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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1886.

ART. I.—HOW IS POLYGAMY TO BE DEALT WITH BY THE RISING CHRISTIAN PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF BRITISH INDIA AND AFRICA?

A LETTER was read from the Bishop of Zululand in the Upper House of Convocation during the summer of 1886, requesting guidance on the question of baptizing persons living in Polygamy. It was determined that communications should be made to those Churches of the Anglican Communion, in which questions relating to Polygamy had been found of pressing importance, and that the ancient ecclesiastical law relating to the subject should be ascertained. At the annual meeting of the S.P.G., the Primate again alluded to the subject, and notified, that it would be discussed in the Pan-Anglican Synod, which would D.V. meet in 1888 at Lambeth.

It may be deemed not inexpedient to recall what has been written on the subject, and to consider it as God-fearing men, and yet not afraid to look firmly in the face the facts recorded in past history, and the circumstances of the days in which we live. We should show that we are neither slaves to precedents, nor desirous of needless change, nor contemptuous of Holy Writ wisely and widely interpreted.

In the Table of Literature on the subject, which I place at the close of this paper, ancient memories will be awakened, and the opinions of men now at rest will be cited. There is still room for discussion, when we find that a quarter of a century ago Archbishop Whately, Bishop Colenso, Bishop Cotton, Bishop Milman were on one side, and Bishop Cotterell, Bishop Daniel Wilson, and Mr. Henry Venn were on the other. Different missionaries have acted and made utterances in different manners. Such of the laity, as have spoken, have as a rule upheld the sanctity of contracts made *bonâ fide*—the contract of the union of the sexes, which is the most sacred, if not always the most holy, of contracts—and repudiated the

idea of a Polygamist purchasing admission into the Church of Christ at the expense of the comfort, the rights, the respectability, and possibly the morals, of his wives. We read in the "Report of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Panjab Church Council" (p. 59), that both Bishop Milman and Robinson, of Calcutta, sanctioned the baptism of Polygamists: we may well draw our breath here; but we read how in South Africa Polygamists were allowed to select one wife and enter the Church, and that the others were sometimes allowed to live not far from him, sometimes allowed to depart, sometimes married off to others: we may well feel a feeling of shame here, for these poor women had souls to be saved also.

What is Polygamy? Its real meaning is the status of a man, who has a plurality of wives, and of a woman, who has a plurality of husbands. The legal test of the word "husband" and "wife" is that the civil law recognises the status and the rights flowing therefrom, and that the children are legitimate. We have both Polygyny and Polyandry in India, thoroughly recognised in the courts of law. Be it remembered, that we guaranteed to the people of India toleration of their religion, and their own laws as regards marriage and inheritance, and no wise ruler would venture to meddle with them. And here I at once lay down another principle: whatever theologians or short-sighted missionaries may say, Polygamy is not a crime. The rulers of India put down with a high hand atrocious crimes. When we annexed the Panjab in 1846, I was with Lord Lawrence, and we summoned the landowners, and told them, that they must not burn their widows, or kill their daughters, or bury alive their lepers. We knew very well, that the greater part were idolaters, and all of them possible Polygamists, and some Polyandrists; but that was no affair of ours. Polygamy and Polyandry may be highly objectionable, but their position ranges with profligacy, intoxication, gambling, and other habits condemned by the moralist, yet extensively practised in Christian countries.

According to Dr. Hunter, Polyandry is found in the Himalayan valleys and in Travancore, at each end of India; one woman has several husbands, generally brothers. In their great heroic poem, the "Mahabhárate," the heroine, Draupadi, marries five brothers and lives happily. So entirely is Polyandry a feature of the custom of some tribes, that General Dalton mentions that, at the request of a father, he directed search to be made for a runaway daughter, who was brought in by the police with her *two* lovers, with whom she had eloped. In the Panjab, among the Jat families, too poor to bear the expense of the marriage of all the males, the wife of the eldest son has to accept his brothers as joint husbands.

One tribe is mentioned by the Mahometan writers in 1008 A.D. as practising Polyandry. In South India the custom has a different and more primitive development, for the sister's son always succeeds to a man's property; and according to Dr. Hunter the women of certain tribes live promiscuously without the form of marriage. The successor to the throne is restricted to the issue of a certain number of princesses, who are kept like queen-bees. Polygamy is lawful throughout India, both to Hindu and Mahometan, but the practice is quite the exception, as it is expensive. Moreover, India is under a rule of law, and has been so for centuries. A marriage is only lawful with certain persons, and must be ratified in a certain way and at a considerable expense. This causes a great restriction of the privilege, and, as a fact, none but the rich avail themselves of it. Very good feeling is often shown. A rich banker came to see me, and told me of his sorrow, that he had no son to perform the funeral rites over him. I suggested to him a second wife, but he would not hear of anything, which would vex his wife. On one occasion I heard in my office, that my head man of business had had two babies born at the same time from different mothers; when alone, I asked him about it, as it appeared to me to be disreputable, and he said that it was not his fault, that his parents had married him to his two wives; that they were both good women, and he had no power to cast either off. I remember a young Rajpút noble marrying the two daughters of a Rajpút neighbour, who added a niece as well to the bargain. The Maharaja Duleep Singh, so well known in England, is the issue of a polygamous father, who left a great many widows. Sheer Ali, the unfortunate ruler of Afghanistan in the last war, was the issue of a polygamous connection. I remember the Maharaja of Puteala, a Polygamist, in his desire to have a son, ordering a wife to be looked for of his own caste, who belonged to a family, where the women always had large families, and his plan succeeded. Nothing is more mistaken than to suppose that sensuality, in India at least, has anything to do with the matter. We read how the high-priest Jehoiada gave King Joash two wives when he was quite a child. As a rule, the bridegroom has never seen the bride before the marriage. The marriage vow is preserved faithfully by the woman at least, and by a very great majority of the men. We quite know that Monogamy does not put a stop to gross sensuality. My object is to show, that it is raising a false issue to exaggerate the foulness of Polygamy. It exists, respected by the law; but, if left alone, will gradually die out under the influence of enlightenment, education, and general softening of manners.

Leaving India, let us consider Polygamy in South Africa.

Sir Theophilus Shepstone, Hon. Secretary for Native Affairs in Natal, on March 26th, 1861, expressed the following opinions at Pietermaritzburg:

I. Native law recognises every woman as a wife, whose position as such has been consented to by the two families concerned, and when such consent has been ratified or carried out by a formal marriage ceremony.

II. For a marriage to be valid, there must be a consideration on both sides, the two families being the contracting parties, and this must be measured by the rank and condition of these families.

III. The suitor must make over cattle to the amount settled, and the girl on her marriage must be accompanied by cattle and ornaments as may be due to her rank. In some cases she brings nearly as much as her husband has paid.

IV. The marriage ceremonies differs with different tribes; but the essence of it is friendship betwixt the families, promise to protect and cherish wife, on part of husband; promise of obedience and good behaviour on part of wife; and a further recognition of the new relations with each other which can always be pleaded in any subsequent dispute.

V. The cattle are taken beforehand to the girl's family, but the girl can refuse them, and does often refuse them, and send them back; and the meaning of this is known.

VI. Her friends may press and threaten her; but a girl, if determined, is sure of victory. In case of personal violence the English magistrate would interfere and protect her, and maintain her right of free choice, and punish violence.

VII. In every stage of the proceedings before and after marriage will be found the exact counterparts and analogies of the higher form of marriage elsewhere, but in their native form peculiar to the state of culture.

VIII. The wife is not a slave, or sold as such. The parent of the girl never loses his right to protect his child. The cattle given at the marriage is a guarantee for their good treatment.

IX. She has, of course, to work, and help to maintain her family. If idle, she is punished. But public opinion has the same effect among women here as elsewhere.

X. A widow may continue with her children, or leave them and marry again. The husband's heirs may claim something, but they cannot control her free action.

XI. If she runs away from her husband, and her friends refuse to give her up, the matter comes before the magistrate, who settles it as best he can.

XII. When separation takes place before children are born, it often happens that all property is mutually restored. Such

cases often come before the magistrate, who, if cruelty and oppression of the woman be proved, would not order the cattle to be given back to the husband.

Sir Theophilus admits the evil of Polygamy, but gross exaggeration of that evil will not help the matter. There are many evils also in monogamic marriages. He states distinctly, that in any case of oppression by father of his daughter, or husband of his wife, the magistrate will interfere.

He considers, that it is wrong to teach a heathen, as a duty enjoined by Christ's religion, that *he must injure others to benefit himself*—that he must commit an unlawful act, involving oppression and injustice, and a reckless sacrifice of the interests of others, to further his own. These women are wives according to their law, or custom having force of law; and their *consciences*—their self-respect—should not be destroyed by inducing them to believe, that they are something less—in fact, dishonoured prostitutes; their children should not be bastardized, who by the law are legitimate, and have rights as such. These women are admitted to be *faithful* wives, because they consider themselves wives. Why subvert this notion and, in fact, encourage licentiousness? A wife at present has within her reach full means of protection, because she has the legal rights of a wife to plead. If deprived of these, her moral sense and her legal rights disappear. It may be expedient to legislate so as to discourage and extinguish Polygamy eventually, but any other course is neither politic nor just.

In India the wives are all equal; but we gather from Sir T. Shepstone, that one Zulu wife ranks above another. But it rarely happens that the first wife, according to date, enjoys the highest rank; nor does the issue of the first wife succeed as of right to a chieftainship: this point is of importance, as will appear below. In South Africa no system of concubinage is known, nor in India: this fact must also be borne in mind. In South Africa, as in India among Hindus, a man cannot marry any female, with whom he is in the remotest degree connected in blood. In South Africa the suitor has seen the girl, who is apparently an adult, and has a veto on the arrangement; in India the bride is generally a child, and has no voice in the matter. In India, with the Hindu female, divorce or re-marriage as a widow is impossible. With the Mahometan there is no difficulty, as the woman can even divorce her husband, and can, as a widow, re-marry. Change of religion from the Hindu and Mahometan point of view dissolve the contract of marriage; but a Christian does not obtain his liberty to re-marry in that way.

But there is a third class of circumstances which presents

itself. In British India law absolutely rules, the "law of the person," enforced by British Courts. In the colonies of Natal and the Cape, law, to a certain extent, prevails, but of a rougher character; but on the West Coast of Africa there exists no law, or custom having the force of law, and there is no Executive to enforce it, if it did exist. Polygamy is made more odious by the existence of slavery and the slave-trade; and it is obvious, that sensuality is the motive here, and that, in fact, marriage scarcely exists. The connection of the Arab and the negro chief with the women of his harem is simply that of wholesale concubinage. If the phenomena presented are more distressing, they are simpler. The male convert in such cases can be dealt with very summarily, as a reformed profligate; the poor women have no conjugal duties to render, but have to be rescued, as best may be, from a life of infamy.

Beyond India and Africa there are other regions where Polygamy prevails, but it is in these two countries, that the opposing forces of Polygamy and Christianity come into collision.

The environment of the chosen people at Hebron and Shechem, in Egypt, and in Canaan, was so totally different, that it is difficult to imagine anything more unreasonable, than to seek for analogies there wherewith to solve this problem of the nineteenth century in India and Africa. If Polygamy prevailed in the Old Testament times, it was obviously of a totally different character from the secluded Indian zunána, the Zulu kraal, and the Yariba harem. In the first case the woman does nothing, absolutely nothing; in the last two she works like a day labourer, and helps to support herself, her children, and her husband or master by daily toil. The wives of the Hebrew Polygamist appeared in public, were admitted to the place of worship, were treated with honour and deference; and in the case of Hannah and Bathsheba, an eighth wife, their issue was the recipient of the highest honour from the Almighty. There were harlots in those days, and there were concubines; but these were wives, and the priests did not think them unworthy of their notice. They had even a higher status than is conceded by law to the wives of the Indian and African Polygamist; and in some cases, though not all—in the case of the mother of Solomon certainly—Polygamy was the result of sensuality, and yet went unpunished under a system of government controlled by a powerful priesthood, and stimulated and awed by inspired prophets, who never wearied in describing the sins and backslidings of the nation (Ezekiel iii. 18), but never spake one word against this great domestic weakness. I mention these facts to justify the English Government of India and South Africa in the policy of forbearance, which they have adopted

towards Polygamy, as in past years they did to slavery, until the latter died out of itself, and this will be the fate of Polygamy also.

My own view is that, subsequent to the Babylonish Captivity, Polygamy did not exist; the only instance on record is that of Herod the Great, mentioned by Josephus. The unlimited power of divorce, and no doubt profligacy, had taken its place. The world had advanced. *Successive* Polygamy had taken the place of *concurrent* Polygamy in the Western world. In Greece and Rome Polygamy was unknown. We only read of one wife of Pilate. Esther is the last Hebrew maiden on record, who fell so low as to be one of the many wives of a sensual tyrant—a heathen, to whom her law forbade her to be united. Her contemporary, the Roman Virginia, preferred death to shame. If it be conceded that Polygamy had ceased to exist many centuries before the time of our Lord and His Apostles, we are spared much useless discussion about inapplicable texts, which could not be meant to cover circumstances, which never existed. In the elder world cannibalism, human sacrifices, and Polygamy had existed, but as far as regards the nations dwelling within the area of the Roman Empire, they had died out. There is an abundance of abominable crime alluded to by St. Paul, but it was beyond his experience and imagination, that a man should err in these three particulars. It seems impossible, that he should have overlooked them in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans had they existed.

Since these days the uttermost ends of the world have been reached, and we find traces of these three giants in America, Africa, Asia, and Oceania. We find nearly all the crimes described by the Apostles, and these in addition. Civilization may have trodden down the two former in China, Japan, and India, but the third remains. Elsewhere all three are rampant. This leads to another reflection. We cannot conceal from ourselves, that all mankind is not on the same level of culture and privileges and responsibilities. Europe and European colonies are far ahead of Asia, Asia is ahead of Africa, and Africa of America and Oceania. It is idle to apply the same methods of government, to require the same standard of morals, to enforce the same discipline, upon tribes just emerging from savagery, in the lowest records of culture, left out in the cold for long centuries, never visited by prophet or evangelist, never elevated by certain hopes of a future heaven, never awed by certain prospects of everlasting damnation. And yet some missionaries would try to introduce *per saltum* ordinances and standards, which they could scarcely be able to enforce in the British Islands, into the African kraal

or the Indian village. Let them set before their flock the highest—the very highest—standard, but be merciful in the application of it for the first or second generations.

All other sins and offences against the law of God and human nature seem to come to an end with the committal and the punishment, the repentance and the pardon. In Oceania we have excellent Christians, who once were cannibals. The sorcerer-priest, the official murderer of the human sacrifice, has been admitted as a communicant; the profligate, the drunkard, the adulterer, the atheist, the blasphemer, the persecutor of martyred Christians—all find that there is pardon; but the curse of the unhappy Polygamist is, by the nature of the case, a continuing one; he cannot get rid of it until his own death, or that of his unhappy wives. And yet Polygamy, though it clearly existed, is not condemned in the Decalogue. The few words, "Thou shalt have but one wife," would have settled the matter absolutely and for ever. To our nineteenth-century ideas the sin of theft, which is condemned in the Decalogue, is as nothing compared to that of Polygamy. As time went on, and the thoughts of men widened with the progress of the suns, no prophet denounced this canker-worm of domestic purity, causing rivalry among women occupying the same house, hatred among the children of the same father. The misfortunes of the lives of David and Solomon could be so clearly traced to Polygamy, that the conscience of the nation would have accepted the prohibition, as indeed it did after the Captivity. It cannot be said, as regards Israel, as it can truly be said with regard to the people of India, that the position of the ruling power was so delicate and precarious that it dared not run the risk of intruding into family customs, for Ezra and Nehemiah plainly compelled the people to put away their alien wives. A word from Moses and Joshua would have nipped Polygamy in the bud; and David's conduct would have been as unjustifiable in taking eight wives one thousand years before the Christian era, as Herod's was in taking nine wives at the time of the birth of our Lord. On the contrary, special favour attached itself to Rachel, Hannah, and Bath-sheba, and their issue, Joseph, Samuel, and Solomon, all begotten by polygamous fathers. The missionary must, therefore, maintain some restraint upon himself in his wholesale abuse of Polygamy, or cease to read the Old Testament to his congregation. We have it on the authority of one distinguished traveller, that a woman in West Africa would disdain to marry a man, who had only one wife. We have it on the authority of a missionary, that after the birth of a child the wife withdraws herself absolutely from the society of her husband for three years, that she may suckle her offspring.

Everything assumes a weird and awful form in Africa. A well-known traveller a few years ago tells us of a chief, who, in addition to his well-stocked harem, claimed a right to every woman in his kingdom on whom his fancy fell; and among the number of his harem were his sisters, his stepmothers, his cousins, his aunts, and his own children. The Polygamy of India, which excludes everyone within the limits of consanguinity and affinity, and limits the number to four at the same time, all of the same caste as the husband, seems quite a decent and orderly custom, compared to the frightful excesses of the Africans in regions, which have not yet come under European law.

I have no wish to fortify myself by the opinions of others. As stated above, I regard all the cases quoted in the Old Testament as inapplicable to Christianity in the nineteenth century, and the pages of the New Testament as silent; but the words, "Male and female created He them," "In the beginning it was not so," seem to govern the whole matter, and to forbid imperatively the admission of Polygamy in any form into the Christian Church. The equality of members of the two sexes that are born is beyond doubt: the superior fecundity of a monogamous population is a fact capable of proof. If once Polygamists are admitted into the Church, even for the lifetime of existing Polygamists, a new lease of life will be given to the institution. The Native Churches are rapidly becoming independent, and it may please some lax Christians to assert a right for a Church to be polygamous. Nor is this fear without foundation, as is evidenced by the letter of a Native Pastor at Abeokuta in Yariba-land, West Africa, 1883:

The Polygamists had gained ground, and had trodden down the communicant members of the community: I have since begun to effect separation between the two. The Polygamists dislike this, and complain against me bitterly, that I virtually separate them from my congregation, because they are sinners. They would persecute the communicants, whenever they have an opportunity. They used to be members of my local Church Committee, so as to be consulted before anything is done by me in the Church, and whatever they do not sanction they would not have me to do. What makes it worse is that they are the more enlightened of the congregation. The *young* Polygamists have a company, which meets once a month for feasting, and on this occasion Monogamy is a subject of scandal and reproach. Some young male communicants had joined them before I came to this station; up till now I have not been able to disconnect them, although they do not seem to join them in heart and mind.

It is stated elsewhere that West African converts fall back into Polygamy.

But in avoiding Scylla do not let us run into Charybdis. The King of Congo professed lately to the missionaries at San Salvador that he was in great trouble about his wives, and

anxious to know what he should do. The missionaries made the prudent reply, that they could not advise him to put them away, as *this could only be productive of greater evils.* This is the whole gist of the matter: let us think it out upon the facts recorded, and not on the opinions on those facts.

Some missionaries would receive the Polygamist on the condition of his retaining one wife only: but which wife? the one, who was the first married to him, perhaps old, childless, neglected, and a hopeless heathen; or the mother of the largest number of his children, or the one to whom his fancy turns, or the one who is ready to become a Christian, or the chief wife, as there is a certain gradation of rank among them. In the event of the chosen wife dying, may he choose another from his reserve-wives? We enter here into a succession of hopeless dilemmas, to which no satisfactory solution can be found. Some bolder spirits would suggest that all the previous marriages were worthless, and the new Christian should, like a snake, come out of his old skin and abandon all, "wife, children, for His sake," and be united by Christian matrimony to a Christian woman. I should not have ventured to have suggested such a shocking device, if I had not read of it as proposed. But natural affection may be too strong for him, and a missionary from Be-Chuána-land writes that in ten years he never had a case of a Polygamist being converted, but he had known one instance of a man putting away a second wife, and becoming a Catechumen; but she came back to him, and he received her, and left the faith.

But we must lift up this subject to a higher level. The missionary sometimes argues, that the African wife is a mere beast of burden and a slave, and at another time an object of sensual lust. She can scarcely be both at the same time. It is sometimes urged, that she is not a wife at all, but only a concubine. The Be-Chuána missionary above quoted goes so far as to say, that the women, who were put away, would not consider themselves injured, and that it was quite a common thing for a woman to have been united to five or six husbands in succession. Such a state of things could not happen in India, and, if the last statement be true, the reply is that the man with such connections is *not a Polygamist* any more than any profligate European deserves that name. But such is not the case ever in India, and only exceptionally in Africa. We must treat these women as *wives* and mothers of legitimate children, and as faithful wives. It scarcely seems consistent with the tenets of our holy religion to try and save the soul of a man at the expense of the feelings, and morals, and comforts, and rights of his rejected, or perhaps worn out, wives. They in honour gave all that hard fortune had endowed them

with—their person and their youth—to this man, called him husband, bore to him children, who inherit his tribal position, his name, and such portions of his goods as fall to them. It is a prodigious breach of faith to make a clean sweep or partial sweep of all his responsibilities: if they are old and childless, it is a bad beginning of a higher life, that they should be cast out for no offence of their own, deprived of all solace and protection; if they are young, it is terrible to read such words as these from the pen of a living Bishop, "She will easily get another husband from her father's home." It would have been better to discontinue the use of the words "husband and wife" altogether, and talk of the Africans as brute-beasts. We all know what an illicit connection is, and what a natural child is in Europe and in India: if by a process of inquiry it is found, that any or all of these women were the divorced wives of other men, or were unfaithful wives, or within the lawful limitations of kindred and affinity, or actually married to some other man, let their names be struck off the list of his wives; perhaps some of them may run away, or disappear, or die, or it may be proved that they were the wives of his brother, or the servants of the house, and thus by a judicial process it may come out that, the man is a Monogamist after all. But if we are to trust Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and the common report of the country, these women are wives in South Africa, and they most assuredly are so in India. Whether Hindu or Mahometan, let the missionaries recollect that they contracted to each other in good faith, and that no wrong ought to be done to the wives, for all have a claim on their husband, not only for maintenance and protection, but what St. Paul describes (as rendered in the Revised Version) as "her due." If condemned to live apart they may wax wanton, and be tempted; and it is their husband then who causes them to commit adultery.

Forbidding then on the one hand the admission of the Polygamist into the Church by Baptism, and resisting to the utmost on the other hand any attempt to get rid of the burden of Polygamy at the expense of his wives and children, what course do I recommend for the present necessity? We take the following narrative from *Central Africa*, the organ of the Universities Mission, March, 1886, p. 42:

> On the last Sunday of 1885 Matola, a powerful chief, was solemnly admitted by Bishop Smithies to the rank of *Catechumen*. He knelt down in the full congregation, and received a cross, as a token of his admission. One stumbling-block he has in his way before he can be admitted to *Baptism:* he had in former years become a Polygamist, and it can only be hoped that God will open *a way for him without injury to those who have borne him children*, to come out of the state which the law of the Church in all ages seems to have determined to be a barrier to admission to the Christian Covenant.

This seems to be the happy *via media*. The man must accept, as his cross, the status, which his own conduct has induced. He is not excluded from Christian teaching, Christian worship; but it is distinctly understood by the Church, that such as he cannot be admitted into the Church. His children come at once under tuition and baptism; and for his wives the door is also open, as each of them no doubt may assert that she is the wife of one man, and not in any way excluded from Christian privileges, living after the manner of Rachel and Hannah.

Such is the opinion which I have arrived at:

1. Polygamist men are not to be admitted to Baptism, but their wives may be.

2. Polyandrists—men and women—are totally excluded; here both men and women are sinning, for the woman in cohabiting with her husband's brother commits incest.

3. No man should be encouraged to put away his lawful wives; he should be reminded that his union with them is for the term of their natural lives.

4. Polygamists may be admitted as Catechumens.

I now add some opinions of others:

In the fifth Report of the Annual Meeting of Native Church Council of the Panjab a letter was read from the Rev. T. P. Hughes, C.M.S. Missionary at Peshâwar, in which this passage occurs:

> In the case of polygamous marriages, the blessings of the Church could hardly be expected; but both the late (Metropolitan) Bishop Milman, and the present Bishop of the Lahore Diocese (Bishop French) have sanctioned the baptism of Polygamists.

In 1834 the Conference of Missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta, including those of the Baptist, the London, the Church Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland, and the American Presbyterian Board, after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion, and after much and serious deliberation, *unanimously* agreed on the following propositions, though there had been previously much diversity of sentiment among them on various points:

> I. It is in accordance with the spirit of the Bible and the practice of the Protestant Church to consider the State as the proper fountain of legislation in all civil questions affecting Marriage and Divorce.
>
> II. The Bible being the true standard of morals, ought to be consulted in everything which it contains on the subjects of Marriage and Divorce, and nothing determined evidently contrary to its general principles.
>
> V. If a convert before becoming a Christian has married more wives than one, in accordance with the practice of Jewish and primitive Christian Churches, *he shall be permitted to keep all*; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the Church. In no other cases is Polygamy to be tolerated amongst Christians.

There were twenty or more who adopted the propositions without any exemption.—Calcutta *Christian Observer*, iv., p. 22.

The Calcutta missionaries a few years afterwards reviewed these propositions, and established them in a form more specifically applicable to India. With regard to Polygamy, the deliverance, which they gave was even more decided than in the original propositions:

The meeting were unanimously of opinion that although Polygamy is one of the greatest evils, and is never to be tolerated in a Christian community, when it can be regulated by the law of the Gospel, yet in the case of Polygamy antecedently to conversion, the husband is bound to retain and provide for all his wives, as such, unless *they choose to take advantage of their own law.* This last clause refers to the renunciation of Hinduism and Mahometanism by either of the married parties being regarded by both Hindus and Mahometans as entailing divorce.—Calcutta *Christian Observer*, vol. xi., p. 401.

A writer in the Calcutta *Christian Observer*, vol. iv., pp. 91, 371, 400, commenting upon the resolutions of the missionaries, remarks: "The missionaries are of opinion that the very allowances which God, through Moses, made for the Jews in their infant state as a people, is by parity of reason to be made now for Polygamists, who from heathens become Christians." I have already alluded above to the fact that nations are at different levels of progress, and this argument may fairly be urged in favour of the Africans, the South Sea Islanders, and North American Indians, but scarcely in favour of the Hindus, who are not in an infant state, but the heirs of an old and advanced civilization, and still less in favour of Mahometans, many of whose ancestors were Christians, and therefore Monogamists, and who appeal as their authority not to time-honoured custom, but the comparatively modern law of Mahomet. I protest against the assertion that Polygamy was ever sanctioned in a primitive Christian church.

Bishop Milman's opinion referred to was as follows:

The very exceptional case of married life among natives of India justified him in allowing a man, lawfully married to more than one wife, to be baptized and retain his wives, and give them their conjugal due. He must not marry another, or, if one die, take another in her place: he must not hold any ecclesiastical office.—*Mission Life*, 1880, p. 227.

Bishop Douglas, of Bombay, decided against the baptism of Hindus with two wives, unless he put one away. The present Bishop of Bombay rather leans to the baptism of such a man without that requirement. Similar leanings are ascribed to the Bishop of Colombo.

It was stated that Bishop Caldwell would baptize a Polygamist *in articulo mortis* ("Mission Life," 1880, p. 185). The Bishop of Melanesia (Selwyn) seemed to think that the putting away of the supernumerary wives should be

the rule, but he had difficulty in facing it. The late Primate of New Zealand (Selwyn the elder) was of the same opinion. We read in his "Life" the following story: "Are you thinking of becoming a Christian?" said the Bishop to a native chief. "Yes," said the chief. I saw the Bishop hold up two fingers, and then bend one down. The chief nodded assent. The Bishop meant that the chief must get rid of one of his wives. We do not find that he indicated which wife should be unjustly deprived of her home.

The missionaries of the Basle Society would receive Polygamists in case of extreme necessity, as when a man had children by both his wives, and all parties agree in the impossibility of separation; yet there is not one Polygamist in any of their missionary congregations in the West Coast of Africa. The missionaries of this society recognise a heathen marriage as a binding one, and declare that a Christian cannot put away his wife, though a heathen.

The Wesleyan missionaries positively refuse all Polygamists, recognising only a Christian marriage, that is to say, one performed in a Christian Church. If a heathen become a Christian, he may keep (or rather marry) his heathen wife, or he may send her away if she remarries a heathen. They direct their converts to dismiss all their wives and marry a Christian: in fact, under this rule, if a man wishes to get rid of his wives, *he has only to become a Christian.*

The Moravian missionaries had to deal with negro slaves in America. Their original rules were: (1) They would not oblige a man who, previous to his conversion, had taken more than one wife to put the others away without their consent; (2) they would not appoint such a one to be helper in the congregation; (3) they would allow no Christian to take more than one wife, and he is bound to her for life. In 1880 they modified these rules, and their present rule is, that in general an applicant for baptism is to dismiss all his wives but one, but that when this may lead to greater sin, an exception may be made under the authority of the District Mission Conference.

I wrote to my friend Dr. Schrader, of the Rhenish Missionary Society, at Barmen, in Germany, to ask for a statement of their present practice, and in his reply, July, 1886, he says:

> We do not think it right, nor indicated by any clear word of God, that anyone who has taken two or more legal wives, as a heathen, should be compelled to dismiss them all except one, before he can be admitted to baptism. It seems to me to be a bad beginning of his Christian life to break legal promises which he has given formerly. Of course every Polygamist must be told that this state of affairs is not in accordance with the Gospel, and as soon as there is an opportunity to get rid of it in a legal way, he ought to do it; but I do not know if it is advisable to postpone baptism until that can be done.

The great difficulty which has been felt several times is this, that very often in churches where Polygamists have been admitted, persons who for special reasons wish to take a second wife, cannot easily understand why something *that is allowed to others should be denied them.* But to avoid this, all persons entering the Church should be clearly made to understand that they will never be allowed to take a second wife as long as the first is still living, and the Polygamist can hold no church office. We have had amongst our missionaries a few who have protested against this liberal praxis, as it is called; but after much renewed discussion (for instance in our Borneo Mission lately) we have always come back upon this one opinion, which has been in use in the Rhenish Mission for a long time.

This Society labours in the Indian colonies of Holland and Borneo, as well as in South Africa.

With regard to Africa, let me quote the opinion of Mr. Buckley Wood, an experienced missionary of the C.M.S. in Yariba-land, in Western Africa: "No one who knows Africa and Polygamy in Africa can ever doubt that the C.M.S. is perfectly right in not for an hour allowing such an abominable custom to exist."

Thus we have the direct contrary practice in force in different portions of the mission field.

I have already stated that the status of "wife" should be defined, and in each case ascertained; and that the concubine, the wife of another man, the divorced wife, the slave girl, the person within the limits of blood or affinity, cannot be deemed *wives*, and that the man is in such cases a profligate, but *not* a Polygamist. It seems so simple; but I read in a missionary periodical, June, 1886, the following:

A convert proved the sincerity of his faith by making quite a sacrifice. An uncle died leaving two wives; these, according to native custom, fell by law of inheritance to the nephew. He was betrothed to another girl, whom he has since married. He was told that if he continued to commit Polygamy he could not be admitted to the Church; to put away his two wives, *his aunts by marriage*, was a great sacrifice; but this convert was not long in deciding, and the two *wives* were put away.

Can anything reflect more on the common-sense of a missionary than this? Can he not see that, under no law, human or divine, could it have been right for a man to take as his wife the widow of the brother of his father or his mother? It is rank incest. Every Hindu and Mahometan would protest against such a thing. The wife of an uncle is to a man as his own mother. They were not *wives*, and the man was not a Polygamist, but guilty of incest. If each case be carefully inquired into, many a so-called Polygamist will be found to be only a debauched profligate, and not a very promising material for a Christian convert, except after a long probation.

LITERATURE ON THE SUBJECT OF POLYGAMY IN CONNECTION WITH CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

1. Dr. Colenso, Bishop of Natal, Remarks on Proper Treatment of cases of Polygamy. Pamphlet. Pietermaritzburg, 1855.
2. Reply to the same remarks by an American Missionary (Lewis Grout, of the American Board of Foreign Missions). Pamphlet. Pietermaritzburg, 1855.
3. Dr. Colenso's Reply to an American Missionary. Pamphlet. Pietermaritzburg, 1856.
4. An Answer to Bishop Colenso's Letter on the Polygamy Question, by an American Missionary (H. A. Wilder). Pietermaritzburg, 1856.
5. Apology for the Toleration of Polygamy in Converts from Heathenism, by a Protestant Dissenter. 1856.
6. Bishop Colenso's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the Polygamy Question. Pietermaritzburg, March 1, 1861.
7. Review of Bishop Colenso's Remarks. Durban, 1855.
8. Letter of Canon Callaway. Pamphlet. Durban, 1862.
9. Pamphlet by the Rev. W. H. Fowle, 1856.
10. Polygamy among Candidates for Baptism, by Bishop Cotterill, of Grahamstown, 1861.
11. Minute by Bishop Cotterill at Conference of Bishops in Capetown, 1861. *Colonial Church Chronicle*, p. 309. 1861.
12. Two Sermons by H. Callaway. Pietermaritzburg, 1866.
13. Government Regulations. Pietermaritzburg, 1869.
14. Minute by Rev. Henry Venn, Secretary to Church Missionary Society. Pamphlet. London, Jan. 1857.
15. Report of Lahore Missionary Conference, 1862-63. Published at Lodiana, North India, 1863. An assembly of Clergy, Missionaries, and State officials.
16. Minute of Views of Bishop Daniel Wilson, of Calcutta, drawn from his "Life," vol. i., p. 363. Appendix to above.
17. Conference of Missionaries held by Bishop of Bombay. *Mission Life*, p. 185, 1880.
18. Letter of Dr. Smythies, Bishop of Equatorial Africa, pp. 79, 80. Central Africa, June 1, 1886.
19. Polygamy in the Himalaya. Dr. Stulpnagel. Indian *Evangelical Review*, Oct. 1877.
20. Polygamy in Relation to Christian Baptism, by Professor Cheyne. Oxford. *Mission Life*, 1880, p. 145.
21. Missionary in Be-Chuána-land. *Mission Life.*
22. Life of Bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand.
23. Brown's History of Missions, iii., pp. 365, 558.
24. Calcutta *Christian Observer*, iv., pp. 91, 371, 400.
25. Letters to the Primate, by Douglas, Bishop of Zululand, on the subject of Polygamy, 1886.

ROBERT N. CUST.

July, 1886.

ART. II.—WORDSWORTH AND NATURE.

THE Wordsworth Society, which was established some six years ago, has lately come to an end. It has attained the object for which it was originally formed, and there is therefore no reason why it should continue to exist. The

Society has done good and solid work. It has lifted Wordsworth to a higher position in the republic of letters, it has promoted and extended the study of his works, and it has discovered and made known many facts of an interesting kind which tend to illustrate and throw light on the text and chronology of the poems and the local allusions which they contain. At the final meeting of the Society, held in the Jerusalem Chamber, it was stated that it is in contemplation to publish selections from Wordsworth, to be edited conjointly by certain of its members, including Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Stopford Brooke, Mr. Russell Lowell, and others, which, if carried out, will no doubt help to make the poet better known amongst all classes. A suggestion was also made at the meeting, which we hope will not be lost sight of till it has taken shape and practical effect, namely, the desirability of having some place in the Lake District, a sort of shrine to which pilgrims and lovers of the poet might resort, in which there might be a collection of busts and portraits of the poet, as well as specimens of his MSS., and other relics and memorials, which posterity might value as we value memorials of Shakespeare, Bunyan, Burns, or any other great man. In this way the gradually increasing influence of Wordsworth upon our time will deepen and gain volume, till, like the tide breaking upon the coast, it dashes its healthy spray into every face; or like the oxygen in the air, upon which our health and spirits depend, it pervades the atmosphere of our national life and thought, quickening and maturing the scattered germs of a truer and purer poetic philosophy than has yet prevailed.

For nearly half a century Wordsworth wrote, not only without recognition and appreciation, but amid perpetual outbursts of scorn and contempt. The reviewers laughed at him, the general public passed him by in silence. Their singers were of quite another kind. They were under the spell of the gloomy sentimentalism of Byron, the sensuous passion of Shelley, the meretricious glitter of Moore, or the wire-drawn artificialities of Rogers, and they had neither eye nor ear nor heart for the calm strength, the ineffable serenity and the spiritual beauty of the great poet of Nature. "Wherefore is there a price in the hand of a fool to get wisdom, seeing he hath no heart to it?" Wordsworth was not brilliant, he was not dramatic, he was not cynical, he was not moody, he was destitute of biting humour, and his wit was of the thinnest kind. His conversational powers were not eloquent and fascinating like those of his friend Coleridge. He could not delight a Belgravian audience with a good story or a capital song like Tommy Moore, or season the club dinner with jokes and epigrams like Horne Tooke or Charles Lamb. There was

nothing dazzling about him. His qualities were of a higher and nobler type: he was simple, earnest, temperate, just, whose days were bound each to each by natural piety. The words of the Poet Laureate, of one great in a different walk of life, may be applied to him:

> Rich in saving common-sense,
> And, as the greatest only are,
> In his simplicity sublime.

And thus, to use the beautiful words of a living writer, "he was kept in peace; he was tainted with no morbid disquietudes; he sang no dirges of despair, but a sweet, high strain of purest song, which has been for the healing and the inspiration of his country, and which will endure in gathered power when the bitter cries of our modern singers are lost in oblivion, or are remembered only with sorrowful disdain. Just as Milton has been pictured standing like a colossal statue of Apollo, watching the arrow-flight of his immortal song, while round his feet, unconscious of his presence, dance the wine-stained satyrs of the Court of Charles, so we may figure Wordsworth standing on the threshold of this perturbed generation of ours, clothed in his simplicity, rebuking its fretful strife with his serenity, and its despairing voices with his faith." A poet who required reflection and some critical insight, who demanded a certain portion of sympathy on the part of his hearers before he could be even understood, could not, it is clear, be enjoyed by readers luxuriating in such exciting and highly-flavoured mental condiments as the first decades of the century furnished. When his "Excursion" was first published it was very severely handled. One critic even boasted that he had *crushed* it. "He crush 'The Excursion'!" exclaimed Southey: "he might as well fancy he could crush Skiddaw!" All this ridicule and opposition, however, failed to shake his faith in himself. Similar treatment had driven men before to cynicism, to settled despondency, even to suicide; but Wordsworth's healthy moral strength lifted him above all such feelings. This is the victory by which he overcame the world, even his faith. The brutal dulness and contemptuous scorn of his critics and contemporaries did not disturb the serene sweetness of his temper or the proved soundness of his judgment. So with unabated hope he sang on, and in time men listened and were glad. And to-day he is one of the chief seers of the land, with a daily growing audience, to whom he has become "guide, philosopher, and friend."

Many of those who every year visit the Lake Country are drawn to that consecrated and romantic region by the genius of Wordsworth. We have seen them and mingled with them, and heard with gladness their words of admiration and affec-

tion for the great poet of Nature and Humanity. And there are many others who, unable for various reasons to visit the locality in person, have travelled in thought at least over the scenes which his pen has immortalized. They have toiled up Skiddaw and Black Combe, "dread name derived from clouds and storms," and Scafell and Helvellyn. They have strolled along the banks of the Eden and the Greta and the Dudden, now flowing gently through moor or meadow, and now dashing their white waters down dark ravines and through wild gorges to the sea. They have visited Calder Abbey and Furness, and reminiscences of their mediæval glories have come up before the mind. They have made pilgrimages to Cockermouth, where the poet first saw the light on the 7th day of April, 1770; and to Grasmere, amongst those hills whose blue peaks had bounded the world of his childhood, where he lived eight years, and to which he brought his bride, Mary Hutchinson, in 1802, of whom he says, after three years of wedded love:

> A perfect woman, nobly planned:
> To warn, to comfort, and command,
> And yet a spirit still and bright,
> With something of an angel-light—

and in whose little churchyard he sleeps his last long sleep; and Rydal Mount, where he took up his abode in 1813, "a cottage-like building, almost hidden by a profusion of roses and ivy," under the shadow of the mountains, with Windermere gleaming to the south, where he wrote his great poem "The Excursion"—an interesting and delightful pilgrimage, where Nature may be studied alike in her sternest and loveliest aspects. Moor and fell, mountain and lake and tarn, river, wood, and ruin, are all there to afford joy and gratification to thousands of the tourist genus every year. No Wordsworth is there now, but his memory haunts, as his poetry has immortalized, every scene on which we look. We cannot travel through the Lake Country without thinking of him. His genius has touched every rock and bush, and waterfall and hamlet, and fern and flower, and hill and stream.

With Wordsworth poetry was a passion, it was the very "essence of his being." In it he lived and moved, and suffered and was glad. He wrote it because he could not help but write. The truly great poet is impelled by his art. Necessity is laid upon him.

> He does but sing because he must,
> And pipes but as the linnets sing.

He thought, like the philosopher in "Rasselas," that "nothing could be useless to the poet. Whatever is beautiful, and whatever is dreadful, must be familiar to his imagination; he must

be conversant with all that is awfully vast or elegantly little." Sun, sky, ocean, mountain, tree, flower, thorn-bush, lichen, "fish in stream," and "bird in bower," and "vapours rolling down the valleys," nay, the humblest articles of trade, and the humblest instruments of life,—the gleam of poetry shone for him over them all. The earth was eloquent to him, and so, too, were the heavens. "While all the poets of his day," says Mr. Dawson in his beautiful little volume of essays, "Quest and Vision," lately published, "were ransacking earth and heaven for some new form of sensationalism, and were busy blowing bubbles of brilliant froth in the heated chambers of Society, he had taken refuge in the serenity and strength of Nature, and had found thoughts too deep for tears in the humblest flowers that blew." His intimacy with the very spirit which gives a physiognomic expression to all the works of Nature was so long and genial, that, like Shakespeare's banished duke, he found "sermons in stones, tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, and good in everything."

> To every natural form, rock, fruit or flower,
> Even the loose stones that cover the highway,
> I gave a moral life ; I saw them feel
> Or link'd them to some feeling.

"His theory of poetry," says the writer from whom we have just quoted, "amounted to this, that it was time for poets to return to Nature, to natural and simple themes, and to clothe such themes in the plain language of the common people. It asserted the dignity of common life, and the sacredness of the natural affections. It was a protest against the diseased sentiment, the histrionic melancholy, the faithless cynicism which had corrupted the life of English poetry, not less than a protest against the meretricious glitter of the style in which such poetry has been couched." "Wordsworth's poetry," continues Mr. Dawson, "was meant to be a rebuke against a debased poetic style, and his character and career were yet a finer rebuke against a debased poetic life."—("Quest and Vision.")

It is of Wordsworth in his relation to Nature we desire to say a few words in this paper. He was, as may be inferred from what has been already said, an unwearied student and a passionate lover of Nature. He devoted himself with indomitable energy and unquenchable zeal to her service. Never did high priest minister at the altar of his church with more enthusiastic ardour and delight than did Wordsworth in the holy temple of Nature.

> The sounding cataract
> Haunted me like a passion ; the tall rock,
> The mountain, and the deep and gloomy wood,
> Their colours and their forms, were then to me
> An appetite.

He held constant communion with the spirit of Nature. His ambition was to be faithful to Nature. He drew from Nature his inspiration. There are times when, as Mr. Matthew Arnold remarks, Nature seems to take his pen and write for him. Hence he is at once simple and original. Like his own Lord Clifford in the "Song at the Feast of Brougham Castle"—

> Love had he found in huts where poor men lie,
> His daily teachers had been woods and rills,
> The silence that is in the starry sky,
> The sleep that is among the lonely hills.

Perhaps no other poet has shown a stronger imaginative grasp of the phenomena of Nature; certainly none has so lovingly and minutely described her in all her moods, vicissitudes and forms. He was constantly making tours on every side to store his mind with imagery, with every faculty awake, every sense acute, every avenue through which light could come, the eye of the body, and that "inward eye which is the bliss of solitude," ever open.

> His mind was keen,
> Intense and frugal, apt for all affairs,
> And watchful more than ordinary men.

His conception of the poet was fully realized in himself—

> The outward shows of sky and earth,
> Of hill and valley he has viewed,
> And impulses of deeper birth
> Have come to him in solitude.

"Impulses of deeper birth." He is not a loose and superficial observer of the objects of Nature; he spiritually apprehends their meaning; he steeps them in an ideal lustre, he sheds upon them "the light that never was on land or sea;" and by the spell of his great genius he makes us to understand and feel something of those mysteries and wonderful sympathies and harmonies which subsist between the spirit of nature and the soul of man. And thus in reading his poetry we are insensibly drawn "from Nature up to Nature's God." We see a celestial light, a divine aureole, investing "all thinking things, all objects of all thought."

At the final meeting of the Wordsworth Society, to which we have before referred, Lord Selborne bore striking testimony to the spiritual influence upon his own life of Wordsworth's teaching. Acquaintance with the works of Wordsworth, said Lord Selborne, had been to him the greatest power next to the Bible, in the education of his mind and character. He put no book, of course, in competition with the Bible; but after the Bible he traced more distinctly, with less hesitation and doubt, to Wordsworth, than to any other influence whatever, he might recognise as good in the formation of his own mind and

character. And the noble earl went on to say, in a very interesting and admirable address, that while he would hesitate to call him greater than Plato, and would not hesitate to place him below Shakespeare, he had learned as an individual more from Wordsworth than he had from Plato and Shakespeare. "What," he asks, "do we learn from Wordsworth?" "We learn," he replies, "more about man and more about nature, and more about the union of the two, than is to be learned anywhere else." The sympathy, the intelligence, with which man is regarded and portrayed throughout the works of the poet is something unique in all literature. The great and noble of the earth—using the word in its moral sense—the men who did illustrious deeds and left imperishable names, Wordsworth felt with them and understood their vocation. And not only them, but common men, men in every condition of life, men struggling with infirmity and temptation, men falling into vice, men bowed down under sorrow, men almost cast out from the world—Wordsworth felt with them all; none were cast out of Wordsworth's sympathy. He saw that which was great, divine and beautiful, pervading them all in every condition: and he could make the lesson of the old Cumberland beggar as touching to the heart as the lesson of great example of public or of private virtue:

That, he (Lord Selborne) thought, was a great thing to learn, because there was in the world in which we live a wonderful amount of distracting force and power in the glory and glitter of worldly success, worldly condition, in the miserable inequality of ranks. He did not say this in any socialistic sense, but as a man sympathizing with his fellow-men. In all these things there was a great deal which tended to distract the mind and harden the heart and make people forget, after all, that man was man, that worth made the man, the want of it the fellow; and, as Pope said, "All the rest was leather and prunella." He (Lord Selborne) was not at all sure that the moral of Pope's life was very much calculated to carry the lesson home to the hearts of men. Wordsworth told the truth, not as a man who came down to ride the high-horse of ethics over his fellow-man, but simply as the poet of human nature. He set before them in all its varieties that same real nature which we have in common, and which we ought to recognise in all wherever we meet with it.

It will not be out of place here, perhaps, to quote the following beautiful lines in which Mr. Matthew Arnold happily describes some essential features of Wordsworth's poetry:

He, too, upon a wintry clime
Had fallen on this iron time
  Of doubts, disputes, distractions, fears,
He found us when the age had bound
Our souls in its benumbing round;
  He spoke and loosed our heart in tears;
He laid us as we lay at birth,

On the cool, flowery lap of earth ;
Smiles broke from us, and we had ease ;
The hills were round us, and the breeze
Went o'er the sunlit fields again ;
Our foreheads felt the wind and rain—
Our youth returned ; for there was shed
On spirits that had long been dead—
Spirits dried up and closely furled—
The freshness of the early world.

Wordsworth is a healthy singer, what Mr. Arnold would call "sane and clear," with a high moral tone, whose influence is always on the side of the true and beautiful and good. It is his glory that from his lips has never been heard the wail of the pessimist, or the delirious cry of the agnostic, for he is

One in whom persuasion and belief
Have ripened into faith, and faith become
A passionate intuition ;

and though, like others, he felt the hopeless tangles of the age, and saw the unrest in the hearts of men around him, though he heard "the still sad music of humanity" arising from the heavy troubles and the sealed enigmas of life, he well knew the remedy for all. He believed in God; his own soul was centred in the Eternal; and while he did not deny that the town had its lessons of life and love for those who lived there, he knew and taught that in the solitude of the mountains, breathing its fresh air, and listening to the songs of its streams, and holding communion with the Invisible, the mind found an answer to its "obstinate questionings," and became strong to do or to suffer according to the will of God. He knew that these simple influences could not be received into the heart without receiving also

A spirit strong,
That gives to all the self-same bent
Where life is wise and innocent.

His poetry does for us what Nature herself does in such hours as these. It purges, refreshes, and calms. "You cannot," says Mr. Hutton, "plunge yourself in the poetry of Wordsworth without being mentally braced and refreshed." His object in writing was not to please or enchant, or depict harrowing scenes, or stir the springs of laughter or tears, but to teach, to elevate, to console, to bless. His own words are—

The moving accident is not my trade ;
To freeze the blood I have no ready arts ;
'Tis my delight alone in summer shade,
To pipe a simple song to thinking hearts.

Goethe once said, "*Ihr sollt was lernen*"—"I meant to teach you something." And this is precisely the idea that Wordsworth had of his poetic mission. He says himself, in

pointing out the design of his poems, "To console the afflicted, to add sunshine to daylight by making the happy happier, to teach the young and the gracious of every age to see, to think and feel, and therefore to become more actively and seriously virtuous. This is their office, which I trust they will faithfully perform long after we (that is, all that is mortal of us), are mouldered in our graves." Truth to Nature, and to that revealed religion of which Nature is the temple, sympathy with what is pure and beautiful and good, "an austere purity of language," as his friend Coleridge says, "both grammatically and logically," are the characteristics of Wordsworth. It was because they were pre-eminently the poets of Nature, and its interpreters to the spirit of man, that Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton have attained to so lofty a height, and have commanded so supreme an influence in the world of literature. And we may say the same in a very emphatic manner of the subject of our paper. He is not, indeed, as popular as those great writers; he cannot yet be called "the poet of all circles," but his popularity, as we have said, is on the increase, and will go on increasing, just because of his fidelity to truth and nature. Fresh, simple, charming, pure as his own daisy, "Nature's favourite," he must grow upon the affections of men. "Make yourselves at rest respecting me," he says himself in a letter to his friends; "I speak the truth the world must feel at last."

It has been said, indeed, that Wordsworth's philosophy was pantheistic in its tendency, that it ignored a personal God; and the famous passage in "Lines on Revisiting the Wye" has been quoted in support of the charge:

> I have felt
> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts, a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.

This is indeed a frail proof of Wordsworth's pantheism, and there is no other passage in his writings that *looks* so like the thing, while a thousand passages might be quoted to show his firm faith in the great foundation-truth of the Personality of God. How lofty and noble, as well as conclusive against the pantheistic theory, is this sentiment:

> One adequate support
> For the calamities of mortal life
> Exists—one only—an assured belief

That the procession of our fate, howe'er
Sad or disturbed, is ordered by a Being
Of infinite benevolence and power,
Whose everlasting purposes embrace
All accidents, converting them to good.

And what a rich flow of Christian faith comes out in the lines:

One
Who in her worst distress had ofttimes felt
The unbounded might of prayer, and learned, with soul
Fixed on the Cross, that consolation springs
From sources deeper far than deepest pain
For the meek sufferer.

Of the "Solitary," upon whose mind "an infidel contempt of Holy Writ stole by degrees," he wrote in these striking words:

How shall I trace the change, how bear to tell
That he broke faith with them that he had laid
In earth's dark chambers with a Christian's hope!

And then he goes on to picture the unhappy effects upon his mind of this rejection of the Christian faith:

Within
He neither felt encouragement nor hope:
For moral dignity and strength of mind
Were wanting, and simplicity of life
And reverence for himself, and, last and best,
Confiding thoughts through love and fear of Him
Before Whose sight the troubles of this world
Are vain as billows in a tossing sea.

The cure for scepticism and its attendant evils he thus eloquently and beautifully points out—

But, above all, the victory is most sure
For him who, seeking faith by virtue, strives
To yield entire submission to the law
Of conscience—conscience reverenc'd and obey'd
As God's most intimate presence in the soul,
And His most perfect image in the world.
Endeavour thus to live; these rules regard,
These helps solicit; and a steadfast seat
Shall then be yours among the happy few
Who dwell on earth, yet breathe empyreal air,
Sons of the morning. For your nobler part
Ere disencumbered of her mortal chains,
Doubt shall be quelled, and trouble chased away,
With only such degree of sadness left
As may support longings of pure desire,
And strengthen love, rejoicing secretly
In the sublime attractions of the grave.

It is Wordsworth's central doctrine, and we read him in vain unless we understand it, that Nature is not lifeless, but that every varied movement of her vast tides is a separate thought of God, the Preserver as well as the Creator; that His power is in her, and that through all her pro-

cesses the Eternal is ever making Himself known. Perhaps the most characteristic and prevailing principle of his poetry, like that of the old Greek theology, is the doctrine of the immanence of God, as distinct from all legal and mechanical views of God's relation to His universe. Carried too far, the doctrine might indeed become pantheistic, and so defective on its ethical side; but ignored altogether, our conception of the Deity would necessarily be that of a great Mechanician Who had constructed a universe from which He had withdrawn Himself to some distant heaven; or of an ingenious Artificer Who had made a huge lifeless machine, the crank of which He kept perpetually turning from afar. Pope and Cowper, who were far enough from being disciples of Spinoza, both use language which might be called pantheistic. Pope says, for example:

> All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
> Whose body Nature is, and God the soul;

and Cowper says that

> There lives and works
> A soul in all things, and that soul is God.

So Wordsworth, speaking of the living principle of all nature, says:

> From link to link
> It circulates, the soul of all the worlds.

The sentiment is somewhat the same in all these poets, and in all it is essentially different from pantheism. The whole spirit and tenor of Wordsworth's poetry is antagonistic to the degrading and dreary idea of God embodied in Spinozism. We see everywhere, as we read his noble lines, the Divine Presence guiding, controlling, modifying, actively overruling all earthly life and all the forces of Nature:

> To every form of being is assign'd
> An *active* principle, howe'er removed
> From sense and observation; it subsists
> In all things, in all natures: in the stars
> Of azure heaven, the unenduring clouds,
> In flower and tree, in every pebbly stone
> That paves the brooks, the stationary rocks,
> The moving waters, and the invisible air;
> Whate'er exists hath properties that spread
> Beyond itself, communicating good,
> A simple blessing, or with evil mixed—
> *Spirit* that knows no insulated spot,
> No chasm, no solitude: from link to link
> It circulates, the *soul* of all the worlds.

And again he says, in clearer tones still:

> The Being that is in the clouds and air,
> That is in the green leaves and among the groves,
> Maintains a deep and reverential care
> For the unoffending creatures whom He loves.

Wordsworth did a noble work in revealing to his age and to all future ages the dignity, the divineness of Nature in all her manifestations. He has impressed the mark of his teaching upon all the best literature of our time. Everywhere we observe a growing reverence for Nature as a manifestation of the divine thought, as a great school where we may learn many true lessons about God. Wordsworth was a devoutly reverent man. The poet who has in him no reverence is "blind, and can't see afar off." When poetry has lost reverence its greatest beauty is gone. Its wings are broken, and it can't soar above the earth. When a vision of the burning bush was given to Moses, a voice said to him, "Put off thy shoes, for the ground is holy." God was there, and that flame was the symbol of His presence. Nature is full of stupendous manifestations of the Invisible. But only he who has eyes can see them. If we could enter into the meaning of what is around us, and interpret aright the voices of Nature that are ever whispering in our ears, "God is here," we should feel that this world "is none other than the house of God and the gate of heaven." This is the spirit that Wordsworth always carried with him. No one describes Nature so simply and truly as he does, because he sees more in her than anyone else. His eye in looking at her was "single," and therefore his "whole body was full of light." "Were not thine eye sunny," says Goethe, "how could it ever behold the sun?" And because Wordsworth's eye was bathed in the beauty and glory of Nature, he saw in her beauties and glories which were hidden from others. And hence the greatness and subtlety of his influence upon the poets of the last half century, and through them upon nearly two generations of men. Mr. Mill tells us how Wordsworth's poetry, little as he sympathized with Wordsworth's opinions, solaced an intellect wearied with premature Greek and overdoses of Benthamism.

We are glad of the increasing popularity of our poet. It is well that we should be taught to look at Nature with a reverent eye, and be made to feel that God is great and good and "not far from every one of us;" that, in Mrs. Browning's words,

> Earth's crammed with heaven,
> And every common bush afire with God.

We want to feel more and more the very throbbings of God in all His universe, to see on every side the traces of His august presence and benignant intentions. We want to have, as Christ had, fellowship with trees and birds and flowers, and so to realize that human life is the perpetual providence of our Father in heaven. A very touching and interesting feature in the life of St. Francis of Assisi was his relations to the birds

and beasts and flowers in the wilds about Alverno. Instinct told them he was their friend, and they loved him, or seemed to love him. The wild falcon, we are told, wheeled and fluttered round him whenever he appeared. The young hare sought rather to attract than to escape his notice. The half-frozen bees crawled to him in winter-time to be fed. A lamb followed him into the city of Rome, and was playfully cherished there by Jacoba di Settesoli under the name of a Minor Brother. They were his "little brothers and sisters," and his life and theirs—the one as simple as the other—flowed gently on together. He saw God in them all, as did Wordsworth, and he loved them and talked to them, and with peculiar interest observed their habits and ways. There is something very hopeful in the growing love for Nature amongst all classes, and we believe the great poet of Rydal Mount has much to do with it. He is more read and studied and illustrated than ever, and we are thankful for it; for the more we know of Nature, carrying with us a devout spirit, the more we shall know of God. Nature is, as we have seen, but the revelation, the unveiling of God—

> That God, which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves.

WILLIAM COWAN.

ART. III.—DOCTRINE OF CALVIN ON THE EUCHARIST.

THIS subject is, for several reasons, deserving of the attention of the theological student. The reputation of the great French Reformer renders everything that fell from his pen interesting; and the influence which his writings exercised upon our own early Reformers has never been duly estimated.[1] Attempts have been made, notably by Archbishop Laurence in his Bampton Lectures (1804), to extenuate this influence, and to ascribe a Lutheran origin to our principal formularies; but the fact is, that on the points on which Lutheranism is supposed to differ from Calvinism, there was, if we except the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, little if any dispute between the German and the Swiss Reformers. Luther and Melancthon held the doctrine of

[1] Eager as the Archbishop of Cashel was to vindicate the Church of England from every taint of "Calvinism," it seems significant that he should have left the doctrine of the Eucharist wholly unnoticed.

election as strongly, and substantially in the same sense, as Zwingli and Calvin; on questions connected with free-will and preventing grace, the Lutheran "Formula Concordiæ" goes beyond any Reformed symbol in its renunciation of Pelagian tendencies; the doctrine of justification is in both Churches identical. Anyone who is acquainted with the lesser peculiarities which distinguish the Reformed Confessions from the Lutheran, such, *e.g.*, as the enumeration commonly found in the former of the books of Scripture, and the exclusion of the Apocrypha from the rule of faith, can have no difficulty in determining to which class our Anglican Confession belongs.

On the doctrine of the Eucharist serious differences do prevail between the two great sections of Reformed Christendom; differences which at one time threatened a rupture. And if it be asked, To which side does our Church, in her Articles and Liturgy incline? the answer must be, Not to the Lutheran but to the Reformed. Indeed so remarkable is this agreement as to lead to the conclusion that the framers of our formularies must have had a special eye to the writings of the French theologian, then widely known and of paramount authority in the Reformed Churches. We propose, in what follows, first, to give some account of Calvin's doctrine on the Lord's Supper, comparing it with our own; and next, to make some critical remarks on the theory thus propounded. The writings of Calvin which we shall use are, the section in the "Institutes" on the Lord's Supper, the tract "De Cœna Domini" and the controversial replies to Westphal and Hesshus. The edition employed is that of Amsterdam, 1667, vols. viii. and ix.

It is well known that hardly had the Reformation commenced its career, when unhappy disputes arose amongst its adherents on the subject of the Eucharist, and particularly on the mode of the presence of Christ in that sacrament. Luther's early views, before his attention had been drawn to the subject, seem to have fluctuated between the extremes of Zwinglianism and Romanism; at least his language is ambiguous, and admits of various interpretation. It was not until A. Carlstadt, at one time a friend and coadjutor of the great Reformer, appeared publicly at Wittenberg, about the year 1526, as an opponent of the doctrine of the real presence, that the controversy assumed an embittered aspect. Luther conceived that the opinions of Carlstadt, a mystical and obscure writer, were substantially identical with those of the enthusiasts of the inner light (*Schwärmgeister*), who followed in Luther's wake and gave him so much trouble. These people depreciated all outward ordinances, and acknowledged no authority but the Christ within. Their extravagances, and their profession that they were following out Luther's own

teaching, had already raised a prejudice against the Reformation; and with characteristic vehemence Luther threw himself into the breach. Carlstadt did not deny the continued obligation of the outward ordinance, but he insisted on its purely symbolical character; the bread and the wine were, in no sense, the body and blood of Christ as a present substance, but merely divinely appointed signs, recalling to our minds the sacrifice of the cross, and thereby stimulating our faith and sealing our union with the body of the redeemed. This view Luther, as well he might, rejected as insufficient to exhaust the full import of the ordinance; and step by step was led to enunciate the doctrine which is associated with his name, that though the elements remain bread and wine yet the natural body of Christ becomes, in the sacrament, incorporated in them; or, as the "Formula Concordiæ" expresses it, "we believe and confess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and are received along with" (*in, cum, sub*) "the bread and wine"[1] (P.I., c. 7). It follows, of course, that of the body and blood thus incorporated, or "impanated," the unworthy equally with the worthy are recipients.

The seed sown by Carlstadt and others in Saxony, however alloyed with error, contained too much vitality not to produce fruit far beyond its native soil. Zwingli the Luther, and Œcolampadius the Melancthon, of Switzerland, adopted substantially what Luther calls the "Sacramentarian" theory; the latter with an ability and learning which place him in the first rank of the theologians of his day. The robust good sense of Zwingli led him at once to detect the weak point in the Romish interpretation of the words of institution; and Martensen, Lutheran as he is, does justice, but no more than justice, to the Reformer of Zurich when he says, "The whole Protestant Church unites in accepting Zwingli's substitution of 'signifies' for 'is,' and his merits in establishing the symbolical nature of the elements have not yet received their due recognition," (Dog. § 262). Zwingli's premature death on the field of battle, 1531, arrested the further development, perhaps modification, of his early opinions, and he left to his successors the task of framing a theory which might unite moderate men throughout the Cantons on a common ground. Calvin believed himself called to accomplish this difficult task; for which indeed, from the structure of his mind and his acknowledged position in the Reformed Churches, he was eminently fitted. Already while pastor and professor at Strasburg he had, about the year 1540,

[1] Compare Luther's "Cat. Maj.," p. 5, "What is the sacrament of the altar? It is the true body and blood of Christ appointed to be eaten and drunk by us Christians under the species of bread and wine."

printed a tract on the Lord's Supper, which contains substantially the view from which he never departed; and it was followed by other treatises, some expository, as the section of the "Institutes" on this subject, and some in reply to his Lutheran opponents in Germany. He succeeded in framing a view which, in the main, was accepted by all the Swiss Churches, and from them passed into the Confessions of the Reformed Churches throughout the world. Without further preface we proceed to give it, in his own words.

In the tract "De Cœna Domini," after observing that Christians are spiritually nourished by the same Word of God, by which they were regenerated, he continues:

What is true of the Word is also true of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For God, in condescension to our weakness, has added to the Word a visible sign, which shall represent to us the substance of His promises and confirm our faith. It is a mystery indeed incomprehensible to us how the body and blood of Christ is in the sacrament communicated; but thus far is clear, that God therein seals to us the promises (that is, the sacraments are not merely signs, but pledges, *pignora*, of spiritual blessings), stimulates our pious feelings, and reminds us of the holiness incumbent on us, and of our union with our Christian brethren. To come now more particularly to the benefits we receive thereby. In the first place, amidst the perturbations of conscience, we perceive here, as in a mirror, Christ crucified for our sins, Christ risen for our justification. It is true that in the Gospel preached the same grace is exhibited, but here after a fuller and more impressive fashion. But further, since the benefits of Christ's passion do not become ours unless He Himself is first ours, my usual mode of teaching is that Christ is the matter and substance of the sacraments, while the benefits we receive flow from His divine presence therein. We conclude, then, that two things are offered to us in the Lord's Supper—Christ as the source of spiritual blessings, and then these blessings themselves. Thus, in the words of institution, He commands us to eat His body and drink His blood—that is, Himself; but also His body broken, and His blood shed—that is, the benefits of His cross and passion. And now for the critical point. How are we to understand the words in which Christ calls His body bread, and His blood wine? If we bear in mind what has been said, we shall see. In the sacrament we enjoy a real participation of Christ, not of His Spirit merely, but of His humanity, the whole Christ. The bread and wine, indeed, remain what they were, but they are visible signs to us of an invisible substance, viz., the body and blood of Christ—that is, Christ Himself, the reality being always present with the signs; they make over to us what they represent. To sum up, we may say that in the Eucharist Christ is offered to us individually, both Himself and His grace, the bread and wine being the instruments of this appropriation. As regards our unhappy divisions, they are not to be wondered at. It is not God's usual method to reveal the whole truth at once to His servants. Luther's doctrine, on the one hand—viz., that though there is no actual transubstantiation, the bread is nevertheless the body of Christ, inasmuch as it is conjoined therewith (consubstantiation)—was hardly distinguishable from that of the Romish Church; while Zwingli and Œcolampadius, on the other, too much, perhaps, intent on opposing the idolatry of the Mass, failed to explain, as clearly as could be wished, in what sense Christ is present in the sacrament. It were much to be desired that some agree-

ment should be come to—and why not? We (Protestants) all profess that when we receive the sacrament we partake of the body and blood of Christ: how that is effected may be matter of debate; only let all carnal interpretations be avoided, and this will be best secured if we raise our minds to heaven, and refuse to believe that Christ has thence descended to be circumscribed by corruptible elements.

Calvin's position is here, on the whole, sufficiently indicated; but it is obvious that some points are left unnoticed, or only briefly touched upon. We turn, then, to the "Institutes" for further explanations:

From the material elements which are offered in the sacrament, we are led by a kind of analogy to spiritual things. Thus, when the bread is given as a symbol of the body of Christ, the analogy is, as bread maintains the life of the body, so the body of Christ is the spiritual nutriment of the soul. When we behold the wine, the symbol of the blood of Christ, our inference should be that what wine is to the body, viz., a means of strengthening and refreshing it, the same is the blood of Christ spiritually. Yet we must not regard the body and the blood merely in themselves (*simpliciter*), but as implying the great work of redemption. The elements direct us to the cross, for we never feed on Christ, to any saving purpose, except as crucified for our sins. A twofold error is to be avoided, the divorcing of the symbols from the mystery attached to them, and the making them all in all so as to destroy or obscure the mystery. That Christ is the bread of life all admit, but all are not agreed as to the mode of participating of Him. There are some who consider eating His flesh and drinking His blood as merely believing upon Him; my own opinion is, that something more mysterious is thereby intended, viz., that we are spiritually quickened by a real partaking of Himself, and not merely by an act of the mind. For just as not the looking at, but the eating of, bread supports the body, so must the soul, in order to be spiritually nourished, be fully and truly partaker of Christ. No doubt this is practically the eating of faith, for we can imagine no other; but there is a difference between their and my mode of expression. To them to eat is merely to believe, whereas I say that by faith the flesh of Christ is eaten, because by faith He becomes ours, and that this eating is the effect of faith; or, if you would have it more plainly expressed, they think that the eating is faith, I that it results from faith. The verbal difference is indeed slight, but, as regards the matter, it is considerable. For example, when Christ is said to "dwell in our hearts by faith," no one imagines that nothing but faith is meant, but rather an excellent effect of faith. So when Christ calls Himself the bread of life, He not only implies that our salvation depends on faith in His death and resurrection, but that by a true communication of Himself His life passes into us and becomes ours ("Inst." IV., cxvii., §§ 3, 4, 5).

Again, in § 9, we read:

Christ, as the Word of God, existed indeed from all eternity, and as such is the source of life to all creatures; but, in condescension to sinners, He became flesh, and thus brought Himself into close proximity to us. Nay, the flesh which He took He renders life-giving, that by it we may enjoy the gift of immortality. "The bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." In these words we are taught not merely that He is life in that He is the eternal Word, but that by assuming our nature He communicates to His flesh a virtue which from it flows over into us. Thus the Apostle declares the Church to be the body of Christ, He being the Head from which all the members derive

life (Ephes. i. 23); and, in still more striking language, that we are "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Ephes. iv. 15). To acknowledge, therefore, no communion with the flesh and blood of Christ is folly.

Again, further on:

To sum up, our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ, as bread and wine sustain our bodily life; and although it may seem incredible that at such a distance (of heaven from earth) the flesh of Christ should penetrate to us so as to become spiritual food, let us remember how vastly the secret virtue of the Holy Spirit surpasses our comprehension. What our minds then cannot compass, let faith accept—viz., that the Holy Spirit unites things which are separated by space. Now the sacred communication of His flesh and His blood, whereby Christ transfuses His life into us not otherwise than as if it penetrated to the bones and marrow, He witnesses to and seals in the sacrament, and not by an empty sign, but by the energy of the Holy Ghost fulfilling what He promises. As regards transubstantiation, we reject it because we believe that the natural body of Christ is in heaven, to remain there until He comes again; nor do we need it, because by the agency of the Holy Spirit, the bond of our union with Christ, we become partakers of the body and blood of Christ—that is, Christ Himself, as St. Paul teaches in Rom. viii. (§§ 10, 12),

And again:

For the same reason we reject consubstantiation (the Lutheran doctrine), which involves the ubiquity of Christ's natural body, bringing it down from heaven, to be enclosed in the bread and wine wherever the sacrament is duly celebrated. Do not our opponents (the Lutherans) perceive that by their doctrine they rend Christ into two? For since the body is united to the bread, and the blood is united to the wine, but it is evident that the bread and wine are distinct, it follows inevitably from their hypothesis that we have not one, but a divided Christ in the sacrament. We, on the contrary, hold such a presence of Christ, as neither derogates from His glory by circumscribing Him in earthly elements, nor is inconsistent with the attributes of a real natural body, of which it is plain that ubiquity cannot be predicated. They are in error who can conceive no presence of Christ except in the bread; for so they leave no place for the secret operation of the Holy Ghost, which unites us to Christ, not by bringing Him down from heaven, but by raising us up to Him where He is. The advent of the Spirit and the ascension of Christ are correlatives (antitheta); therefore it is impossible that Christ, according to the flesh, can dwell with us in the same way in which the Spirit does. Hence arose their other error, that the unworthy partake of Christ's body. They forget that the eating of Christ in the Supper is as spiritual a thing as eternal salvation itself; whence we infer that those who are destitute of the Spirit of Christ can no more eat His flesh than we can drink wine without tasting the flavour (§§ 16, 19, 26, 31, 33).

At the risk of being tedious, we add a passage or two from Calvin's replies to Westphal and Hesshus, and from the Genevan Catechism. Thus, in the former, he says:

I have always maintained that the body of Christ is exhibited to us in the sacrament efficaciously but not naturally, as regards its virtue but not as regards its natural substance. I affirm that by that body which hung upon the cross our souls are spiritually fed, no less than our bodies are by the bread and wine. The difficulty touching local absence I thus

solve: Christ indeed does not change His local habitation, but He descends to us virtually (*vi, virtute, efficaciâ*). I leave Christ in possession of His heavenly throne, and am content with the secret operation of His spirit, whereby He feeds us with His flesh. As regards the unworthy, Christ's body was never intended *canibus et porcis.*

In the latter:

They (the Lutherans) accuse us of rationalism. What can be a greater miracle than that our immortal souls should derive life from flesh in itself mortal? that the flesh of Christ should transmit its virtue from heaven to us? that the Son of God Who, according to His human nature, is in heaven, should so dwell in us that the immortality with which His flesh was endowed should become ours also? [Query: Must not this mean that Christ's body and blood render our bodies immortal?—our souls are already immortal.] If it be asked whether we enjoy this benefit apart from the sacrament, we reply undoubtedly. By faith, too, we feed on the body and blood of Christ, but in the sacrament we have a visible pledge of the blessing, and, it may be, a fuller enjoyment of it. Are we not, in like manner, cleansed by the blood of Christ apart from baptism? But the sign was added to confirm our faith.

In the Genevan Catechism, we read:

M. Are we then (in the sacrament) fed with the body and blood of the Lord? P. That is my opinion. For since in Him is our salvation, it is necessary that He Himself should become our own. M. Did He not give Himself to us when He died for our sins? P. Certainly, but that is not enough; what we want is to receive Him now. M. What special advantage have we in the sacrament, over and above what we receive by faith? P. This, that the participation by faith is here confirmed and increased. For although both in baptism and in the gospel Christ is exhibited to us, in them we do not receive the whole Christ, but only in part (!). M. What do the bread and wine represent? P. The body of Christ once offered, and His blood once shed, and now spiritually received. M. The Supper, then, was not instituted to repeat the sacrifice of Christ? P. No, only that we may feed on the body and blood once offered. M. To sum up, then, you say there are two things in this sacrament: the visible signs, and Christ Who invisibly feeds our souls? P. Exactly so; and not only that, but that our bodies too receive a pledge of their resurrection, since they partake of the symbols of life.

We are now in a position to gain as clear a conception of Calvin's doctrine as we can expect. It will be seen that, in common with all the Reformers, he rejects transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the Mass. Nor does he, with the Lutherans, hold that Christ's natural body, through the *communicatio idiomatum,* is ubiquitous: it is confined to heaven. Nor is it conjoined with the bread so as to be partaken of equally by worthy and unworthy. Nor is there any physical admixture, or transfusion, of the body and blood into either our souls or our bodies. Yet, on the other hand, the elements are not mere signs, as Zwingli, at least in his earlier teaching, maintained, but signs which convey what they signify. *Simultaneously* with the faithful reception of the symbols Christ is received as the food of the soul (Luther would have said *in* the symbols). This spiritual union with Christ is effected by the

mysterious operation of the Holy Ghost; which of itself proves that the unworthy do not thus receive Christ, for in none but Christ's members (in Calvin's view, the elect) does the Holy Ghost dwell. Faith is the *sine qua non* of a beneficial reception; and yet faith is not exactly the same as the sacramental feeding on Christ. Whether the mysterious operation of the Holy Ghost consists in raising our souls to feed on Christ's body and blood in heaven, or in bringing Him down to us on earth—on this point Calvin's language, as will have been seen, varies; but the former is his usual mode of expression. The nourishment furnished by the body and blood applies only to the soul, that is, it is purely spiritual; and herein Calvin seems to differ from Luther, who does not hesitate to make the immortality of the body a result of reception. Some of Calvin's statements, as will have been seen, may be thought to tend in this direction, but on the whole he avoids the theory. It can claim no warrant of Scripture, which instead of ascribing the resurrection of the body to a physical union with Christ, makes it a result of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost (Rom. viii. 11). It is remarkable that Calvin does not insist so strongly as Luther[1] and his followers did, on forgiveness of sin as conveyed in the sacrament; to the former, Christ's body and blood, or Christ Himself, is the immediate gift, and forgiveness of sin and sanctification consequences.

It is hardly necessary to observe how closely this teaching corresponds with that of our Articles and Liturgy:

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death, insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith (Art. xxviii.).

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, are in nowise partakers of Christ (Art. xxix.). What is the inward part or thing signified? The body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper (Cat.).

Then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us (Communion Service). Grant us so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us (*Ibid.*). Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, may be

[1] "Of what advantage is this eating and drinking? The words of institution tell us, 'Given for you;' 'Shed for the remission of sins.' Namely, that through the sacrament remission of sin and salvation come to us."—Luther, Cat. Minor.

partakers of His most blessed body and blood (*Ibid.*). The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, preserve thy body and soul, etc. (*Ibid.*). We heartily thank Thee that Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ (*Ibid.*).

The natural 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 (Rubric, Communion Service).

Calvin's theory, as we have observed, passed into the Confessions of all the Reformed Churches (as distinguished from the Lutheran).[1]

We proceed to make some remarks upon the whole theory. It is likely that some who have been accustomed to associate the name of Calvin with rationalistic tendencies will be surprised at the strain of thought in the extracts above given. Far from bearing such a character, they insist, with peculiar emphasis, on what Calvin conceived to be the mystical side of the ordinance. They are as far removed from pure Zwinglianism as from the doctrine of Trent. That there is a mystery in the sacrament, incomprehensible to us, is everywhere inculcated. It may, however, be a question whether the mystery is placed where it ought to be placed. In what follows we shall attempt to examine the theory principally from an exegetical point of view.

What is "the body and the blood" supposed to be, in some mysterious manner, communicated to the soul of the faithful recipient? A vast deal, in our opinion, depends upon the answer to this question. Calvin answers it distinctly. It is plain from the whole tenor of his teaching that it is the *glorified* body of Christ which he has in view. We need, he says, union with Christ *now*, and not merely with the Christ on the cross. It is not enough, says the Genevan Catechism, that Christ died once for our sins on the cross; what we want is to receive Him *now* (in the sacrament). The Holy Spirit

[1] The Scottish Confession, *e.g.*, runs thus: "We believe that in the Lord's Supper, properly received, Christ is so united to us as to be the very nutriment of our souls. Not that the bread is to be supposed transubstantiated into Christ's natural body, or the wine into His blood, but that this union which we enjoy with His body and blood is effected by the Holy Ghost, Who raises us above terrestrial objects, and enables us to feed upon the body and blood once broken and shed for us, and now at the right hand of God. And although there is a vast interval of space between Christ's body in heaven and us on earth, nevertheless we firmly believe that the bread which we break is the communion of His body, and the cup the communion of His blood; and that He dwells in us and we in Him, so that we become flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone; and that as the Deity communicated life and immortality to the flesh of Christ, so His flesh and blood partaken of confer the same prerogatives on us."—Conf. Scot. Augusti, p. 162.

either raises us to a mystical union with Christ in heaven, or brings down the virtue of His body and blood from heaven to us; but in either case it is the glorified Christ that is thus applied. It is true the cross is never put in the background; but the "Christ Himself," whom in the Eucharist we receive, is directly, and in the first instance, Christ glorified. Now how does Calvin attempt to prove this? He cannot, like the Lutherans, ground the presence of Christ in the Eucharist on the ubiquity of Christ's body, through the *communicatio idiomatum*, for he expressly rejects that doctrine. Like our Church, he maintains that the natural body of Christ can be only in one place at one time. He is obliged therefore to fall back on the words of institution, and from them to argue, as he attempts to do, that the glorified Saviour, or rather the virtue and power of His glorified body, are conveyed in the sacrament duly celebrated. But it is certain that when Christ at the table delivered the bread and wine as (in whatever sense, for this at present is immaterial) His body and blood, it was not His future glorified body which He intended, but the body which He then had, the body which was capable of being broken, the blood which was capable of being shed, for sin; in other words, the body of His humiliation. The words import, not "This is My body," and then, as an accidental adjunct, "which is destined to be broken for you;" but "This is (signifies) that body of Mine that is about to be offered on the cross." If there was a miracle at the institution, it consisted in transubstantiating the bread and wine into *this* body, not into the body with which He ascended. And to do the ancient and the mediæval Church justice, their great writers never taught otherwise. Whatever superstitious notions may have gathered around the elements, or the priestly word, it was the reproduction of Christ's *body of humiliation* which these writers intended. J. Damascenus, the representative of Greek orthodoxy, is very explicit on this point. "You ask how the bread becomes the body of Christ, and the wine His blood? I will tell you. The Holy Ghost effects it. The body is that born of the Virgin and united to Deity; *not that the ascended body comes down from heaven*, but that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of God"; *i.e.*, into the body which Christ had before His resurrection (De fid. Orthodox, iv. 13). Nay, to do the Romish Church herself justice, her accredited symbols, at least, teach nothing else. The transubstantiation which is supposed to take place is a new creation of the human nature of Christ such as it was when He was born into the world. The stupendous miracle is that of bringing the Christ Who walked on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and Who hung upon the Cross, on earth again; not the Christ

Who is at the right hand of God. And the reason is obvious. The ancient Church, the mediæval Church, and the Romish Church, one and all connect the idea of sacrifice, a proper sacrifice, for the sins of the world, with the Eucharist; the first in ambiguous, it may be figurative, language; the second more literally; the third in its naked simplicity. Now the idea of sacrifice involves that of suffering, but it is obvious that that idea cannot be connected with Christ in His glorified state. Accordingly the miracle of transubstantiation is that the bread and wine do actually become the Christ Who was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, Who afresh in the Mass, as formerly on the cross, suffers for sin. And that, too, was the Christ Whom our Lord Himself, in the words of institution, presented to the minds of His disciples; that was the Christ Whom St. Paul contemplated in the ordinance, when he declared that as often as we celebrate it "we do show forth the *Lord's death* till He come" (1 Cor. xi. 26).

We hold this to be a flaw at the very foundation of the edifice. Calvin's theory assumes an actual continuity between the suffering and the glorified body; ignoring the fact that the former, that intended by Christ Himself in the institution, has for ever passed away, and given place to a form of body with which neither breaking nor shedding of blood can be associated. In one sense, no doubt, the body in which Christ sojourned here, and the body which He now has, are the same; but in another and a very important sense, they are different (1 Cor. xv. 44). A miracle intervened between the two; which miracle Calvin and his followers pass over in silence. "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more" (under this form). As an excellent writer of our own has it:

> Christ's body as crucified, and blood as spilled, are no more: His *glorified* body is as far distant as heaven and earth, and therefore not present in the sacrament.

And again:

> To say that the Communion here (1 Cor. x. 16, etc.) signifies the eating Christ's glorified body by faith or with the mind, is not a just interpretation: because whatever is corporeal cannot literally be the food of the soul; as also because what is represented and eaten in the sacrament is not the body glorified, but the body crucified, and the blood shed, *which are no more*, and which therefore cannot be received either with mouth or mind, excepting only in a qualified and figurative sense.[1]

If this writer proceeds, as he does, to say that one result of feeding upon Christ's body broken and blood shed, that is appropriating the virtue of the *atonement* which was effected by

---

[1] Waterland, "On Eucharist," c. viii., on meaning of 1 Cor. x. 16.

His death, is a "mystical union" with His glorified body,[1] the inference may be admitted, or it may not be; it leaves the main point unassailed, that the words of institution apply directly only to the broken body and the shed blood which, in Waterland's words, "are no more." In short, there appears to be no passage in the New Testament which connects the Lord's Supper with the *glorified* body of Christ. Not, as we have seen, the words of institution; not 1 Cor. x. 16, for, as Waterland remarks, St. Paul explains himself in the next chapter, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, you do show forth the Lord's *death* till He come" (xi. 26); not John vi. 53-56, for no one has as yet succeeded in proving that the words refer directly to the sacrament at all. We fully agree with the result of Waterland's exact and exhaustive discussion of this last famous passage, viz., that though the passage may be *applied* to the Eucharist, it cannot be directly *interpreted* of it.[2]

None of the passages above mentioned apply directly to the incarnation, though they imply it; for no atonement could have been made had not the Son of God become incarnate; their direct reference is to the atonement itself, the body *broken*, the blood *shed*, that is, the death of Christ, which is passed and gone, and cannot be repeated.

But further: Calvin assumes that the expression "body and blood," or, as he otherwise calls it, "the flesh of Christ," is

---

[1] "We eat Christ crucified in the sacrament as we partake of the merits of His *death:* and if we have this part in His crucified body, we are thereby *ipso facto* made partakers of His glorified body; that is, we receive our Lord's body into a closer union than before, and become His members by repeated and stronger ties" (Waterland, "On Eucharist," c. vii.). This doctrine of a mystical union with Christ's glorified body *in consequence* of our partaking of His body crucified, that is, His atonement, amounts to little more than saying, what is quite true, that one result of the atonement appropriated will be that "our vile body will be changed into the likeness of His glorious body" (Phil. iii. 21). But Scripture does not connect this change especially with the partaking of the sacrament.

[2] "Our Lord's general doctrine in this chapter seems to abstract from all peculiarities, and to resolve into this: that whether with faith or without, whether in the sacraments or out of the sacraments, whether before Christ or since, whether in covenant or out of covenant, whether here or hereafter, no man ever was, is, or will be, accepted, but in and through the grand propitiation made by the blood of Christ." "There is one construction which will completely answer, and it is this: all that shall finally share in the death, passion, and atonement of Christ are safe; and all that have not part therein are lost. All that are saved owe their salvation to the salutary *passion* of Christ: and their partaking thereof (which is feeding upon His flesh and blood) is their life."—Waterland, "On Eucharist," c. vi. on John vi.

equivalent to Christ Himself, that is, the whole Christ.[1] Over and over again he identifies the two. Now, waiving the question, entertained by many divines, whether a *glorified* body has blood at all,[2] we may ask, Can the expression "body and blood" represent the whole Christ? Has not Christ a human soul? Is not the Deity an essential constituent of His person? In themselves, the expressions "body and blood," or "the flesh," denote only the physical side of Christ's humanity, not its spiritual; much less the Deity. Julius Müller, in one of his theological essays, not inaptly describes the difference between Luther and Calvin as this: the former makes a *thing* (the flesh of Christ in the bread), the latter a living agent (Christ Himself), the substance and matter of the sacrament. The learned author is quite right; that is the real distinction. With Calvin, the real presence is that of a living agent, as appears from his making the soul of the believer, rather than the body, the seat of this agent's operation, and rejecting all notions of admixture or transfusion (physical). He saw plainly that the human nature of Christ, or Christ in His human nature, cannot be conceived of as entering into literal union with the soul, an immaterial substance; and hence he is compelled to have recourse to ambiguous and mystical language, if he would not contradict himself. The "body and blood" become, after all, only the power, virtue, efficacy of Christ Himself, Who never really leaves heaven, as regards His natural body. But surely, to say the least, the expression "body and blood" is ill-chosen to denote what Calvin intended, a living agent; it is, to all intents and purposes, a thing; it cannot represent even the whole human nature, much less the whole Christ. Nor does it do so in Scripture. It represents merely the physical side of Christ's humanity, the only element of His Person which admits of the epithets "broken" and "shed." And the *separation* of the two things, in the words of institution, which could not take place as long as Christ had a living body, points unmistakably to death, not to

[1] Compare Wilberforce, "On Eucharist," p. 78: "His body and blood are He Himself, Godhead, soul and body, the gift communicated. His manhood was the medium through which His whole Person was dispensed." But "body and blood" in themselves were not even His whole manhood. So Hooker, "This sacrament is a real participation of Christ, Who thereby imparteth Himself, even His own entire Person, to every soul," etc. ("E. P.," v. 67). This may be so; but the words of institution do not imply it.

[2] "Might not," asks Waterland, in his *argumentum ad hominem* addressed to Mosheim the Lutheran, "body alone have sufficed; especially considering how doubtful a point it has been thought, whether a glorified body has properly any blood in it or no?" (c. viii.). He refers to Allix, Diss. de Sanguine Jesu Christi.

life; to a fact, not an agent. The blood was not the blood circulating in our Lord's veins when He sat at the table (*sanguis*), but the blood "shed," or about to be shed (*cruor*), the well-known symbol, under the old covenant, of expiation for sin. To use the words of the valuable writer above mentioned:

> We say, upon our principles, that the distinct mentioning both of the body and the blood was exceeding proper, and very significant; because it shows that our Lord is considered in the Eucharist according to the state He was in at His crucifixion: for then only it was that His body and blood were *separate;* one hanging on the cross, the other spilled upon the ground. That body and that blood are commemorated in the Eucharist, the body broken, the blood shed: therefore St. Paul so distinctly mentions both, lest Christians should think (as indeed in late and dark ages Christians have thought) that the words of institution, though express for *broken* body, and blood *shed* upon the earth, should be interpreted to mean His *glorified* body in heaven. St. Paul very justly followed the style of the institution, our Lord's own style; and by that he showed that he was speaking of the separation of body and blood, which in reality was the *death* of Christ, or seen only in His death; and consequently such manner of speaking directly pointed to the *death* of Christ, and to the fruits or benefits arising from it.[1]

And this may be the reason—viz., to impress upon the communicants the fact that it is the *death* of Christ (with its consequence, the atonement) they are celebrating—why the Elizabethan revisers restored the form of delivery which had been omitted in the second book of Edward VI., "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul," "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve," etc. The *separation* of the body and the blood, that is, the *death* of Christ, is thus pointedly presented to the mind as what in the sacrament we ought to keep in remembrance. This we hold to be the second flaw in the theory of Calvin and his followers.

Space will not permit us to do more than briefly to advert to Calvin's (as they appear to us) mistaken interpretations of such passages (and there are many in Scripture) which speak of union with Christ, oneness with Christ, and particularly of Ephes. v. 30 ("members of His body, His flesh, and His bones"), which the context proves to signify not a union of a physical nature in any sense, but one *similar* to that which subsists between husband and wife, that is, a moral and spiritual one.[2]

To criticize is one thing, to construct another, and a more difficult one. We are unwilling, however, to conclude without asking whether Scripture itself does not point out to us "a

---

1. Waterland, "On Eucharist," c. viii.

2. On this subject the present writer ventures to refer to an article in this magazine (October, 1884) on Canon Westcott's interpretation of 1 John i. 7.

more excellent way." Our Lord, before He suffered, and in view of His suffering, instituted an ordinance which should be a perpetual remembrance (Luke xxii. 19; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 25), not merely of Him but specifically of His death; of His body about to be broken and of His blood about to be shed for the sins of the world. We cannot suppose that the bread and wine which Christ delivered to the Apostles were the actual body which the Apostles saw sitting at the table with them; and, indeed, they themselves seem unconscious of any such amazing miracle. He must have meant, therefore, that the bread and wine were to be signs and symbols; symbols of the physical side of His human nature, in which human nature He was about to be offered up a sacrifice for sin. Thus our Lord Himself has for ever established the commemorative aspect of the transaction as, at least, one of its principal elements.[1] But is there no transitive, no mystical element? There is; and if Calvin had followed his own correct instincts, he would probably have reached it in its proper form. Christ is present in this, as in every Gospel ordinance, and as a living Agent, but how? Not as the *Redeemer*, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity incarnate, but in the Person of His divine Vicar, the Holy Ghost, the third Person, to Whom He has expressly delegated the *active* administration of this dispensation. Calvin says, "The body and blood of Christ, or rather their virtue, are communicated to us in the sacrament by the power of the Holy Spirit." Why should He not at once have said that the Holy Ghost Himself, as a Person, is virtually Christ in us, and applies to our souls, as only a spiritual Agent can, the benefits of the atonement once offered, and further, the assurance of our being individually interested therein? Christ told His disciples that in His human nature He was about to leave His Church, no more to be *thus* with it till He comes again (John xvi. 5, 7, 16, 28); but He also told them that He would not leave His Church comfortless; that he would return to it; that He would be with it to the end of the world; that wherever two or three are gathered in His Name, He would be in the midst. How are we to reconcile these

[1] It is to be remarked that St. Paul's account of the institution (1 Cor. xi. 23-26), in which the commemorative element is predominant, is not merely the *earliest* which we possess, but the one which most directly emanates from Christ Himself: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you," etc. It is well known that many good MSS. omit κλώμενον in verse 24; but this makes no difference to the argument, indeed strengthens it. If κλώμενον be retained, it *might* be argued, as Luther did, that it refers back to ἔκλασε in verse 23—that is, denotes merely the breaking of the bread in the *present* administration of the sacrament; but τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν alone can refer to nothing but the offering of the body on the cross, once for all.

statements? The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and that alone, enables us to do so. Christ, not as Redeemer, but as dwelling in the Church, is virtually the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of Christ, and proceeds from Christ; and the Holy Ghost is virtually Christ dwelling in the Church. We do not say merely that Christ as regards His essential deity dwells in the Church; the abstract attribute of Omnipresence of course is, and always has been, His; but that His Divine Nature, as personified (if we may use the term) in the Third Person of the *œconomical* Trinity is now the only Christ that we have to look to as the Author and Giver, the active Fountain of spiritual life in the Church. If there is, besides this active Agent, a presence of Christ with us, denoted by "body and blood," it is an otiose conception. Here is the "living Agent," the real presence, which Calvin and many of our own Reformers were feeling after, but which it cannot be said they gave due prominence to. Is the function of the Holy Ghost to be confined to His endowing, in some mysterious manner, the "body and blood" of the Redeemer with quickening virtue, after which He retires from the exercise of active personal administration, leaving that to the "body and blood" (assumed to be equivalent to Christ Himself) to fulfil? Does this conception exhaust the statements of Scripture on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost? We hardly think so. From old associations, and it may be from prudential motives, the Reformers chose rather to designate this presence of the Holy Spirit as "the body and the blood" rendered effectual by the Holy Ghost," a periphrasis as it seems to us. We must, no doubt, be cautious in our statements on this mysterious subject. We may not say that the Second Person is directly the Third Person, that is, "confound the Persons;" nor may we say that the Holy Ghost is directly Christ, *i.e.*, the incarnate Son (the term Christ always implies the incarnation). But neither may we "divide the substance." As regards "the substance," that is, in fact, the true personality of the Godhead, Christ and the Holy Ghost are one, and one especially in all works *ad extra*, of which dwelling in the Church is an instance. "*Opera Trinitatis ad extra*," says the old canon, "*indivisa sunt;*" to which it adds (and we should never forget it), "*salvo tamen earum* (*Personarum*) *ordine et discrimine.*" Redemption is the special work of the Second Person, and sanctification, and all that belongs thereto, of the Third; but as regards "the substance," where the Third Person is, there is the Second, and *vice versâ*. Therefore our Lord could, with all propriety, say that, in one sense, He would depart from His Church (to discharge *sacerdotal* functions in heaven); and in another, that He would ever be with His

Church, viz., in and through His divine Vicar, the Holy Ghost; or, in other words, Christ is really absent and really present; as regards the Eucharist as well as other acts of worship; Christ dwelling in the heart by faith, Christ in us the hope of glory, Christ teaching, quickening, sanctifying, giving effect to all ordinances; but not directly as the incarnate Son, but as the Third Person of the Holy Trinity.

If this be a correct view (and it is of course open to criticism), some of the doctrinal statements of the Reformed branch of Protestantism on the Eucharist seem to need reconsideration or explanation. The great men of the sixteenth century were so occupied with restoring the *Redeemer* to His proper place in the economy of grace, that they seem hardly to have bestowed sufficient attention on the administration of the Third Person in the same economy. Have their successors fully emerged from the penumbra in which, on this point, their predecessors moved?

E. A. Litton.

Art. IV.—"THE CRUISE OF H.M.S. 'BACCHANTE.'"

The Cruise of H.M.S. "Bacchante," 1879-1882. Compiled from the private Journals, Letters, and Notebooks of Prince Albert Victor and Prince George of Wales, with additions by John N. Dalton. Two vols. Macmillan and Co. 1886.

IT is needless to point out the extraordinary interest with which this book is invested. Some half century ago it was indeed part of the accepted claptrap amongst those who passed for the more advanced school of political thinkers to pronounce, in their usual dogmatic fashion, that in these days of constitutional monarchy, the personal character and ability of a sovereign is a matter of very small moment to the commonwealth, and that in fact a decently respectable mediocrity would probably prove more suitable upon the throne than any exceptional eminence either moral or intellectual. The futility and shallowness of such speculations, however, has been abundantly proved by the happy experience with which the Divine Providence has since blessed our country. Such a reign as that of which we have now reached the jubilee, has at least taught us that what mathematicians would call the personal equation of our monarch has still as mighty an influence on the destinies of our land as any other social or political force amongst us. We have only to ask ourselves what England would have been by this time had our Queen been weak or selfish or tyrannical, to be convinced of the truth of this. And

indeed this conviction has been thoroughly brought home to the great mass of her subjects; witness the intense interest taken in every detail of her life, as set forth in the "Journal of our Life in the Highlands," and in the "Life of the Prince Consort." With these, the book now before us is well worthy to be ranked, presenting, as it does, the hope that her reign will not stand alone in our annals, but that her successors will follow in her footsteps.

In "The Cruise of H.M.S. *Bacchante*" we have a record of the life of the Prince whom we trust one day to hail as King, and of his brother during the period of their first absence from home—a critical time in the life of every youth. The first impression left upon the mind in reading it, is that of the *thoroughness* of the whole work. The book itself, with its careful editing and almost too voluminous details, is a type of the training undergone by the young Princes in their journey through the most interesting scenes which the world has to show. We find nothing scamped, nothing superficially or carelessly hurried through. Not only did the Princes, like their uncle the Duke of Edinburgh, thoroughly learn their profession, taking their share in every duty of the ship as much as any other midshipmen, keeping watch with their messmates, working out the ship's course, etc., but they were encouraged to record every evening the impression of the day in that journal which is the foundation of Canon Dalton's record of the voyage. Whatever place they visited, it was for no cursory or perfunctory inspection, but to be thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the locality, and to imbibe with the most intense appreciation the beauties and the interest of each. In illustration of this we may quote the words of their journal on their first arrival in Australia.

> From tree to tree were hanging all sorts of creepers and parasitic orchids, and the dry calm air was filled with an aromatic or resinous odour; while beside the path which was cut through the wood were several strangely-shaped and brilliantly-coloured flowers growing. Cardinal Newman says somewhere that he often found it help him in realizing the *genius loci* when he first visited Rome to repeat over to himself, as he walked the streets of the Eternal City, "This is Rome, is Rome;" so we, as we wandered in these woods, scarce realizing where we were, repeated to ourselves, "This is Australia, is Australia."
>
> o o o o o o o
>
> It was getting dusk when we shoved off from the beach to row back across the smooth surface of the harbour, in which were reflected, as in a mirror, the rose, blue, green, and golden hues of the sunset; a few streaky clouds alone were in the sky, and on the water here and there were little scarcely perceptible cats'-paws made by puffs of wind. . . . So ended our first landing on Australian soil.—Vol. i., p. 447.

And in like manner we everywhere find the *genius loci* responded to by the royal youths in a manner rarely met with

in the records of travel, and which places their journal in the very highest class of such records. It is not, indeed, too much to say that it has an interest on its own merits even surpassing that with which it is invested by its authorship. In reading it, the individuality of the writers, which at first is the leading thought in one's mind, becomes forgotten amid their vivid descriptions and profound reflections upon the scenes which they visited. Higher praise than this could scarcely be accorded to a book. This interest, moreover, increases from page to page. As the Princes grow in years, so their diary becomes more full of noteworthy matter, sometimes original, sometimes what they had heard during the day in conversation, and with constant references to standard authors, showing the wide and carefully selected range of their reading. Shakespeare, Tennyson, Wordsworth, Browning, Morris, and Kingsley are amongst these; while the quotations from Scripture are so numerous that it would be hard to find half a dozen consecutive pages without one at least, from the beginning of the book to the end. Indeed, by far its most striking characteristic is the deeply religious tone which marks it throughout. When on the last pages we read the Princes' reverent description of their Confirmation, we feel that few youths approach that holy ordinance in a fitter spirit. Their whole voyage would seem to have been one continued course of preparation for it. Whatever they see, whatever they experience, is always regarded from a religious standpoint. The services which they joined in, the hymns which they sang, the sermons they heard, are constantly being referred to with loving reverence and intelligence. In fact, to use a phrase which we fear has nowadays somewhat gone out of fashion, this book stands almost alone amongst the many like "Cruises," "Voyages," and "Wanderings" with which we have of late years been flooded, in being a thoroughly "Sunday book." Thus within a fortnight of their going to sea we find the following, which may be quoted as a specimen of their life on board, with its routine of naval duties, its healthy boyish sports, its appreciation of the beauties of nature, and the devotional feeling underlying and sanctifying all:

Oct. 4th.—A warm bright day, the usual Saturday routine, cleaning ship throughout, fire quarters, etc. In the evening, as before, high cockolorum, "sling the monkey," etc., and then to choir practice. A beautiful starlight night, with the moon behind a thin veil of cloud, through which also Mars is distinctly visible, shining with a ruddy hue; Jupiter in the west, with his four moons (which the officer of the watch persisted were seven in his glass), was very bright, and in the north was the Swan with its cross, a finer one even than the Southern Cross. Went forward on the forecastle, and there looked out on the waters as the ship ploughed her way through them, and all the stars glittered in between the spaces of the sails and rigging, and everything was silvered over by the light of the moon. "Quam magnificata sunt opera tua, Domine! omnia in sapientia

fecisti; impleta est terra possessione tua. Hoc mare magnum, et spatiosum manibus; illic naves pertransibunt. Sit gloria Domini in sæculum: lætabitur Dominus in operibus suis."—Psalm ciii. 24-31.

The Princes, it may here be observed, show a truly royal familiarity with Latin, and mostly quote the Scripture in that tongue. Their visit to the Destitute Children's Home at Sydney suggests the text, "Iste grex quid commeruit?" (1 Chron. xxi. 17), and we read (vol. i., p. 607), "in the stillness [of the Australian woods], as you stand alone, seems to sound the echo of the command given to the forefathers of the human race when they stepped forth into a solitary world—'Crescite et multiplicamini, et ingredimini super terram et implete eam' (Gen. ix. 7)."

The burial of a young seaman who fell from the mast is most strikingly described:

A sailor's funeral at sea is almost more impressive than a soldier's ashore. He who has gone from their midst is always well known to everyone in the ship, where men are brought into such intimate contact every hour of the day and night, that they soon learn, even more readily than men in a regiment, each one the other's character and habits. When, therefore, on board a man-of-war, amid every token of respect, and with the white ensign half-mast high, the body of their comrade, beneath the folds of the Union Jack, is carried by his former messmates up from the after hatchway, down along the quarter-deck to the gangway, through the guard of marines with their arms reversed, and followed by the captain and every officer of the ship uncovered, there is not any of all the ship's company, then "conscious the more of One unseen, yet ever near," as they stand by bareheaded, upon whose ears the words of the Burial Service fall, who can remain untouched: "In the midst of life we are in death: of whom may we seek for succour but of Thee, O Lord?" . . . The sea, to which the little cluster of his chums and messmates gathered round the gangway then committed his body, was that evening of the darkest purple-blue, and over the whole height of heaven were spread at that moment bright and deep-coloured clouds, some angry and lowering, others of a delicate emerald and olive-green, and others again saffron and golden.

> "O mother, praying God will save
> Thy sailor—while thy head is bowed,
> His heavy-shotted hammock-shroud
> Drops in his vast and wandering grave."

Then, the service being over, the marines fired three farewell volleys in the air, in token that he had in the exercise of his daily duties, just as much as if he had died amid the strife of war, fallen in the service of his Queen and of his country. The ship then stood on her course, and sailed steadily on all through the starlit night.—Vol. i., p. 258.

The diary, which is the joint work of the royal brothers, and is written throughout in the first person plural (though occasional lapses into the singular, and frequent mention of "George" and "Eddy" in the third person, enable us more or less to trace the share contributed by each), begins with their joining the *Bacchante* on August 6th, 1879. They were at this time

15 and 14 years old respectively, and had undergone the usual training for naval cadets at Dartmouth. The *Bacchante* is "a fast-steaming cruiser" (though her usual pace is described by the Princes as a "dignified crawl" of about six miles an hour), with a crew 450 strong. There were 15 midshipmen, including the Princes, and the following time-table shows that their training was no sham:

A.M.	6.0.	"Rouse Out" bugle for mids.
	6.15.	Mids to drill.
	6.45.	Breakfast.
	7.30—8.	Drill.
	8.30.	Quarters.
	9.	Prayers.
	9.30—12.	School.
	12.	Dinner.
P.M.	1.30—3.45.	Instruction.
	4.15.	Supper.
	4.45.	Quarters.
	5.7.	Drill.
	10.	"Out Lights" (in gunroom, where the mids messed).

All this, it must be remembered, was besides the regular keeping of watch, by day and night in turn.

On Sunday morning, "Inspection over," we read, "the sentry tolls the bell, and all find their way to their places on to the main deck for divine service":

> The first Sunday in the month there is a celebration of Holy Communion. In the *Bacchante* this always takes place on the main deck at a small oak table covered with a red cloth, from beside which also, instead of from the more formal pulpit or reading-desk, the prayers and lessons of the Sunday service are always read. Those who wish retire on deck, and the rest remain where they happen to be on their forms; a canvas screen shuts off more than half the main deck. Occasionally there are early celebrations of the Holy Communion in the captain's large forecabin at 8 a.m., which have been attended by about as many as the mid-day celebrations. After church service the men go to their dinners.
>
> ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
>
> After evening quarters, evening service . . . and on the last Sunday in the month we had our *Bacchante* hymn for absent friends, as well as one of the regular hymns for those at sea. This we used to do the last Sunday in every month regularly as long as the ship was in commission; and the men all sang the words with heart and soul, for their friends at home knew our practice, and we often thought they were joining too, though separated from us by thousands of miles.

The following is the *Bacchante* Hymn thus referred to:

> Holy Father, in Thy mercy
> Hear our anxious prayer,
> Keep our loved ones, now far absent,
> 'Neath Thy care.
>
> Jesus, Saviour, let Thy presence
> Be their light and guide,
> Keep, oh keep them in their weakness
> At Thy side.

When in sorrow, when in danger,
When in loneliness,
In Thy love look down and comfort
Their distress.

May the joy of Thy salvation
Be their strength and stay;
May they love and may they praise Thee
Day by day.

Holy Spirit, let Thy teaching
Sanctify their life;
Send Thy grace that they may conquer
In the strife.

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,
God the One in Three,
Bless them, guide them, save them, keep them
Near to Thee. Amen.

(Tune: Stephanos. Hymns A. and M.)

The first stage in the voyage was Sicily, where the Princes find much to say of the Punic wars (p. 16); thence *viâ* Madeira and Teneriffe to the West Indies. Here they obtained their rating as midshipmen, the last of all the naval cadets in the gunroom, their promotion appropriately closing "Eddy's birthday festivities," on January 8th, 1880. Everywhere they were of course welcomed with the greatest enthusiasm, especially by the negro population, who flocked round "the Queen's picanninies," in their rapturous delight clinging to and kissing the very carriages and horses which conveyed them. Nevertheless the chief impression left upon the Princes by their visit to this "earthly paradise" seems to have been one of sadness at the decay of so many once flourishing British colonies, owing to foreign competition. Thus at Martinique they write:

We should be less than Englishmen, less than men, if we did not feel a thrill of pride while sailing here. It was in these waters that Rodney, on the glorious 12th of April, 1782, . . . destroyed the French fleet . . . thus saving the whole West Indies. . . . The battle began at 7 a.m., and lasted till 6.30 p.m. The loss of the English was 261 killed and 837 wounded; the French loss was 14,000 taken or killed, and of these 5,400 were French troops. On what a scene of crippled and sinking, shattered and triumphant ships, in this very sea, must the conqueror have looked round from the *Formidable's* poop, while the French admiral was with Rodney in the cabin below, and not, as he had boastfully promised, with the English admiral on board his own *Ville de Paris*. . . . The air yet, even in clearest blaze of sunshine, seems full of ghosts—the ghosts of gallant sailors and soldiers. Truly here

"The spirits of our fathers
Might start from every wave;
For the deck it was their field of fame,
And ocean was their grave"—

start and ask us, their sons: "What have you done with these islands

which we won for you with precious blood?" And what could we answer? We have misused them, neglected them, till at the present moment, ashamed of the slavery of the past, and too ignorant and helpless to govern them as a dependency of an overburdened colonial bureau in London, now slavery is gone, we are half minded to throw them away again, and "give them up," no matter much to whom. But was it for this that these islands were taken and retaken, till every gully and every foot of the ocean bed holds the skeleton of an Englishman? Was it for this that these seas were reddened with the blood of our own forefathers year after year? Did all those gallant souls go down to Hades in vain, and leave nothing for the Englishman but the sad and proud memory of their useless valour?—P. 108.

Of the idleness and childishness of the emancipated negro they speak in familiar language; but the prosperity of the imported "coolies" is less generally known:

The coolie immigration has enabled the Government to open up the resources of the island [of Trinidad] most wonderfully. So intimate and mutually beneficial is the connection which binds together the several portions of the British Empire. . . . At the end of the five years for which they contract, Government is bound to find them a free passage back to India; but so contented are they with their lot here that but few avail themselves of this, and they prefer to exchange it for a Government grant of ten acres of land, and settle down on their savings in Trinidad, where they form entire villages of their own, and the savings they amass are really extraordinary. . . . Every year ships take back to India returning coolies, with, on an average, £7,000 to £8,000 between some 400 and 500 souls, exclusive of quantities of jewellery, often of great value. And, strange as it may appear, incoming ships bring back many coolies who have spent or lost their money, who are returning in order to get more; and not only that, but bring relatives and friends with them. . . . The contrast between the poor, abject, slouching, half-starved individual who crawls on board ship at Garden Reach, Calcutta, and the erect, self-important man who struts about his West Indian home, clothed in gaudy raiment, with a goodly balance at the local savings bank, is immense.

From the West Indies the Princes returned by way of Bermuda, where they were much struck with Shakespeare's accurate local touches in "The Tempest," a point we have never before seen referred to, and so reached England on May 3rd, 1880, their return being saddened by the grievous news of the loss of the *Atalanta* with all hands, to which they refer in terms of deep feeling.—(Vol. I., p. 197.)

The Princes' run ashore was not of long duration. By July 19th they were again off to sea, for a cruise with the Channel and Reserve Squadrons, first to Ireland, then by Vigo, Madeira, and Cape de Verde Islands to South America, whence they hoped to make their way into the Pacific. While at the Falkland Islands, however, the squadron was ordered in all haste to the Cape of Good Hope, where the Boer war was just beginning, and where they remained from February to April, 1881, when they sailed for Australia. During their passage through "the roaring forties" the rudder was disabled by a sea, and the ship

for a while in great danger, which obliged them to make for the nearest Australian port, King George's Sound, instead of landing as proposed at Melbourne. We have already quoted their record of the feelings with which they first trod the soil of the great Island Continent; no other place seems to have affected their imaginations more strongly. They visited all the four States into which it is divided, and partook of every phase of the vigorous colonial life, from balls in the city to kangaroo hunts in the bush. The chief local questions, Religion, Education, Free Trade, and above all Federation, are each commented on in their journal, and on leaving, they write thus:

As the shores of Australia recede from our view, we are conscious of very mingled feelings. . . . "Abundantia diligentibus te! Fiat pax in virtute tuâ, et abundantia in turribus tuis. Propter fratres meos, et proximos meos, loquebar pacem de te . . . quæsivi bona tibi" (Ps. cxxi. 7, 8). After England, Australia will always occupy the warmest corner in our hearts. We need scarcely say "after England," for are not both part and parcel of the same dear country? What is ours is theirs, and what is theirs is ours. As our past history is theirs, so may their future be bound up with ours, from generation to generation!—P. 626.

From Brisbane, being unfortunately unable to visit New Zealand, the Princes sailed straight to Fiji, and thence to Japan, where, like all recent travellers, they dwell with mingled regret and hope upon the extraordinary break up of the old civilization which has taken place during the last few years. The decaying shrines of the disendowed Buddhist faith especially struck them. Over one of these they were conducted by "the Rev. Mr. Akamatsu, one of the priests, who has studied Christianity at Oxford and Cambridge, and returned as zealous a Buddhist as ever." We read: "It was a new sensation to be able to talk perfectly freely in English to an Oxford man who was also a Buddhist priest. One point he kept insisting on was that Buddhism was not a religion, but a philosophy . . .; be pure and kind, patient and contented, be earnest, not lazy in thought . . . this, he said, was philosophy, not religion, and was the same law as we called the indestructibility of force." In another shrine they saw a giant statue of Buddha, fifty-three feet in height, erected in 1252. "There is only one other statue," the journal says, "that of the Christus by Thorwaldsen over the high altar in the Fru-Kirke at Copenhagen, that has ever impressed us more than this one does":

The calm dignity and unselfish benevolence of Buddha as one who is possessed of the true light of wisdom, is not surpassed even by that expressed in the face and attitude of our Saviour. Each alike is intended to welcome toiling humanity and set before them the ideal for their aims. 'Venite ad me omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis et ego reficiam vos" s the promise that breathes from each teacher. But as the sitting

Buddha of Eastern Asia personifies the rest and passionless repose won by contemplation, so the up-standing and forward-moving Christus exhibits rather the ideal of Western Europe, the rest of satisfaction born of action and progress, His arms and hands strengthened by rough manual work, yet outstretched to welcome all who "follow Him" in the workman's life.

> What are we set on earth for? but to toil,
> Nor seek to leave our tending of the vines,
> For all the heat o' the day till it declines,
> And death's mild curfew shall from work assoil.

China was next visited; and here too, well-worn as the subject is, the Princes find many little things to say which, so far as we know, have not been said previously, as again at Singapore and Ceylon, which they took on their way homewards. But we must pass over these, and hasten on to that which is by far the most interesting portion of the work, the chapters relating to Egypt and Canaan. Their first view of these sacred regions was at the entrance of the Gulf of Suez.

"On March 1st," says the journal, "at 5.30 a.m., just before sunrise, looked out through the starboard ports over the surface of the wan water, just crisped by the north wind, at the long ridge of hills of the Sinaitic peninsula, which then stood out, clear cut, in dark præ-Raphaelite blue against the saffron sky behind":

As we watched, up, over Mount Serbal, rose the sun: "Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered: let them also that hate Him flee before Him. . . ." These are the words of Ps. lxviii., one of those read at this morning's matins in the breviary. After the sun was up, the Sinaitic hills became, by reason of their being flooded in his glory and light, much more indistinct, and then looked like the Delectable Mountains, pencilled outlines only in a sea of luminous glory. "The chariots of God are many times ten thousand, even thousands of the blessed, and the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, so in the Holy Place."

Egypt was most thoroughly seen, mostly under the guidance of the greatest of living Egyptologists, Brugsch Bey, "from whom we have heard twenty times as much as any guide-book could impart;" and the 200 pages which are given to it are full of original matter, by far the best and clearest account of ancient Egyptian religion and history that has as yet been published. The most interesting account of the Pyramids, of Thebes, of the great dynasties of Egypt, amongst whose captives even Chinese have lately been found represented on the monuments, we must leave our readers to find for themselves, and pass on with the Princes to the Holy Land. Here again they enjoyed advantages beyond those of any previous traveller, even their own father in 1861, and at Hebron especially made notable discoveries. Their description of Jerusalem contains much that is quite new, and shows keen observation. They were chiefly struck by the great depth of

the valleys around the city, "so far beyond what any description or picture had prepared us for." On Palm Sunday they walked "along the road by which, as on this day, our Lord approached the Holy City . . . and the very stones in the great Temple wall were heard to cry out in echo to the cheers of the crowd." They had also an opportunity of witnessing the celebration of the Passover in the house of the chief Rabbi of the Sephardim. To quote the journal:

> The account given of the Exodus, and Psalms cxiii. and cxiv., were then chanted in a monotone in the original Hebrew. This part of the service is called the Commemoration, or "shewing forth" of the Lord's deeds on their behalf. The Rabbi then raised the bread and showed it (like the Host), saying, "This is the Bread;" and the wine, saying, "This is the Wine;" and in the same way the herbs "of the Lord's ordinance." The hands were then washed a second time. Then the third cup was drunk, each member of the family reclining a little back from the table, in symbol, we were told, of ease and the new won freedom of their ancestors from slavery. This would appear to have been the moment when St. John asked, leaning back, "Who is it?" (St. John xiii. 25). Then the chief Rabbi again took bread and brake it, and gave it to all that were with him, and dipped it into the dish with the haroseth and the lettuce. The family dipped together two by two, smiling and bowing each to each while so doing (St. John xiii. 26).

The holy places they visited under the guidance of Captain Conder, chief of the Palestine Ordnance Survey, Bethlehem first, then Hebron, and Mar Saba. "Before turning in," says the journal (p. 628), "we looked at hymns 132, 133, A. and M., written by St. John Damascene at Mar Saba 1,100 years ago; and at hymn 254, 'Art thou weary, art thou languid?' also written in this monastery." After traversing the little-known regions east of Jordan, they journeyed on through Samaria into Galilee. At Gilboa they vividly realized Saul's overthrow from a tactical point of view. The army of the Philistines was at first drawn up on the northern side of this valley of Jezreel, and Saul with his men on the heights of Gilboa fronting them:

> The night before his death Saul stole across the valley away from his own host and up one of the passes to get round to Endor, in the Philistines' rear. While he was thus absent the Philistines moved across the valley on that very night, and outflanked his position on Gilboa. When the morning broke Saul therefore found himself hemmed in. . . . There was no escape for his men . . . except by rushing over the jagged ravines of these cliffs, or precipitating themselves on to the rough blocks of basalt below. It was a veritable Majuba Hill to them.—P. 667.

Nazareth was approached "over a very English-like grass common:"

> The paths resemble those in Devonshire, and run zigzagging between clumps of dwarf oak and hawthorn. The grassy glen is all aglow with poppies, dandelions, blue and purple flowers, clover, mallows, a large yellow flower like a primrose, much so-called rose of Sharon, and

meadow-sweet, and with the grasshoppers' chirping, the rocks peeping out from the brushwood at the sides of the valley, and the stonechats mewing, the effect altogether is intensely homelike and English. The paths are smooth and different from any we have met with in Palestine . . . . The olives, like hoary willows here and there, are the only things which remind us that we are not in England, but "beneath the Syrian blue."

On reaching Nazareth, the Princes write:

We went into the chapel, where there happened to be a child's funeral going on. The little body was lying in an open coffin in front of the screen, and the Greek priest beside it was intoning, amid the incense-burners and the sorrowing friends.

"Thou hast filled a mortal bier,
Jesu, Son of Mary, hear."

"Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem non horruisti Virginis uterum. Tu devicto mortis aculeo aperuisti credentibus regna cœlorum." We came here full of thoughts of the Virgin mother, in an ecstasy of joy at the prospect of her child that is to be—we find another Nazarene mother grieving for her child that is dead.

From Galilee their route was by the sources of the Jordan to Damascus and Baalbek, finally embarking at Beyrout.

The land was soon out of sight. On October 9th, 1193, Richard Cœur de Lion took leave of Palestine, watching with tears its receding shores, as he exclaimed, "O Holy Land, I commend thee and thy people unto God!"—P. 735.

The only drawback to the perfect enjoyment of this trip seems to have been the vexation constantly awakened by the sight of Turkish misrule, which is constantly being referred to.

The Turkish Government shows more than an utter carelessness for all antiquities. . . . The Baroness Burdett Coutts proposed to spend £25,000 on a subterranean aqueduct to carry the water to Jerusalem once more, but the Turks would have none of it. . . . If the Turks hold Palestine long enough they will succeed in making the country a desert. Villages inhabited a few years ago are now completely deserted. The roads are utterly neglected.—P. 594.

With their departure from Palestine the transcendent interest of the voyage comes to an end. After a pleasant week at Athens with their royal cousins, the Princes returned home *viâ* Corfu, Sicily, and Gibraltar, to be confirmed, on August 8th, 1882, by Archbishop Tait, whose words to them on that occasion were the last he ever lived to speak in public.

So terminates one of the most remarkable books that has come out for a long time, and which we hope that this review may induce our readers to peruse for themselves. They will find themselves well repaid, for we have been unable to give more than the merest outline of its contents, and have been obliged to omit many points of interest—such, for example, as the apparition of the Flying Dutchman (vol. i., p. 551), and

the Princes' outspoken dislike of the Indo-Chinese opium trade, and Disestablishment, which we frequently meet with. We have, moreover, confined ourselves strictly to those parts of the work contributed by the Princes themselves, and can merely refer to the numerous excursus with which Canon Dalton has illustrated it. These, nevertheless, are most ably written, full of power and accuracy, and often of rare interest. We may mention especially that on the West Indies (vol. i., p. 116), that on imperial federation (vol. i., p. 538), that on China (vol. ii., p. 239), and those on the Eastern question (vol. ii., pp. 735, 748). Altogether, Canon Dalton's editing deserves the highest praise. There are very few misprints; and the only faults of the book are the lack of an index and the portentous bulk, which we fear will effectually preclude its being so well known as it ought to be. Volumes such as these, too big to hold in the hand, or to read except at a table, and too costly to be generally purchased, will never nowadays gain the place to which their merits entitle them. We hope that before long we may see them published in some cheaper and handier form, like the "Life of the Prince Consort" (of which, by the way, we are frequently reminded in the sentiments expressed by the Princes). The book is far too good to be merely tasted through the medium of reviews.

EDWARD CONYBEARE.

ART. V.—"THE RESULTANT GREEK TESTAMENT."

The Resultant Greek Testament. By RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, D.Lit., Fellow of University College, London. Elliot Stock: 62, Paternoster Row.

THIS is a very useful work. It exhibits in a compact form the results of modern critical research as applied to the text of the Greek Testament. Dr. Weymouth does not profess to give us a text based on an independent collation of MSS., Versions, and Patristic citations. His aim has been far less ambitious and more modest; it has been simply to produce a text which shall represent as far as possible the consensus of the principal editors—"that in which (roughly speaking) the majority of them agree." But at the same time he is careful to inform us that he has not merely counted names, but has weighed the reasons which may have influenced an editor in adopting a particular reading. Thus, for instance, "since Lachmann's time and since the earlier portion of Tregelles's Greek Testament appeared, fresh MS. evidence has come to

light, some of the most valuable uncials (the Codex Vaticanus and others) having been more carefully collated, and some hitherto unknown (notably the Codex Sinaiticus) having been discovered;" and it is but reasonable to suppose that the judgment of these critics would have been modified in some instances by the new material thus supplied, had they had it before them.

Every reader can judge for himself with what success Dr. Weymouth has accomplished his task; for the evidence is put clearly before him. "In the upper inner corner of each page all the authorities for that portion of the text are named;" while on the other hand, "The footnotes contain the readings which have won less numerous or less weighty suffrages." Instead of having to consult half a dozen different editions, the student can now tell at a glance what is the reading of Lachmann, or Tischendorf, or Tregelles, or Westcott and Hort, and how far their agreement extends.

The idea, indeed, is not altogether new. Dr. Scrivener had already furnished the groundwork of such a comparison in his Cambridge Greek Testament, but he did not attempt to construct a text; he merely issued a careful reprint of Stephens's third edition of 1550, contenting himself with placing at the foot of the page the various readings of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles.

An attempt to produce a resultant text had also been made in the Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. There, however, the basis of the text is narrower; it rests upon the consent of Tischendorf and Tregelles. When these two editors are at variance, a determining voice is allowed to the text of Stephens, where it agrees with either of their readings; and to Lachmann only where the text of Stephens differs from both. This is the general principle followed, provision, however, being made for the due recognition in the Gospels of the Sinai MS. (ℵ) which was discovered too late to be used by Tregelles except in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel and the following books.[1]

Dr. Weymouth's critical authorities are more numerous. He has not only availed himself of the labours of the editors already mentioned, the great masters in this field of criticism, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, but he has also made use of Alford's Greek Testament; of the Bâle edition of 1880, by Dr. Stockmeyer, and Professor Riggenbach; the readings (so far as they can be ascertained) adopted by the New Testament Revision Company; Bishop Lightfoot's and

[1] The text of Westcott and Hort had not been published when the earlier volumes of the Cambridge Greek Testament were issued.

Bishop Ellicott's edition of St. Paul's Epistles; and Dr. Bernhard Weiss's text of St. Matthew's Gospel, published in 1876.

On these authorities, Dr. Weymouth constructs his text, but he has further given, for the sake of comparison, all the readings of Stephens's third edition (folio, 1550); in many places, and chiefly where it agrees with his text, the readings of the Complutensian Polyglot; those of the *Editio Princeps* of Erasmus, 1516; and the most important in Stephens's margin. He has also noticed the few instances in which the readings presumed to underlie the English Authorized Version as well as those in which the Elzevir edition of 1633 (the so-called "Textus Receptus") differed from that of Stephens; and he draws attention to the fact that in many hundreds of passages "either Erasmus or Stunica adopted, or Stephens himself inclined towards, those very readings in favour of which, with fuller knowledge of the evidence, the consensus of modern editors has decided."

It will be seen, therefore, that the basis of Dr. Weymouth's comparison is wider than that of those who have preceded him in the same field. At the same time the selection of his authorities strikes one as somewhat arbitrary; and without laying stress on the objection that has been urged, that "some of the editions above enumerated can hardly claim to be admitted as authorities," and whilst admitting the force of Dr. Weymouth's reply that he fails to see "that only those scholars who have devoted a large part of their lives to the study of manuscripts can form a judgment of any value on the *results* of such study," I venture to think that critics like Meyer, for instance, and Delitzsch (on the Epistle to the Hebrews) were not less worthy of notice than some of those to whom Dr. Weymouth appeals.

It may be interesting to compare this "Resultant Text" in a few crucial instances with two other "Resultant Texts"—that of the Cambridge Bible for Schools, so far as portions of it have appeared, and the text which, in the instances I am about to give, it is quite certain had the support of the Revisers.

Matt. i. 25.—All have "a son" instead of "her first-born son."

Matt. v. 13.—All omit the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer; and in verse 44, all omit the words "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you," and the words "that despitefully use you."

Matt. vi. 1—All have "righteousness" instead of "alms."

xviii. 11.—Omitted by all.

In Luke ii. 14, the reading of all alike is εὐδοκίας, not εὐδοκία, "peace among men in whom He is well pleased," as the Revised

Version expresses it. This has always been the reading of the Western Church, and is found in a passage of Origen.

Luke vi. 1.—All omit δευτεροπρώτῳ.

Luke xi. 2-4.—The Lord's Prayer: all three are alike, and all give the shorter form.

In John v. 3, 4, the words "waiting for the moving of the water . . . whatsoever disease he had" are omitted by all.

Acts ii. 30.—All omit the words "that He would raise up the Christ according to the flesh."

viii. 37.—The words of Philip to the eunuch, "If thou believest," etc., together with the eunuch's reply; and in ix. 5, 6, the words "It is hard for thee . . . and the Lord said unto him" are omitted by all.

xx. 28.—The Cambridge text agrees with Dr. Weymouth in having Κυρίου, whilst the Revised retains Θεοῦ as in the Authorized Version.

In Romans v. 1, Dr. Weymouth has ἔχωμεν, in this agreeing with the text of the Revised Version. The Cambridge Greek text of this Epistle has not yet been published, but the editor, the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, in his Notes on the English Version of the Epistle, has declared himself in favour of the Received reading, ἔχομεν.

In the celebrated passage 1 Tim. iii. 15, which has been the subject of so much controversy, Dr. Weymouth has ὅς with the Revisers, and with every modern editor of note. The Revisers' margin, "The word *God* in place of *He who* rests on no sufficient ancient evidence," is an unquestionable fact, and the reading ὅς admits of the amplest justification, as has been shown by Dr. Vaughan in his "Authorized or Revised?"

In Hebrews iv. 2, Dr. Weymouth has συνκεκερασμένους with the Revised Version. Tischendorf, however, has here συνκεκερασμένος, and this has been defended by Delitzsch, and is, it appears to me, on every ground the preferable reading.

In 1 John iii. 1, all alike insert καὶ ἐσμέν.

It is needless to remark that the notorious interpolation in verse 7 is rejected by all.

Dr. Weymouth's work has been done with the most conscientious care, and, so far as my observation has extended, with remarkable accuracy. His book may be confidently recommended to readers who wish to see at a glance what the present state of the text of the Greek Testament is, as determined by the consensus of the most competent editors.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

Reviews.

Creation and its Records. A Brief Statement of Christian Belief with reference to Modern Facts and Ancient Scripture. By B. H. Baden-Powell, C.I.E., F.R.S.E. Pp. 240. Hodder and Stoughton. 1886.

THIS work deserves to be carefully studied by all who are interested in the reconcilement of revealed religion with science. It merits, indeed, a longer and more accurate comment than I have either the space or the ability to give. I can only touch upon certain parts, and I do so, not as a scientific, but merely as a thoughtful and reasoning man. As regards the object of the work, no Christian person can, I think, deny that it is a praiseworthy one, whether or not the author has succeeded in proving his points. His endeavour is to remove a stumbling-block, to show that the doctrine of evolution (on the truth of which he does not express a decided opinion) is not inconsistent with the Scriptural account of the creation. I wish that Dr. Darwin had lived to read this work. Its arguments might have influenced him, for he was a man possessed of remarkable candour of mind, as the following anecdote, which perhaps may be new to some of my readers, will show. Darwin had in former years visited the land of Terra del Fuego, and declared that the Fuegians were such a low type of humanity as to be no more capable of amelioration than beasts. Subsequently, on learning what Christianity and cultivation had done for that people, he said: "I was wrong, and I am very glad I was wrong;" and not confining himself to words, he sealed his recantation by sending five pounds to the South American Missionary Society. What his opinions respecting the creation were, I cannot exactly tell, and I doubt whether he himself could have told. For I know as a fact, that once, when asked whether the contemplation of nature never suggested to him the thought of a creative or superintending Providence, he replied: "Such an impression sometimes crosses my mind, but it is transient." Probably, in his case, as in that of some other scientific men, the impressions produced by the evidences of design with which all nature abounds, were swallowed up by the doctrine of evolution, as the fat kine in Joseph's dream were swallowed up by the lean ones. But this is no proof that the inseparable connection between design and a designer is not (as is generally thought) innate in the human mind. There are those, I know, who throw a doubt on the truth of this assertion from the fact that some deny that evidences of design suggest to them the idea of a designer. But if such individuals speak what they really believe to be true, it is evident that they must be self-deceived. For though, in judging of matters relating to God, Darwin and others like him, may be influenced by prepossessions, and be destitute of that faith "which is the evidence of things not seen," yet in judging of earthly and visible things, it is quite certain that no sane man hesitates for a moment in inferring that design implies an intelligent originator. This is so clear, that there is no need to illustrate its truth by giving one of the many thousand instances which might be quoted in proof of it. Waiving, however, all these considerations, to say that design does not imply a designer, is (in strict language) a contradiction in terms. For the very meaning of the word design, is that which proceeds from the mind and will of a designer (*i.e.* an intelligent being), and is not the mere result of general laws or qualities in the nature of things. Those persons, therefore (and there are such), who do not admit the truth of the conclusion which Paley arrives at in his "Natural Theology," cannot (without arguing very illogically) deny that it follows from his premises. What they mean, or

ought to mean, is that he has not established the truth of these premises, that what *we* call design cannot be predicated of the Almighty. But the arguments by which they try to prove this (whether they be conclusive or not) need not affect our views of God as the Creator, or as the protecting Father of His creatures; for as Mr. Baden-Powell observes:

> No account of the creation can be other than wonderful and mysterious; nor can the mystery of the Divine act be explained in language other than that of analogy. We can speak without mystery of a human architect conceiving of a design in his mind; and when he utters it, it is by putting the plans and details on paper and handing them over to the builders, who set to work under the architect's supervision, and in obedience to the rules which he has prescribed as to the methods of work and materials to be used—all this we can transfer by analogy only to a Divine design.

This passage sets forth the point of view from which we should look at all the Divine acts. But our author proceeds to say, that "the design is in the Divine mind." This term is what the persons I have been just alluding to would say is not applicable to the Almighty. Miss Martineau speaks with contempt of what she calls "the mechanic God of Paley." But the great mistake which she and those from whom she derived her views on this subject fall into, is that they stop at this point which they think they have established, and thus lead themselves and others into practical if not actual infidelity; whereas, if rightly considered, these views need have no effect on our faith or our practice. For the office of revelation and, I may add, of all creation, is not to teach us the nature of God as it is in the abstract, but as it is relatively to us. And, as Archbishop King truly remarks, since it is only by analogy that one man can be said to possess the same qualities as another, of course the analogy between man and God must be weaker.

Of Mr. Powell's views respecting evolution, I can only give a short summary. The conclusion at which, after examining several of the phenomena in the animal and vegetable kingdom, he arrives, is that, admitting the agency of evolution, we cannot say that it explains all the facts which we see in human nature, or that it excludes the idea of a Divine Design or a Providential Intelligence. His opinions on this subject are summed up in the following passage:

> Surely, if our conclusion in favour of a Divine Design to be attained, and a Providential Intelligence directing the laws of development, is no more than a belief, it is a probable and reasonable belief. It certainly meets facts and allows place for difficulties in a way far more satisfactory than the opposite belief, which rejects *all* but "secondary" and purely "natural" arrangements.
>
> So clear does this seem to me, that I cannot help surmising that we should never have heard of any objection to Divine creation and providential direction, if it had not been for a prevalent fixed idea that by creation *must* be meant a final one-act production (*per saltum*) of a completely developed form where previously there had been nothing. Such a "creation" would, of course, militate against *any* evolution, however cautiously and clearly established; and no doubt such an idea of "creation" was, and still is, prevalent, and would naturally and almost inevitably arise while nothing to the contrary in the *modus operandi* of creative power was known. What is more strange is, that the current objection should not now be "Your *idea of creation* is all wrong," rather than the one which has been strongly put forward (and against which I am now contending), "There is no place for a Creator."—Pp. 78-9.

Some believers, perhaps, may have unintentionally played into the hands of infidels, by assuming that the old-fashioned idea of creation is the only one which can be entertained. But on the other hand, I cannot but suppose (as indeed Mr. Powell suggests) that many persons are influenced by the desire of getting rid of the thought of an all-powerful being to whom they are responsible, or by the desire of possessing a complete

system in accordance with which they can map out the whole phenomena of nature. And this suggests a fact which it is well for us to bear in mind, *i.e.*, that it is next to impossible for us to view matters which have a strong bearing on our personal life and conduct from a purely intellectual point of view. Those, therefore, who maintain that a young person's mind ought not to be biased in favour of religion, or against it, are aiming at an end which is unattainable. As an uncultivated garden will produce weeds, so will the carnal or natural mind (which St. Paul tells us is enmity to God), if left to itself, sow to the flesh, and will of the flesh reap the weeds of corruption. Can we therefore call those unfair who try to counteract these tendencies, and to work upon the only ray of light which, in our fallen nature, remains unbroken? All other rays of light in the natural man are divided as by a prism, so that the noblest attributes of God, the beautiful, the true, the moral, etc., appear to us, not as they really are, inseparably united, but running in different channels. But one ray remains undivided, white as when it lay upon the bosom of the Almighty. It is that instinctive longing after something which it has not found, something in which all these Divine attributes are united; it is an altar to the unknown God, a ray of undivided light, though when left to itself it either withers away, or remains in man's heart "a dull, imprisoned ray, a sunbeam which has lost its way." But when touched with the magnet of God's Spirit (not otherwise) it turns towards God, just as the needle touched with the loadstone turns to the North Pole. It is this ground on which the Missionary and the Evangelist can work with hopefulness, though they may be compelled to dig deep in order to find it, hidden as it often is under the mould of earthly desires. Who can say that to appeal to this feeling is to bias the mind unduly? For does not the analogy of other things show that every want in human nature has its natural fulfilment? and does not even the heathen philosopher, Aristotle, maintain that there is no such thing as a κενὴ καὶ μάταια ὄρεξις?

Mr. Powell's remarks on the inspiration of the Old Testament, as inseparable from that of the New, though they are sufficiently obvious, and most of them not original, yet are such as in these days require to be stated again and again. For there are some who are seized with a sort of infatuation on this subject, and either deny the inspiration of the Old Testament, or so limit it that it becomes as a Divine authority, null and void. It is one of the devices of Satan to begin by impugning the authority of the Old Testament, in order that he might shake the foundations upon which the New rests, without alarming people at the outset. For there are some so blind as not to see that the two must stand or fall together (see p. 136). A lady once humorously remarked with reference to attacks made in this quarter, "If I rejected the Old Testament, I should, though with great reluctance, feel myself obliged to burn the New." Mr. Powell dwells principally on the evidence of the first eleven chapters in Genesis, as these bear most especially on the subject which he is handling. "There are," he remarks, "at least sixty-six chapters in the New Testament in which they are directly quoted or made the ground of argument. Of these, six are by our Lord Himself" (p. 137). "It can hardly be denied by any candid student of the New Testament that our Lord and His Apostles certainly received the early chapters of Genesis as of Divine authority" (p. 136). The whole of his tenth chapter is an able defence of the authority of the Book of Genesis in particular, and incidentally also of the whole of the Old Testament.

As to his manner of disposing of the difficulty with respect to the six days of creation, it seems to me the most satisfactory of all the theories which have been propounded on this subject. He inclines to the belief

that they were literal days, partly on the ground that the supposition of their being long periods is fraught with difficulties and objections, which it is not easy to get over. His view of creation is as follows: "I submit," he says, "that given the general fact that God originated everything in "heaven and earth (as first of all stated generally in Genesis i. 1-3), "the essential part of the *detailed* or *specific* creation subsequently "spoken of, was the Divine origination of the types, the ideal forms, "into which matter endowed with life was to develop; without any "*necessary* reference to how, or in what time, the Divine creation was "actually realized or accomplished on earth" (p. 169). He explains this by pointing out that in human affairs we talk of an architect creating a building, or a sculptor creating a form, not referring to the execution of the details, but to the conception of the first idea, because the design in human works so often fails in execution. A human ideal is often created, which can actually never be realized in practice. But with God there can be no failure, with Him perfect execution must follow creation, therefore they can be spoken of as virtually the same. God may have planned the system of creation in six days, though its details took thousands of years; in short, God set the laws going which were to operate and to be carried out, in the history of the creation. In creation, as in unfulfilled prophecy, it is manifestly not needed, and often not possible, that those who are to be instructed should understand the details. When it comes to practice it is otherwise. Moses had to make his practical teaching perfectly clear. All that was needed in the history of creation was to point out that the Supreme Being did it all, and then fix the order in which the phenomena appeared. Mr. Powell has given a table to show that the discoveries of geologists, in a certain way, correspond with this order. It is time, however, that I draw to a conclusion. I have not been able to do full justice to the contents of Mr. Powell's work, and perhaps it is as well that I could not, for there will be less temptation to make the perusal of this article a substitute for reading the work which I have been reviewing.

ED. WHATELY.

Charge. By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, D.D., sixty-second Bishop of Exeter, delivered at his Primary Visitation, 1886. Exeter: James Townsend.

Bishop Bickersteth's Charge will be read with lively interest by many outside his diocese. It is the Primary Charge of a Bishop honoured and beloved, and it deals with questions which are being discussed throughout the Church. Every devout and thoughtful Churchman, while admiring its candour and its fervent spirituality, will find it very readable and full of suggestions.

"There are many questions of worship and ritual," says the Bishop, "upon which the limited time at my disposal forbids me to enter now. "But there are two or three subjects upon which I must touch, as they "are matters which I know are exercising the minds of some of you.

"At our Diocesan Conference I ventured to say that, in my judgment, "the humblest house of prayer ought, save with rare exceptions, to have "its daily service and its weekly celebration of the Holy Communion. "Many of the clergy seem to think this is impossible in their parishes: "their churches are far away from the bulk of the inhabitants; a daily "service, they say, would only be attended by the members of their own "family, and perhaps two or three aged neighbours; and as to a weekly "Communion, they find it difficult to gather their communicants around "the Holy Table once a month." The Bishop here quotes from the Preface to the Prayer Book, "All priests and deacons are to say

"daily . . ." and proceeds thus: "I know that this habit has widely "fallen into disuse. But I ask has the disuse tended to the greater de- "voutness of our people? I trow not. Is family prayer (and I should "be sorry indeed to do anything that would weaken that great bond of "home piety)—but is family prayer so general that it supplies all who "desire it with the daily opportunities of united worship? I trow not. "Is the Morning and Evening Prayer said privately in their own homes "by those who fail to say it in church? I trow not by most clergymen. "There is something to my mind inexpressibly dreary and desolate in "the house of God being closed from Monday morning to Saturday night. "A closed church repels rather than attracts the heart's best sympathies. "And, on the other hand, the very fact of the house of prayer being "opened day by day, and the church-going bell being tolled, and the "little company of suppliants being known to assemble together for wor- "ship, has a quiet but deep influence on the minds of others. Be it that "only two or three are there, the prayer of St. Chrysostom has lost "nothing of its virtue by the lapse of years: the Saviour's promise is "pleaded, and will not be pleaded in vain. Who does not gratefully "think of Anna in the Temple? The little rivulet of prayer swells the "great tide of supplication, which is arising from the Church militant "night and day. And the numbers of worshippers will increase. Children "will become used to the devout custom. In times of illness and anxiety "at home, other members of the family will be found stealing into the "church that they may join in the prayers offered for the sufferer. So "times of deliverance will claim united thanksgiving. By degrees the "church would vindicate its name more and more as the house of prayer. "It may take the lifetime of a generation fully to revive the use of the "daily office; but the lifetime of a generation is a short period in the "history of a church."

For ourselves, we are bound to confess, the good Bishop's arguments as regards small *rural* parishes, do not seem to us, after a considerable experience, to be quite as practical as they are persuasive.

Upon the question of a weekly celebration of the Holy Communion,[1] the Bishop says:

> I believe the Church in these last days is returning to the freshness of her first love, and is claiming more and more urgently year by year this heavenly feast upon every returning Lord's Day. I believe that, when those who have been accustomed thus to hold tryst with Christ at His Table week by week, come to a parish church where there is no weekly Communion, they go away from that church hungry and dissatisfied. I believe further that, where this spiritual appetite is wanting in our people, we do well in trying by God's grace to awaken, and foster, and deepen it. And lastly, I believe that where the setting forth of Christ crucified does not hold the central position it ought in the services of the preacher (deeply as I deplore so grievous a loss, for only as Christ is lifted up will men be drawn to Him), there in many a parish the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper according to the pure and simple ritual of our Prayer Book supplies to the faithful that spiritual maintenance which they had craved in vain from the teaching of their pastor.

Something is to be said, of course, on the other side; and accordingly the Bishop proceeds as follows:

> But I know that, as every kindled lamp casts its shadow, so every privilege has its danger. Frequent celebrations have theirs. God grant that this sacrament of His love may never hide the Saviour from our view, but by His Holy

[1] Some of our readers may be glad to be reminded of the remarks of Mr. Hay Aitken on this subject—CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 106.

Spirit reveal Him to the adoring eye of faith. I freely admit that there is a peculiar solemnity about a monthly Communion. And this many still esteem most profitable for themselves and for those recently confirmed. They feel that thus the Lord's Supper stands out as a more marked monument on their pilgrim road. But many long for it more often, and it is well to be able to answer their eager inquiry, "Is it your Communion Sunday to-morrow?" with the satisfying assurance, "It is always Communion Sunday in my church."

While he has not forborne thus to lay open his heart to them regarding daily Prayer and weekly Communions, his Lordship advises the clergy to do nothing rashly. "Weigh these matters seriously with yourselves when nearest to your God at the throne of grace," and then "talk them over with the devoutest members of your flocks."

"There is another question," he says, "upon which some of the most "laborious parish priests in the diocese have asked my judgment, I mean "the celebration of the Holy Communion in the evening. They have "introduced the practice from a deep conviction that only an evening, in "addition to an earlier, administration of the Lord's Supper met the "needs of all the members of their flocks; and the numbers who avail "themselves of it have, they think, abundantly justified this return to a "Primitive and Apostolic use; but they have been pained by the severe "criticism and condemnation which other Churchmen have not scrupled "to pass upon this practice.

"Now in the first place we must remember that there is just as much "authority in our Prayer Book for an evening celebration, as for an early "celebration before Morning Prayer. Our Church has not fixed any "limit of hours for the administration of the Lord's Supper, or affixed or "prefixed that administration to any Service. Let me adduce the follow-'ing testimonies to this.

"Bishop Phillpotts, my predecessor in this See, writing to Mr. Croker "(1840), says, 'I apprehend that you are quite right in your supposition "that the Communion Service is a distinct office altogether, and was wont "to be performed at a separate time from either Morning or Evening "Prayer. I apprehend, too, that there is no rule and no principle which "connects it more with Morning than with Evening Prayer.'"

Bishop Bickersteth then proceeds to quote from the Charge of the late learned Bishop Jeune: "The hour of administration of the Lord's Supper has greatly varied in the Christian Church. . . . 'mple warrant there surely is for evening Communion in the institution of His Supper by the Lord, and in the practice of Apostolic and after times."

Bishop Bickersteth also quotes from Bishop Wordsworth (Addresses, 1873), and Dean Goulburn (on the Communion Office). He proceeds, as follows:

To these wise and weighty words I would only add that that saintly man, the late Dean Champneys, said to me not long before he left Whitechapel, "I hope God has permitted me to labour here these twenty years not without tokens of His favour, but I consider one thing has been a greater blessing than all beside to my flock, the commencement of an evening Communion; it has enabled so many to come to that blessed ordinance who could never come before."

The Bishop sums up his counsel upon this subject in a very practical passage: "Let those clergy," he says, "who prefer an early and mid-day "celebration, and find *after careful inquiry* that these hours do not exclude "any of their flock, abide in their present practice. Let those who have "adopted evening in addition to morning celebrations, and are persuaded "that this arrangement meets the needs of their people best, not be dis-"quieted by any adverse criticism. According to Mackeson's 'Guide to "the Churches of London,' evening celebrations are held in some 300

"churches of our Metropolis. The numbers progressively increase, so "that the usage evidently meets one of the real wants of our age. In the "parish of Christ Church, Hampstead, of which I was pastor so long, we "always had an early celebration of the Holy Communion every Sunday "morning at eight o'clock, a mid-day celebration on the first Sunday, and "an evening celebration on the last Sunday in the month. We had more "than 500 Communicant members of my flock. The evening celebrations "were chiefly frequented by the working classes, and by domestic servants. "They were the most numerously attended of all, and no one could doubt "the solemn awe and reverence which pervaded the church. Perhaps, "personally, I enjoyed most the sweet morning hour, but some of the "happiest holiest Communions of my life have been at eventide."

The counsel given in the Charges of such Bishops as Dr. Thorold, Bishop of Rochester, and Dr. Bickersteth, Bishop of Exeter, will have weight, no doubt, with many who have hitherto refused even to consider the question of "Evening Communions." [1]

In the opening portion of his Charge Dr. Bickersteth refers to the number of *small* parishes in the Diocese of Exeter. According to the last census there are 23 parishes with less than 100 souls, 61 with more than 100 and less than 200, 63 more than 200 and less than 300 souls. He gives excellent advice to the pastors of those parishes. For ourselves, the case as here presented seems to strengthen the argument we have for years advanced, viz., that many of the smaller rural parishes should be joined to contiguous benefices. Bishop Temple's Bill, passed last year, is, as we remarked in THE CHURCHMAN, a step in the right direction; but it does not go far enough. The National Church, in a day becoming more and more democratic, needs the men in the towns; with the present machinery or organization there is a waste of money and material.

We conclude our notice of this Charge by quoting a passage in which the Bishop refers to his predecessor's "Reform" Act:

"I have ventured to speak hitherto, as if all parishes were under the "charge of faithful pastors, assisted by faithful lay-helpers; and I "rejoice to believe that it is so in the great majority of the parishes of "our diocese. But I have already found in my brief experience, as I "have gone in and out among you, joying and beholding your order and "the steadfastness of your faith in Christ, that while the larger number "of parishes call for nothing but grateful praise to God, there is here and "there a parish which is a grief and a stumbling-block, shepherded by a "careless pastor, whose people, alas! sometimes love to have it so. It "may be only one in twenty-five or more. Of the other twenty-four "parishes nothing is heard in the busy world: God's work is being quietly "carried on there. But it is very different with the twenty-fifth parish: "distress is there; or worse, despondency; or worst of all, death; until "at last the state of that sheepfold awakens the cry of public indignation.

"Now a new power has been put into our hands by the Pluralities "Acts Amendment Act of 1885, for which we are so largely indebted "to Bishop Temple. I say we, my brethren of the clergy and of "the laity, for we are one body, and whether one member suffers, all "the members suffer with it, or one member be honoured, all the members "rejoice with it. Now in speaking of this Act I pass by its other clauses "and provisions, valuable as many of them are, to draw your attention "to the significant second paragraph, in which the ecclesiastical duties "enforced by this Act are stated 'to include not only the regular and

[1] See the "Hour of Holy Communion," by Rev. N. Dimock, M.A. (Elliot Stock.) A reprint from THE CHURCHMAN, 1886.

"due performance of divine service on Sundays and Holydays, but also "all such duties as any clergyman holding a benefice is bound by law to "perform, *or the performance of which is solemnly promised by every clergy-*"*man of the Church of England at the time of his ordination.*'"

Short Notices.

The Great Commission: Twelve Addresses on the Ordinal. By JAMES RUSSELL WOODFORD, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely. Edited by H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D., one of his Examining Chaplains. Pp. 226. Rivingtons. 1886.

THERE is much in these "Addresses" to admire. Yet we are inclined to think some friends of the good Bishop will regret their publication. The spirituality of tone is unmistakable, and many passages are excellent; but occasionally the argument is weak, and a word or two seems lacking. For instance, in the address on "The Power of Absolution," we read:

This is, indeed, the meaning of that clause of the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins." It does not only express the truism that our God is a God that forgiveth iniquity, but the clause, following directly upon that declaring belief in the Holy Catholic Church, embodies our belief in a particular way of remitting sins within the Church's pale.

Something might have been said, after Pearson on the Creed, on the historical point, as to the clause "the forgiveness of sins" immediately following the clause "the Holy Catholic Church." The paragraph as it is surprises us. Still more are we surprised at a paragraph on p. 116, touching Baptism, which seems to ignore the signing with the cross, the dipping or sprinkling, and the prayer "Sanctify this water. . . ." We give the passage, as follows:

Now, it is the Prayer of Consecration by which the elements of bread and wine are set apart to be thus the outward sign of an inward pact. . . . There is no similar setting apart of the water in the font; there are no manual acts to be performed analogous to breaking the bread and laying the hand in blessing upon the bread and cup. On the contrary, the opening prayer in the Office of Baptism of Adults run thus:—"Almighty and everlasting God, Who . . . by the baptism of Thy well-beloved Son, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify the element of water to the mystical washing away of sin." The whole element of water having been once for all hallowed for this purpose, there needs no further benediction of any separate portion of it. And hence, again, the ministration of the priesthood is by the Church demanded for the one Sacrament and not for the other.

Dr. Woodford, strongly sacramental as was his teaching, by no means went so far as some who reckon themselves true—even the truest—exponents of the Church's doctrines. For instance, on Absolution (p. 75), the Bishop wrote of "*special spiritual trouble*," and also of "*counsel and advice*," and he proceeds as follows:

I would have you then (for such I hold to be the mind of the Church of England), not look at Private Confession as the necessary door of approach to Absolution. I would not have you regard it or speak of it as generally requisite, and not set it forth as the essential habit of a high spiritual life. It is rather to be regarded as a special remedy for a special sickness, an occasional medicine rather than as the ordinary stay of the soul.

Self-Discipline in Charity. A Sermon preached in Salisbury Cathedral on behalf of the Clergy Orphan Schools, on the Fifth Sunday after Easter, May 30, 1886. By JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Lord Bishop of Salisbury. Rivingtons: London. Brown and Co., Salisbury.

Preaching upon St. James i. 26, "Pure religion and undefiled . . ." the Bishop of Salisbury, in exposition, says:

The word here translated "religion" (*θρησκεία*) is not of very common occurrence, and it bears a peculiar colour. It represents neither the service of the sanctuary (*λατρεία*) nor the feeling of the heart and conscience, the temper of faith and piety (*εὐσέβεια*). It betokens rather the external practice and voluntary self-discipline of devout persons—that which the Pharisees aimed at, but did not properly attain. It is necessary to bear this in mind, lest we should suppose that the Apostle was giving a complete account of religion in all its aspects; and lest we should thereby be tempted to draw a negative conclusion, and infer that nothing else is requisite in religion than to follow the particular duties here enforced. To do so, indeed, would be to neglect the plain teaching of other parts of the epistle. In other chapters the Apostle distinctly makes us feel the absolute necessity of faith, when it is made perfect by works, and the value of prayer and of the public service of God. But in this place he seems, as we have said, to be thinking only of the voluntary element of religious practice—not that which is essential to belief, or matter of universal necessity in every religion properly so called.

The passage in which Bishop Wordsworth, pleading for the Clergy Orphan Schools, deals with "Church Finance" is so important just now that we quote it at nearly full length. The Bishop urges "a more careful stewardship of our wealth for Church objects." "There is great poverty," he says, "in our country at the present time among the clergy. Notwithstanding all that has been done since the days of Bishop Sherlock, their incomes are still very mean and miserable. Much, indeed, has been effected by the ceaseless action, first, of Queen Anne's Bounty, and more recently by the Ecclesiastical Commission—two corporations which are not popular with all men, but which are recognised as of indispensable utility by all who take the trouble to inquire into what they have done and are doing day by day. But notwithstanding their ceaseless and successful efforts to stimulate private and local generosity, there still remain, as we are informed, twelve thousand of the clergy whose official incomes are under or just up to a nominal £200 a year. With glebes often ruined by ill-treatment, and finding no tenants, with tithes often grudgingly paid—and that sometimes not without reason, since the distress touches nearly all who have to do with land—we must expect the area of clerical poverty to increase largely in the next few years. There is, therefore, a call upon us to become, in the literal sense of the words, according to an unwritten saying of our blessed Lord's, 'approved bankers'—*δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται*. We must, that is to say, learn to manage the finances of the Church with a scrupulous economy, just as if we had to pass a scrutiny of inspection, and to show ourselves above all reproach of extravagance.

"Now, there is one aspect of recent Church finance to which I wish particularly to draw your attention. A very praiseworthy attempt has been made, in connection with the 'Official Year-Book of the Church of England,' to make up a rough statement of our expenditure for the last twenty-five years. The whole sum accounted for (though much more has, doubtless, been spent) is eighty-one and a half millions sterling. Of this, far the most striking item is thirty-five millions spent on the building and restoration of churches and parsonage-houses, and the enlargement of burial-grounds. It is a great blessing that we have been able to afford so much for these objects; but it is clear that we must retrench

"very much in such matters in the next quarter of a century. No one, I "hope, will suppose me indifferent to the externals of religion. I could "willingly see them brighter and more glowing than they are. But com- "pared with the support of our teachers, both lay and clerical, our home "and foreign missions, and our charities to the poor and the fallen, they "are of very small account. We must, then, from the present time "economize in our personal comforts, in our parsonage-houses, and not "less in our church-buildings, in order that these greater charities may "not be pinched. No doubt necessary repairs must be done by subscrip- "tion, since church-rates avail but little; but there are often petty dis- "comforts and unsightlinesses which could and should be borne by "Church people, without pressing too much to have them removed, and "the money so saved given to such less material objects as that for which "I am pleading to-day. Pride and vanity, and even extravagance, may "enter into church restoratiou. Who can say that no parsonage-houses "have been built in too costly a style? Who can deny that in some of "our churches sound and solid, but dull-looking work of a past genera- "tion has sometimes been destroyed to suit the dominant taste of the "day?"

We are pleased to be able to quote such a passage. The whole of it is admirable and most timely.

A History of Derbyshire. By JOHN PENDLETON, Author of "Old and New Chesterfield." Elliot Stock.

This is a good volume of the series of "Popular County Histories." Mr. Pendleton is full of his subject, and writes in a pleasing style. He tells of Matlock and Derby, and Chatsworth, and Eyam and Sheffield and the rest, of towns and villages and great houses; and a bit of news, or reminiscence, historical, social, or archæological, follows some pleasing description of an interesting place. There is a well-drawn picture of the famous yew of Darley Dale, supposed to be 2000 years old. In the pages which relate to Wirksworth appears a very interesting account of Elizabeth Evans, "Dinah Bede." We quote a passage:

It was amongst these homely folks that George Eliot came, and found the germ of her most striking character—the earnest woman who preached so fervently on the hillsides of Derbyshire. The novelist's relatives, Mrs. S. Evans and her husband (whom Wirksworth people maintain were the "Dinah Morris" and "Seth Bede" of George Eliot's most popular story), then lived at Millhouses, just outside the town, and the authoress was only seventeen when she first visited their "humble cottage." But the impressions she got of her aunt, Mrs. Evans, were vivid and lasting.

One of the daughters of Elizabeth Evans, living now at Sheffield, has the Quaker bonnet, the white net cap, and the spun-silk shawl that were worn by "Dinah Morris" when she went preaching. This descendant remembers George Eliot's visit in 1837, and until recently had in her possession a bundle of letters sent by the novelist to her parents at Millhouses. These letters are now in the possession of Mr. Cross. The letters, written on old-fashioned post-paper, are signed "Mary Ann Evans." Their most striking characteristic, says our author, is the religious tinge that pervades them all.

The English Church in other Lands. The Spiritual Expansion of England. By the Rev. W. H. TUCKER, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's. Author of "Under the Banner," "Memoirs of the Life and Episcopate of George Augustus Selwyn," etc. Pp. 220. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1886.

This is a really interesting book, and it gives a good deal of information in a small space. The first chapter is headed "The Growth of the

Missionary Spirit;" it touches on the Colonial expansion of England, starting with Elizabeth and James. It was in the year 1578 that the first national attempt at distinct colonisation was made, the Queen giving authority to Humphrey Gilbert, a Devonshire knight, "to take possession of all remote and barbarous lands unoccupied by any Christian prince or people." King James gave a patent by which, in 1606, Virginia and New England were permanently settled. We read:

In the charter given by James I. to the Virginia Company, it was provided that "the Word and service of God be preached, planted and used, not only in the said colony, but as much as maybe among the savages bordering among them, according to the rites and doctrine of the Church of England." The Rev. R. Hunt was appointed to accompany the expedition. Raleigh, though his fortune was gone, yet gave £100 to the Virginia Company for the establishment of religion in the colony; and the names of Lord Delawarr; of Whitaker, son of a master of St. John's College, Cambridge; of Sandys, the pupil of Hooker; and of the saintly Nicholas Ferrar, who were influential members of the Company, are a guarantee that other than commercial motives prompted the venture. The baptism of Pocahontas, daughter of the native chief, and her subsequent marriage to an English gentleman, are familiar to all.

The Commonwealth, says Mr. Tucker, was not less mindful of religion than the Monarchy. In 1648 "the Commons of England assembled in Parliament, having received intelligence that the heathen in New England are beginning to call upon the name of the Lord, feel bound to assist in the work." This was the preamble of the charter given to the New England Company, the forerunner of all missionary societies. Charles II., soon after his accession, established a "Council of Foreign Plantations." At this time, 1662, "the Church of England began to pray daily, morning and evening, for all sorts and conditions of men, that God would be pleased to make His ways known unto them, His saving health among all nations."

This admirable little volume, we note, is the beginning of a series, "Epochs of Church History."

The Christian's Own Calendar of Personal and Family Events. A Daily Memorial for Prayer, Intercession and Thanksgiving. With an introduction by the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Seeley and Co.

This is a charming little volume; as to type, paper, and binding, dainty, and with an admirable, though brief paper, on Prayer, by Mr. Moule.

The Church and the Franchise. By A. S. LAMB. Pp. 91. Nisbet.

There is much that is good in this little book. We sympathize with the author's aim, and should have been glad if he had given more definite counsel. The learned barrister's style, to say the least, is not "popular."

A paragraph (says the C.M.S. *Intelligencer*) has appeared in the newspapers to the following effect: "Sir Henry Ponsonby having been written to as to the circumstances under which the Queen made the oft-quoted statement, 'The Bible is the secret of England's greatness,' has replied that 'there is no foundation for the story.'" Sir H. Ponsonby is no doubt correct as to the exact words inquired about; but it may be well to reprint here an extract from the letter written in 1849 by Lord Chichester to the chiefs of Abeokuta at her Majesty's command, to show the real words which were the origin of the statement now challenged, and which the Queen did authorize the President of the C.M.S. to say in her behalf:

I have had the honour of presenting to the Queen the letter of Sagbua and other chiefs of Abeokuta, and also their present of a piece of cloth. . . . The Queen and

the people of England are very glad to know that Sagbua and the chiefs think as they do upon this subject of commerce. But commerce alone will not make a nation great and happy, like England. England has become great and happy by the knowledge of the true God and Jesus Christ. The Queen is, therefore, very glad to hear that Sagbua and the chiefs have so kindly received the missionaries, who carry with them the Word of God, and that so many of the people are willing to hear it. In order to show how much the Queen values God's Word, she sends with this, as a present to Sagbua, a copy of this Word in two languages—one the Arabic, the other the English.[1]

A pamphlet which really deserves to be read, and also to be recommended, is *Evening Communions* (G. Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden). It is a "Letter from a Layman to a Layman," and, so far as we know, is the best thing of the kind. A few sentences may well be quoted. The "Layman" writes: "It is rumoured that, in this parish, "the Vicar intends to abandon the Communion which has been celebrated "on one Sunday evening in each month during twenty years, and which "in our small church has been attended by an average number of thirty "communicants." He points out that Evening Communion has been recommended by High Churchmen. You are not ignorant, he says, "that opposite "views and inclinations have been expressed by Churchmen, and that "Evening Communions are not countenanced exclusively by any party "in the Church, although those of the High Church school, to which "you and I both belong, are frequently opposed to the adoption of the "evening hour. But the leaning even in that school is not universal. "Thus Dr. Hook permitted Evening Communion, but personally preferred "the mid-day celebration, and avoided both early morning and evening." He then quotes a letter to the *Guardian* from Canon Jackson, many years Dr. Hook's curate. The esteemed Canon's witness, of course, has a peculiar value, and his interesting letter contains this statement: "In "the year 1851 a Committee of the Leeds Ruridecanal Chapter, of which "Dr. Hook was chairman, having issued a report bearing among other "subjects on that of the times for administering Holy Communion, and "strongly recommending the then ordinary celebrations to be supple-"mented by an administration in the evening, the first Service of the "kind was held on the following Advent Sunday, in St. James's Church, "under the sanction of Dr. Hook. The first evening Communion was "followed in a short time by similar celebrations in the evenings of all "Saints' days at the parish church, and continued during the whole of "the time Dr. Hook remained in Leeds." Dr. Hook used to say that going out "early in the mornings always gave him headache, and made him useless for the rest of the day." The experience of many who for some reasons would prefer an early celebration, quite agrees with Dr. Hook's: they find mid-day the most suitable time. Others, again, prefer the quiet and stillness of an administration in the evening. The late Dean Howson, in a letter to the *Guardian* (also in December, 1881), referred to the action of Dean Hook, and he added:

I have only twice in my life been at an Evening Communion. Of course I had no serious religious scruples on the subject, or I should not have been present on those occasions. But I acknowledge that I did apprehend there might be produced on me an unfavourable impression as to want of wakefulness, seriousness, and reverence. No such effect, however, resulted; but very much the contrary. One of these Evening Communions was in London, and I believe it was an oppor-

[1] Readers of Mr. Bullock's admirable volume, "The Queen's Resolve"—recommended in the July CHURCHMAN—will gladly notice that, after all, there is a good foundation for this "story."

tunity very helpful to some who could at no other time have had their minds so free for attention and devotion. The other was in a large market town in the country, and the hard, black hands of some of the numerous communicants showed that those who are commonly absent from the administration of the Holy Sacrament were not altogether absent then.

Again, Mr. Ransford, a clergyman of great experience among the poor (says the "Layman"), wrote as follows:

May I be allowed to contribute my experience in the matter of Evening Communion? For eighteen years have I practised it, and have never perceived the least tendency to irreverence in those who frequent it. To my mind, the Evening Communion has a special fitness and solemnity. I try all times, 8 a.m., 8.30 a.m., mid-day, afternoon, and evening. The evening is the most largely attended, and certainly not by the careless or irreverent. Some of the most saintly, especially among the poor, come then.

A Consuetudinary of the Fourteenth Century for the Refectory of the House of S. Swithun in Winchester, edited by G. W. KITCHIN, D.D., Dean of Winchester, is published by Mr. Stock (Winchester Cathedral Records, No. I.). This interesting Manuscript throws light on the usages of the time. My lord the Prior, it seems, was bound to provide the Refectory with bread, beer, wine, and salt, with cheese and butter; also with the needful mats and straw litter for the floors.

In the *Sunday at Home*, a good number, appears "An Artist's Impression of the Holy Land."—*Cassell's Family Magazine* has an interesting paper on the extension of University education.

In the *National Review* Mr. Mallock concludes his story. A paper on Agricultural Depression, by Lord Egerton of Tatton, is full, and readable; "The Siege of Derry," by Mrs. Alexander, is stirring.

From Messrs. Nisbet we have received vol. xiv. of *The Homiletic Magazine.*

The Report of the C.M.S., 1885-6 has just reached us. It is a pleasure to read again a wonderfully strong and suggestive sermon by Archbishop Benson, from which we gave a brief extract at the time. As one looks at the admirable maps in this book, and dips here and there in the carefully selected intelligence, 262 pp., one feeling rises quickly: the publications of this grand Society are edited with singular skill and good judgment. "The General Review of the Year," read at the Anniversary, is in every way excellent. Two or three new features of the *Report* merit praise.

In the *Monthly Interpreter* for August (T. and T. Clark) Canon Rawlinson continues his "Biblical Topography" papers.

Nonconformity in Poor Parishes, by Rev. WILLIAM ODOM, a reprint from the July number of this magazine, has been published as a pamphlet by Mr. Elliot Stock (sold also by the Church Defence Institution, 9, Bridge Street, S.W., and T. Widdison, 14, Fargate, Sheffield). Mr. Odom's article was warmly praised in the *Record*, *Guardian*, and other journals.

We have received from Messrs. Cassell and Company two specimens of "Cassell's National Library" (threepence each)—Latimer's "Sermons on the Card," and Luther's "Table Talk." This admirable series is edited by Professor H. Morley, LL.D.

We observe that a third edition has been published of *The Athanasian Creed:* A Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Wallasey, by the Rev. T. E. ESPIN, D.D., formerly Rector of Wallasey, Chancellor of Chester and of Liverpool, Hon. Canon of Chester, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop, Rector of Wolsingham (12 pp.). Liverpool: Holden, Church Street. London: Rivingtons.

THE MONTH.

THE Conservative Ministry has been formed. The Marquis of Salisbury is First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister, the Earl of Iddesleigh being Foreign Secretary. Lord Randolph Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer, leads the House of Commons, Sir M. Hicks-Beach having accepted the post of Irish Secretary. The Marquis of Londonderry is Lord-Lieutenant.

There have been deplorable riots in Belfast.

The question of Imperial Federation has been brought prominently forward, and Lord Salisbury made an encouraging reply to an influential deputation from the I. F. League.

The meeting of the Emperor Frederick William and the Emperor Francis Joseph, at Gastein, with their Chancellors, Prince Bismarck and Count Kalnoky, has caused great enthusiasm throughout Germany and Austria.

At the Brighton gathering of the British Medical Association, the President, Dr. Withers Moore, raised the question of the over-education of women. He said:

> Is it for the good of the human race, considered as progressive, that women should be trained and admitted to compete with men in the ways and walks of life, from which heretofore (as unsuited to their sex) they have been excluded by feeling and usage, and largely, indeed, by actual legislation? Will it be well that we should have female doctors and divines, lawyers, mathematicians and astronomers, professors, publicists, and Ministers of State? . . . Do the "rights of women," does "justice to women," demand it? Do the "duties of women" (due to the whole human race, and to their own sex and selves as a part of that whole) admit it? The old chivalrous ideal, certainly, was a very different one. It was that sweat of the brow and sweat of the brain should be mainly masculine—that man should go forth to adventure and achievement, "to his work and to his labour until the evening," while woman should wait at home and welcome him back again, and lend her ear to his tale of doing or of suffering, and reward him with her gentle sympathy and loving appreciation—
>
> She loved me for the dangers I had passed;
> And I loved her that she did pity them.

To the men of "the old time before us" those words of Othello's seemed merely natural. Their thought was, not that woman should have her fair chance with man in the battle of life, but that she should be shielded and sheltered from that rude battle, if possible, altogether; that man should fight it for her. But, if we are to "change all that," then those who enter into the conflict where cuffs are going—man or woman—must be content to be cuffed and to cuff back again; and the age of chivalry and chivalrous courtesy (so far as woman is concerned), with all which

that courtesy did to make life noble and beautiful, must indeed be held finally to have passed away.

Dr. Withers-Moore next laid before his hearers his reasons for replying in the negative to the question proposed:

I think that it is not for the good of the human race [he said] considered as progressive, that women should be freed from the restraints which law and custom have imposed upon them, and should receive an education intended to prepare them for the exercise of brain-power in competition with men. And I think this because I am persuaded that neither the preliminary training for such competitive work, nor the subsequent practice of it in the actual strife and struggle for existence, can fail to have upon women the effect of more or less (and rather more than less) indisposing them towards and incapacitating them for their own proper function—for performing the part, I mean, which (as the issue of the original differentiation of the sexes) nature has assigned to them in the maintenance and progressive improvement of the human race. This "higher education" will hinder those who would have been the best mothers from being mothers at all, or, if it does not hinder them, more or less it will spoil them. And no training will enable themselves to do what their sons might have done. Bacon's mother (intellectual as she was) could not have produced the *Novum Organum*, but she—perhaps she alone—could and did produce Bacon.

Canon Westcott has been preaching, in Westminster Abbey, some remarkable sermons on "Aspects of Social Life."

The Bishop of Rochester, we gladly note, has appointed Mr. L. T. Dibdin Chancellor of the Diocese.[1] Mr. Dibdin's "Church Courts" was reviewed, in warm terms, in THE CHURCHMAN of October, 1882, by that eminent ecclesiastical lawyer, Mr. Droop. Mr. Dibdin's paper on Pews in THE CHURCHMAN of last June attracted much attention.

Due tributes of respect have been paid to the memory of the Rev. Daniel Wilson.

Is British Methodism fading away? A short time since, says the *Record*, we reprinted from the *Methodist Times* an article which boldly declared that Wesleyanism "has been weighed in the balance and found wanting:"

There was, the *Methodist Times* went on to confess, a decrease in the number of persons meeting in society classes; the income of the Mis-

[1] Mr. Dibden was called to the Bar in May, 1876, by Lincoln's Inn, and has ever since practised in the Chancery and Ecclesiastical Courts. Mr. Dibdin was summoned to give evidence before the recent Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. In 1882 he published "Church Courts, an Historical Inquiry" (Hatchards). In 1884 he edited an essay on "The Royal Supremacy," by Sir Matthew Hale, which until then had remained in MS. in Lincoln's Inn library. In 1885 he edited Brewer's "Endowments and Establishment" (Murray), and in the present year he has published, through Messrs. Hamilton and Co., "The Livery Companies of London." Mr. Dibdin is also a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, to which he has contributed, amongst other articles, a paper on the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission (October, 1883).—*Record.*

sionary Societies—both home and foreign—was said to be going down; the funds of other agencies were also diminishing; and, worst of all, the Theological Colleges were half empty. The picture is a gloomy one; but it must be remembered that Mr. Hugh Price Hughes's organ notoriously studies effect, and therefore, without the least desire to cast a slur on our contemporary, it seems reasonable to turn to other and more matter-of-fact sources of information before accepting this melancholy verdict. The Wesleyans have been assembled in Council for more than a fortnight, and the deliberations of the Representative Conference, which includes ministers and laity, are still proceeding. The Pastors' Conference terminated on Saturday last, so that we can gather their opinion as to the position and prospects of the Wesleyan body. It is needless to say there is no such sweeping condemnation of the past as that in which our contemporary indulges, but there is throughout the proceedings evidence of a sense of failure, or at any rate weakness, and of the necessity for some extraordinary effort, if Wesleyanism is to hold its own and to be the power for good in the future that it has undoubtedly been in years gone by. . . . Statistics are proverbially unreliable means for testing the real effect of any movement, and when applied to work the full result of which can only be known in eternity, they should, no doubt, be received with great reserve. But after making all due allowance for this uncertainty, it would seem from the statistics presented to the Conference last Friday by the Rev. J. W. Greeves, that the note of alarm has been sounded not a moment too soon. The state of the Wesleyan Methodist districts in Great Britain at the close of the year showed a net decrease in numbers of 778, and this too at a time when it is universally conceded that the amount and power of Christian work and Christian activity are greatly increased and constantly increasing. But this decrease is not, for Methodists, the most alarming feature in Mr. Greeves's figures. If we read them aright there has been a withdrawal of 27,135 members from the community during the year. True, there has been an accession of 45,230 new members, but the falling away of more than half that number presents a problem that demands immediate solution at the hands of the leaders of the community. The Pastors' Conference was better attended this year than ever before, and it is strange that no practical reason was given for so large a secession.

The centenary of the publication of the first edition of the poems of Burns has been celebrated at Kilmarnock.

The Convocation of Canterbury was opened in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 6th, the Dean of Canterbury preaching the sermon.

The Convocation of York was opened by Canon Lord Forester (as Commissioner for the Archbishop). Canon Fleming, we are pleased to record, has been chosen to represent the York Chapter.

We regret to record the death of the Ven. Edward Birch, Vicar of Blackburn.

An Oxford Layman's Church Defence League has been formed.

At the Annual Meeting of the Church Defence Institution an admirable speech was made by Mr. Bosworth Smith.

The Rev. Dr. Dowden has been elected Bishop of Edinburgh.

The Bishop of London has appointed the Right Rev. Dr. Wilkinson, formerly Bishop of Zululand, to supervise the Chaplaincies on the Continent, in succession to Bishop Titcomb. The resignation of Bishop Titcomb, from ill-health, has been received with very great and general regret.

At the Bangor Diocesan Conference, after papers on Parochial Missions had been read, the Bishop explained the reason why the subject had been selected for discussion:

Two months ago he, with three other Bishops, at the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, went to Lambeth Palace with the object of discussing the condition of the Welsh Church. It was there that the question of having parochial missions throughout the Principality was mooted, and adopted unanimously. Their intention in that diocese was to have retreats for the clergy from the 11th to the 16th October, to which the clergy should be invited, and spend the time in spiritual exercises and such counsels as might tend to the subsequent efficiency of the more general missions to be held in the diocese. Mr. Morgan (in his paper) had told them how much previous preparation was required in order to fit a parish for the reception of the mission, and therefore missions would not be held until early next year. It was their duty to set everything in order as soon as possible. Every clergyman present should lay this to heart, that he would not be able to stand the scrutiny of the last day who could not, in the face of public opinion, say to his people, "Be ye followers of me, even as I am of Christ." Before any clergyman brought a missioner into his parish he hoped he would labour to bring his people into the frame of mind best fitted to receive that mission; and they trusted that when that missioner had left there might be in their respective parishes a sermon continually preached by a Christian community carrying out in their daily lives the holy lessons they had learned in the house of God. A diocesan committee for carrying out the parochial missions had been already formed, and he hoped it would soon be actively engaged.

The question of Church Finance, as we have often said in THE CHURCHMAN, is sure to come to the front. Canon Hoare, at the Canterbury Diocesan Conference, spoke in strong terms of the pecuniary condition of rural parishes; and it is becoming more and more evident that "*something must be done!*" Local Taxation needs serious consideration, from the standpoint of the tenant farmer (or landlord) and the Rector. The *Guardian* (of the 18th) says truly:

The extent to which benefices have suffered by the agricultural depression is as yet little appreciated outside the ranks of the rural clergy. They alone know the heavy losses of income, the despairing efforts to find a way of escape in what is at best the unsuitable work of farming their glebe, and the pain of discovering in the end that they have only added the burden of debt to the burden of poverty.

INDEX TO VOL. XIV.