoria Nyanza in 1878-9; it will be welcome to many.—We are greatly pleased with the *Church Missionary Society Service of Song.*

Scarlet Anemones and *There's a Friend for Little Children* are two cheap and pleasing stories published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton.

From the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge we have received *Picture Stories from old Bethlehem*, tasteful, illustrating the history of Ruth; and two other packets of Christmas Cards, ferns, Nos. 98 and 99.

Twice Bought (Nisbet) is a Tale of the Oregon Gold-fields, by Mr. BALLANTYNE. There is enough of incident to attract boys, as in all this excellent writer's stories, and there are several illustrations. It is a cheap gift-book.

From Messrs. Cassell and Co. we have received four pretty gift-books for children, wonderfully cheap at a shilling: *Some Farm Friends, Creatures Tame, Those Golden Sands, School-day Hours;* the coloured pictures on the cover will make little folks pick these books in preference to larger ones.

A pleasing and pretty little book is *Daddy Darwin's Dove-cot* (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), a Country Tale, by Mrs. EWING, whose "Jackanapes," a delightful shilling's worth, has been such a success.

Up High! is a new book by the Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, Vicar of Christ Church, Dover; "friendly words to those within and to those without the fold of Christ." Mr. Everard's many excellent little books are happily well known. (Nisbet.)

Messrs. Hildesheimer and Faulkner (41, Jewin Street, E.C.) have sent us a number of their excellent Christmas and New Year Cards. Each November, during the last five years, we have had the pleasure of recommending the Cards of this firm, eminent in the artistic line; their specimens, in the present season, merit most hearty praise. Lately, we observe, Messrs. Hildesheimer and Faulkner took the gold medal, highest award. The characteristic feature of their new Cards is scenery; and some of the landscapes are wonderfully good, both as to design and execution—pictures of the highest merit. It is impossible to mention each of the packets which appear to us particularly tasteful; but No. 425, four sepia landscapes by F. Noel Paton, with verses by the author of "John Halifax, Gentleman"; No. 425, four designs, "Woods in Winter," pretty pictures; No. 459, four dainty circular landscapes, will prove very popular. No. 419, four floral designs, and No. 403 (a little larger, with verses, very handsome); No. 441, four rustic cottages, and No. 7441, screen; No. 343, four studies of dogs; No. 442, four rustic views; No. 7463, screen, autumn leaves, strike us as specially good. Two very dainty little books, *Home, Sweet Home*, and *Auld Lang Syne*, to be enclosed in an envelope, are choice presents for the season.

Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode have sent us several specimens of their Cards, which are, as usual, exceedingly attractive. The three coloured photographs are very choice; the country church with "May your New Year be bright and happy," is a lovely little picture. Three hand-painted are delightful; so are the "Ships" and "Swans" in satin wrappers. The cheaper picture-cards are pleasing. The "Palette" and "Ye Olde Plate Calendar" deserve a word of praise; so does the "Churchman's Calendar," just the thing for one's writing-desk.

Messrs. T. and T. Clark have published Professor Lindsay's commentary on the Acts of the Apostles i.—xii., one of their useful series *Handbook for Bible Classes*. From Messrs. Clark we have also received No. 1 of the *Monthly Interpreter*, which some students, no doubt, will prefer to the *Expositor*, or the *Homiletic Magazine*. It is edited by a well-known divine, Mr. Exell, editor (with Canon Spence) of the "Pulpit Commentary." Drs. Mattheson, Bruce, and Reynolds, and Dean Plumptre, are the chief contributors.

Mission Addresses (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge) is a good companion volume to Bishop Thorold's excellent little book recommended in a recent CHURCHMAN. The addresses were delivered to members of the London Lay Helpers' Association in preparation, of course, for the London Mission, 1884-5. Canons Mason, Body and Curteis, Bishop How and Mr. Bickersteth gave the addresses. This is a very valuable little book; nearly every page is excellent. May it be read by "lay helpers" throughout the Church!

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge list of Christmas Books, this year, is a very good one. A *Dresden Romance*, by LAURA M. LANE, is a quiet, pleasing story of German middle-class life; the tone is good, and it teaches self-sacrifice.—*Crab Court*, by M. SEELEY, tells something about life in the slums; it is a good book for a lending library or for mothers' meetings.—*No Beauty*, by HARRIET CHILDE PEMBERTON, tells of a plain-looking, very clever authoress, and the betrothed of

a handsome girl. It is clever, and may interest young ladies, but it would be better and much more useful if it had some real religion in it. What is the aim of such a novelette? one wonders.—*The One Army*, quiet and interesting, tells of a soldier and a nurse.—*The Magic Flute*, rather fanciful, has many points of interest. According to the legend that a flute encrusted with gold is not capable of sweet sounds, a genius who is spoilt with flattery and so forth loses vigour and manliness.—*Griffinhoof*, by CRONA TEMPLE, is undoubtedly clever, and is very readable. Griffinhoof is the name of an old sailor. There is power, and pathos, in the story.—In *Black Jack* are well-written and very sensible Temperance tales.

In the *Boy's Own Paper* appears a coloured picture, "The air that led to victory;" excellent. There is also a picture of "Our cricketing guests." In the *Leisure Hour* appears Dr. Macaulay's Church Congress Paper on Popular Literature. Dr. Lansdell writes on Khiva and the Turcomans.

We are much pleased with *Bible Thoughts for Daily Life*, by Mrs. COLIN G. CAMPBELL (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge): Family Readings from St. Mark's Gospel; a very practical little book.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received several good "Christmas Books," well printed, illustrated, and with tasteful covers. *Saxby*, by EMMA LESLIE, "a Tale of Old and New England," tells of the Pilgrim Fathers and the *Mayflower*. It will have sufficient of historical life and realness to attract the older readers of a parish library.—*Wind and Wave*, by H. E. BURCH, a new rendering of the Siege of Leyden, 1574, with many vivid touches, is very readable. The interest is well sustained. We are much pleased with this tale.—*At the Sign of the Blue Boar*, by EMMA LESLIE, gives sketches of life and character in the reign of Charles II.; well intentioned, and not without interest.—In *Seven Steps Upward* are some capital stories, which young readers will appreciate, illustrating Colossians iii. 12, 13, Revised Version, "a heart of compassion, kindness," etc. This is a very pleasing book.—*The Sunbeam of the Factory;* readable and very practical sketches; likely to do good service.

From Mr. J. E. Hawkins, 17, Paternoster Row, we have received, as usual, several very tasteful packets of Scripture Cards. "The Lord our Shield," four, admirable in design and execution; "Love and Peace," four, beautifully printed; "Sonship" (flowers and landscapes); "Looking unto Jesus," six, very good. Cheaper Cards are "The Fountain of Life," and "Wondrous Love." Such chromo-lithographed cards, choice as to colour, with well-selected Scriptures, deserve to be widely known.

The *Report* of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, 1884,[1] will have an interest for many of our readers. Archdeacon Bardsley's article on Clerical Charities, in the October CHURCHMAN, which has brought us many letters, led an esteemed correspondent to write to us on behalf of the Cor-

[1] Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy Office, 2, Bloomsbury Place, Bloomsbury Square, London, W.C. William Paget Bowman, Esq., Registrar.

poration; and we gladly quote some information given in the *Report*.[1]

The operations of the Corporation, it seems, are directed to these four purposes: (1st) continuous or occasional assistance to clergymen; (2nd) pensions and donations to clergy widows; (3rd) pensions and donations to aged or invalid single daughters of deceased clergymen; and (4th) grants towards the education and start in life of clergy children. The sums paid during the last year are as follow:

	£	s.	d.
To Clergymen - - - - - - -	4,420	0	0
.. Widows - - - - - - -	9,116	0	0
.. Aged Single Daughters - - - - -	7,082	0	0
.. Children, for Education, Outfits, and Apprentice Fees -	3,532	0	0
	£24,150	0	0

The total number of Grants and Pensions in the year 1883 was 1,461. As to Pensions, the following paragraph from the *Report* may well be quoted:

Too much respect and sympathy can scarcely be felt for those numerous and admirable women, the Widows and aged single Daughters of Clergymen, who, having shared all the privations and trials of their Husbands and Fathers, having been their helpmates in teaching the young, and attending to the wants of the sick and the aged, are in Widowhood and Orphanage often unavoidably left to be maintained by charity.

The Governors therefore keep steadily in view the importance of gradually raising the Pensions, as the state of the funds at their disposal gives them the opportunity, to a uniform amount of £30, a sum which, if scarcely of itself sufficient to provide a decent maintenance, is at least a valuable addition to any small private means the Pensioner may enjoy.

This excellent Society,[2] its history, character, operations, and management being considered, is eminently the "National Church Society for the Relief of the Clergy and their Families;" and it appeals with confidence to Churchfolk throughout the country, the Laity and also the Clergy, for increased support:

Unlike other Societies, established for the benefit of a particular district, or one class of sufferers, whether Clergymen, Widows, or Orphans, the Corporation labours to assist ALL with equal solicitude, and administers its funds to claimants in all parts of England and Wales.

---

[1] The Society, founded in 1655, was incorporated by Royal Charter in the year 1678. The title by which the Charity is commonly known is derived from the circumstance of its earliest promoters having been Sons of Clergymen.

[2] The management of the Society (says our well-informed correspondent) is admirable. The members of the Court of Assistants devote much time and care to the administration of the affairs of the Charity. There is a most efficient and very kind and sympathizing Registrar.

As to the Clergy, our correspondent says: "How is it that so noble a Society is supported by so few offertories and collections?" And as to the wealthy Churchmen amongst the Laity, he asks: "Why are there not more, *many* more, subscriptions and donations?"[1]

Just now the Society, no doubt, is specially pressed. Everybody knows the price of wheat; and the rural clergy, like the farmers, are in evil plight. One of our correspondents lost, last year, he writes, £100 out of his £400 a year; another received only £220 out of £300; another, what "with my farmer failing," lost tithe and glebe, £500. If a poor Vicar's clerical income be £180, and he receive "only—rates and taxes being paid—£110," he may well rejoice to know that the Corporation House in Bloomsbury Place has an open door.

Canon Hole, in his sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral on the last Anniversary of the Corporation, said:

Never since those days of persecution and poverty, when the children of the Church met in secret places, like the prophets in the caves, and the first Christians in the catacombs, for worship—the days when Evelyn received the Holy Sacrament from the great Bishop of Down and Connor in the house of a mutual friend, and this Society was first formed by and for the Sons of the Clergy—has there been such severe distress. In the recent seasons of adversity, which have come from untoward harvests upon those who derive their income from the land, no class of the com-

[1] A correspondent writes to us: "Of the sum distributed by the ninety-seven general Clerical Charities, £129,956, the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy contributes nearly one-fifth. There is, of course, no other charity anywhere near it in point either of age or income; and if any amalgamation should take place, it is the natural nucleus. But I doubt if the smaller charities would consent to give up their cherished individuality; and till they do there must always be a good deal of unnecessary administrative expense." Certainly, "some of the smaller charities and trust funds might do well to become merged in the great London Society (the Parent Society), with a view to economy of administration, and to the prevention of any overlapping of charitable help." "The question treated of by Archdeacon Bardsley (in his able and timely paper) is a very large one, and I do not consider any solution of it probable at present. There is a good deal of misconception in men's minds upon the point of pauperization of the Clergy by charitable help. I do not consider that a grant of £20 made to a clergyman of small means by a Society, Diocesan or London, can in any way tend to pauperize him, since his income is fixed, and does not depend upon any slackening or acceleration of effort. It seems to me that it simply serves to relieve him from pressing anxiety, and encourage him in his toilsome journey. Surely wealthy laymen and wealthy women might take more interest in such a matter. Let them think of the letter containing the announcement of a grant making its appearance on the country Vicarage breakfast-table, and try to picture to themselves the beaming faces of the family when it is opened, and its contents are made known."

munity has been so helpless as the clergy, because they are disqualified both by their training and vocation from making the most of their means; they cannot go into markets to buy and sell; they cannot seek other employment; and if their lands are tenantless (in the year 1881 there were 4,000 acres of glebe land without a tenant in the Diocese of Ely alone), they have neither knowledge nor capital to keep them in cultivation.

THE MONTH.

THE Franchise Bill has been read in the House of Lords a second time without a division; and the prospects of a peaceful settlement of the Reform question have grown much brighter.

To pay the bill for the Soudan and Bechuana expeditions another penny has been put upon the income-tax.

Another letter from General Gordon has been received by the Government.

Touching the East London Mission, earnest prayers have been offered.

Several Diocesan Conferences have been held, with much of unanimity, and in a most practical temper. The Liverpool Conference seems to have been a signal success.[1]

The Visitation Charges of the Bishops of London and Manchester, reported fully, have been read with interest.

Many tributes of respect have been paid to the Right Hon. H. Fawcett, M.P. (Postmaster-General), whose sudden death occasioned universal regret.

---

[1] In his opening address the Bishop of Liverpool thus spoke of *Aggressive Evangelization*: "Men of all schools in the Church of England agree in thinking that some special means must be used in order to reach the myriads of our countrymen among the working classes who now go to no place of worship. Few are prepared to maintain that it is sufficient to build and throw open fine churches with bright and hearty services. The 'masses' cannot appreciate such services, and will not come to such churches. The man who sits in his study and expects to catch fish by holding a rod and throwing a fly out of his window, would justly be called foolish. The fisherman must go after the fish, and not wait for the fish to come to him. The clergyman must not only throw open the church, but go down among the people, and approach them with friendly Christian aggression. But in what way this aggression is to be managed, whether by a Church Army, on the lines of the Salvation Army, or by habitual preaching in the open air, for which all men have not a gift, or by elementary services in rooms, are points which deserve discussion, and such discussion I hope we shall have. One thing at any rate is certain, when men like Moody or General Booth address the masses at irregular services, they never want hearers."