

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1883.

ART. I.—MY JOURNEY IN AFRICA.

THE world at large, one would gather from its conversation looks upon Missionaries very much as the passengers of the P. and O. boats look upon the Zanzibaris that, for the most part, perform the duties of stokers on board these ships. The expressive name Seedy boys tell us how they estimate them; but it is the Seedy boys that, amid heat that few Europeans could stand, pile on the fuel which causes the mighty engines to move; and thus, as the passage goes on, the history of these ships is hourly being changed, and progress is made toward the desired haven. So Missionaries, under the burning sun of the tropics, or amid the ice and snow of the frozen regions, keep in motion the grand machinery that the master Builder has formed for His Church; and thus it is that the history of nations is changed, the very character of races is altered, and many immortal souls are furthered towards the Haven of rest. The world may think of them as it likes, but thank God some will be found ready to face any difficulty, and through good report and evil report will go forth to further such great ends. Few of those who stay at home realize how hard the Missionary life is. It has its joys, and they are great; it has its adventures, and amusements, and relaxations; but, as a rule, the battle of life is fought with a stern reality that saps the very blood of the natural life from the veins, while, at the same time, the isolation and surroundings are such that without the utmost watchfulness and prayer, the spiritual life also becomes sapped, and the torch burns low and dim. What I have to record will, I think, be a further proof of the hardships of this life in one of the most interesting parts of the world; but though I have passed through much, and met with great difficulties, yet the most trying circumstance in the career of many Missionaries is absent from my

tale ; namely, long and patient waiting in a lonely land, labouring on and on often for years without seeing much result.

On 17th May, 1882, in company with four other clergymen and one layman, I started on board a British India steamer for East Central Africa, our instructions being to strengthen the already existing station of Uyuvi ; to form a new station at the south end of the Lake Victoria Nyanza, and to reinforce the one at Rubaga, the capital of Mtesa, the powerful Emperor of Buganda, or as it is generally called in the Zanzibaris dialect, Uganda. We were thus to endeavour to promote the work that, in answer to Mr. Stanley's appeal from Rubaga itself, had been undertaken by the Church Missionary Society, and was commenced by Rev. C. Wilson in 1876.

Our sea voyage was not an eventful one. The first port we touched at was Malta. Long before we arrived, passengers began to flutter about the deck in their best things. The male portion now, for the first time, mounted their solah topees, and tucked white umbrellas under their arms, ready to do battle with the fiercest rays of the sun. The steward, who had a little more leisure than the officers, was much besieged with questions as to the precise moment we should arrive in port, and rather piteously deprecated that he was not a navigating horficer. As in all these ports, the instant the gangway was lowered, guides, interpreters, puppy-dog merchants, coral sellers, etc., stepped on board. But it is no use my describing the sights we saw. I had an immense treat ; I found a stinging nettle that I had been looking for for years in different places (*Urtica pilulifera*) ; but what surprised me most about it was, nobody would get excited about it, nor would volunteer to see how much more painful the sting is than of our ordinary nettle (*U. dioica*).

The heat of the Red Sea was spoken of by the captain of the unlucky *Austral*, who was there at the same that we were, as being more trying than he had known it before. This was but a poor preparation for what lay before us, for, instead of the voyage renewing the strength that had been expended by the fatigue of getting together the necessary outfit and leaving home, some of us were reduced to great prostration.

At Aden we exchanged into another and much smaller steamer, in which we were greatly over-crowded and badly fed. "Dirty" was rather too mild a word for her ; and, as a preparation for the country to which we were going, she was a complete entomological cage, where the natural history of ants, cock-roaches, flats and sharps might most successfully be studied, even by a non-enthusiast. On rounding Cape Garda Fui we fell in with the first fury of the south-westerly monsoon. I, for one, was three times washed to leeward, and got a good

ducking, without any possibility of changing my things for three days and nights ; so it can well be imagined that we were not sorry to reach Zanzibar on the 19th of June.

Here we were welcomed by our travelling Missionary, Mr. C. Stokes, and by the Society's agent, and were soon very comfortably housed in the French hotel ; and a delightful exchange it was after what we had just gone through.

Zanzibar has been so fully described by such great travellers as Burton, Stanley, and Wilson, that I need say but little about it. European intercourse and civilization has done much for the town and island ; and the description of squalor and filth that one read and heard about, now appears to be almost exaggeration. Still there are dirty quarters, and there are many odorous perfumes into which you can thrust your nose without a great deal of seeking for them ; but I doubt if they are worse than in many continental towns. Even the sweet waters of Cologne and the lanes of Genoa the beautiful have a mild savour. And as for half-starved slaves and beggars, the former have grown fat and the latter have almost entirely disappeared. One is accustomed to be persecuted by beggars in foreign towns, but I don't think I was asked for alms more than once or twice in Zanzibar ; and the many quaint sights one sees more than atone for all disagreeables.

Outside the town the tropical vegetation, oftentimes crowning a gentle slope and standing out against the clear blue sky, or backed by the deeper blue of the ocean, kept a succession of striking pictures before the eye. Dark spreading mangoes, limes, lemon and orange trees laden with fruit within our reach ; broad-leafed bananas, plumed cocoa-nut palms are crowded together with the luxuriance of a forest ; while pine-apples are planted in rows along the roadsides, or massed together in small enclosed gardens. The whole forms a scene of great beauty to the newly-arrived traveller. Cultivation seemed to me to have cleared the ground of larger wild flowering plants, though here and there strange things cropped up ; while old familiar green-house friends, as Thunbergias, occasionally appeared. No doubt in the rainy season there is a profusion of blossom.

But I said I would not enter into a description of Zanzibar. Even our great day, the wedding of my late charge, Miss A. Havergal, niece of the poetess, does not tempt me to delay ; for it was such a success, and exactly what it would have been had it taken place in England, with but two or three exceptions—namely, the narrowness of the streets compelled it to be a walking wedding ; black servants waited at table, and black ants joined us at the feast, even partaking off the same plates. It was rather an unlucky day for me, for I got a slight touch

of sunstroke in the back, of which I did not take sufficient notice at the time, but went in the evening for a ride which nearly terminated disastrously. Our intention was to go and see something of the work of the Universities Mission at Mbweni, a station about five miles distant from the town. When about a mile on the road my horse took fright; in my endeavour to stop him one of the stirrups broke, and my other foot, as a natural consequence, got disengaged, and my power over my hard-mouthed steed was much weakened. Away we went over a rough road, mended with sharp-edged coral, at a break-neck speed, and we soon began to draw near to our destination. When close to the house a sudden fear seized me of thus coming into a courtyard, probably full of children. My hat gone, my whip thrown away, perspiration streaming down my face, were but small matters compared with riding over a child, or perhaps being thrown on top of a tea-table. So I determined, come what would, to put his head at a cocoa-nut palm, and make the best of it. In this way I not only stopped him, but succeeded in keeping my seat. Being, however, weak and poorly at the time, I was much exhausted by my adventure, and was easily persuaded to stop the night, which gave me an opportunity of seeing more of their excellent work than I otherwise should have done.

My time was more than taken up getting things together for the journey into the interior. Nor was it on the whole an easy task, for one has to combat with the intense lethargy that prevails in a tropical and feverish climate. This is the style of thing: six a.m.—for one gets up early—you want a package sewn up in canvas. You find a clerk at the agent's, probably a Parsee, who promises to send you a Hindu who will do it at once. You wait half an hour most patiently; then you think it would be as well to go and see when he is coming, and you find that the Parsee did not realize that you wanted him in such a dreadful hurry. However, he will send a boy to fetch him at once; in fact you see him start. And now you have nothing more you can do until the Hindu, or, as he would be called out there, Hindi, arrives. About an hour afterwards you see him stroll quietly into the yard. You jump up; he, on the contrary, sits down, and wonders why you troubled yourself to bound so energetically from your seat. You explain what you want, and impress him that you are in a great hurry. He looks first at you and then at the package, and measures both with his intelligent eye. By-and-by he actually rises and measures the package with tape; then he once more squats down and chews betel-nut with an activity that you wish he would apply to your job; and then, in about a quarter of an hour, departs to

get his needle and thread, promising to return instantly. 'Tis now about half-past nine, and you are summoned to breakfast, which is quite ready for you and you for it, as you still carry about with you a few fragments of your European appetite. On arriving upstairs you find nobody else has come, so you sink into an Indian armchair, and with your feet higher than your head you meditate on the Java sparrows which fly in and out at the open windows, and build in mysterious holes in the wall of the sitting-room; or you watch the black hornet skilfully plastering his nest of clay which hangs from a beam above. In about an hour's time the party has all arrived, expressed its various apologies, and in another hour has languidly concluded its breakfast and discussed the topics of the day. On your return you expect to see the package finished. Alas you ignoramus of Zanzibar ways! You find that the Hindi has arrived, but he is patiently waiting for you to show him how you want the job done. Having stated your opinion at length, with very great pains and with many signs, you delight to find he pooh-poohs your notions and prefers his own way, at the same time reminding you it is the midday hour, the hour that he feeds and sleeps; but he will return afterwards. 'Tis three p.m. before the package is finished; and thus did one have to battle his way through an immense amount of packing, much patience and perseverance being necessary for us to be ready at the appointed time.

Only one circumstance more connected with Zanzibar, and then I am off into the interior, to fields of stranger adventures. I speak now of my visit to Seyyid—Bargash Bin Said—the Sultan. His palace is well situated on the grand square looking out on the roadstead, with a most ornamental lighthouse, lighted by a fine electric light, close to its side. Hither, at the appointed time, Colonel Miles, H.M.'s Acting Consul during the absence of Sir John Kirk, conducted me, arrayed in cap and gown. A guard of honour was drawn up in front, and saluted us on arrival. After waiting a minute or two the Sultan descended the steps of the palace, attended by one or two officers, and met us. He shook hands first with the Consul, and then with Captain Hore, of the London Missionary Society, who was likewise being "introduced," and with me, after which he beckoned us to follow him. We mounted some very steep stairs, which were quite sufficient to prevent any inebriate from thrusting himself into the royal presence, and were then led by the Sultan into a small reception-room, and bade be seated on some grand amber armchairs. Then some attendants brought Moeha prime in glass cups exquisitely mounted in gold; it was certainly the best coffee I had ever tasted. Immediately after it, iced sherbet was served in beautifully cut

glass tumblers. The fashion with this seemed to be only just to taste it, for the attendants at once presented their trays and relieved you of your burden. These now retired, and silence was broken. The Sultan asked me, through an interpreter, how long the journey would take? how fast we travelled? and about the shape of the Victoria Nyanza. I, on the other hand, expressed my respect for his Highness, and said I had come to pay homage, and to ask for letters of introduction to King Mtesa. The most extraordinary part of the conversation was about a snake in Ugogo, reputed to reach to the sky, and to eat up whole oxen and women and children (quite a match for St. George's dragon): if we heard about it we promised to let him know. After about half an hour the Consul said we must be going, otherwise, I think, his Highness would gladly have prolonged the interview and the conversation, which never flagged for a moment. Upon our rising he likewise arose, led the way into the square, and wished us good-bye. He is apparently about fifty; and, from a European standard, thick-featured and not handsome. His dress was the plain, everyday attire of wealthy Arabs, the long black coat, or Joho, trimmed with silver; an ordinary turban; a handsome waist-belt, in which was thrust two finely wrought dirks. The most remarkable ornament about him was a splendid beryl ring, worn German fashion, on the first finger.

Owing to the ravages of the tsetse fly and the density of the jungle it is impossible to convey goods by horses or waggons, and so porters have to be hired to carry our packages on their heads or shoulders according to their nationality; but of this more by-and-by. By the 26th of June we had got our things together; and Stokes, our caravan-leader, with the majority of goods and porters, left on two Arab dhows for Sedaani. How they ever got across I don't know, for they were huddled together like men after a shipwreck on a raft. The next day we were to join them. When I went round the first thing in the morning to the agent's, I was saluted with "You can't go to-day." "Why not?" "Fifteen men have run away, and they must be hunted up." Now this is what the traveller is liable to. Part of the men's wages must be paid in advance. They get this under the plea of support for wives and families, and it is the law that they should have it; when paid, the temptation proves too strong for some, and they bolt with their advance, and leave the white men in the lurch. The Sultan, however, lends all the help he can, and the strong arm of the law goes in pursuit; most times, I fear, it returns empty-handed. The news of these runaways had been received from Stokes, who had written a letter and sent it back with the dhows by Raschid, one of our head-men, but an out-and-out scamp. On

examination into the case I found I had simply to instruct the police about it and leave the matter. The difficulty made about starting was nothing but villainy on the part of Raschid, who wanted to spree about town with his advanced money. So I ordered a start at 12:30 p.m., and actually by 1:30 things were ready; but we were not off yet. Just on starting, a letter, accompanied by two armed soldiers, was brought to me from General Matthews, the Commander of the Sultan's army, saying that one of our boys, William Sayed, owed money, and if it was not paid he must be arrested; he wrote exceedingly politely, suggesting its being stopped out of his wages. So I sent Litala, our chief cook, off to see; and we embarked on board the dhow. I there found a man, whom I knew nothing of, giving orders to start without the cook. I imagined that he was one of Stokes' head-men, and in some authority; but I insisted on their bringing up again and waiting for the cook's return; and well I did so. This scoundrel turned out to be Jacob Faithful—one of Livingstone's men, who has now become a terrible drunkard. It afterwards appeared that he had thrust himself on board our boat with a quantity of grog to sell to our porters, and had urged a start in case I should find him out and turn him back. Once off, he became more and more intoxicated and objectionable, yelling at the top of his voice, till at last I had to threaten the use of violence.

How Stokes managed to get over I don't know. We were crowded; and as a man fell on board, so he had to lie for the rest of the passage, and we were not half so huddled together as was his party. On reaching the coast we grounded about half a mile out, and began to thump so furiously that I anticipated the speedy dissolution of the dhow. Stokes, who was awaiting our arrival, plunged into the sea, and with some men brought off a small dugout canoe more than a quarter full of water. I thought better to put my clothes into a bag and plunge into the sea, never giving sharks and crocodiles a thought, while they fortunately treated me in the same off-hand manner. I found, however, that I had to struggle over sharp coral thinly covered with sand, which, to say the least of it, was unpleasant. We all arrived safely ashore, found our tents pitched, and were soon introduced to that universal luxury of African board, a tough goat.

It is too early to begin about tent-life just at present; I must turn to the men and describe them. They consisted of three distinct sets, talking three cognate, yet sufficiently distinct languages for those who only knew their own dialect not to be able to understand the others. First there were the Wanguana—the coastmen and Zanzibaris. The word itself means "gentlemen," and is generally applied to freed slaves; but

amongst our Wanguana were many who were slaves at the time, and permitted to go, or even sent by their masters, into the interior with us: in such cases the masters take the wages. The next two classes were the Wanyamwesi, from the region between Tanganika and Nyanza; and the Wasukuma, from the south end of Nyanza. These men from the interior are far the best porters, but are of rather a quarrelsome disposition. We trusted them with the cloth and beads; while the Wanguana carried the tents, personal luggage, and boxes. Then we come to two very important individuals, our cooks—so-called Christians; but if their Christianity was measured by their cooking, it was small indeed. To each tent were attached two boys as personal attendants. Mine were freed slaves from Darfurteet, brought thence by Pearson; and I also had a third boy, Henry Wright Duta, the first baptized convert from Buganda, a chief's son, who was attached to me to do odd jobs as a kind of payment for his passage home. With the exception of being intensely idle he was a thoroughly good fellow, and a great favourite of mine when I was not in a hurry.

One day was spent in getting things ship-shape for the road; and on the morrow, June 30th, we started for the interior: Stokes, our caravan-leader, six Missionaries, about 500 porters, head-men, and tent boys all told. We were compelled to have so many porters on account of the quantities of cloth that one has to carry to barter for food, and to pay away for wages, besides the necessary supplies of English stores that one must take.

Of course we expected to see lions, leopards, giraffes, etc., at every turn of the way; a hare, however, summed up all the game we saw for a great many days. Our first march was very uneventful. We began at once with the same narrow track—like a path through an English wood—that continued with us to our journey's end; and we also began to pass through high grass, thickly strewn with mimosa-trees of all sizes, which likewise, from time to time remained our faithful companions to the lake. A few strange butterflies, mostly orange and purple tips, crossed my path; but I was slightly disappointed with regard to them, and even more so with the birds. One expected to have the eye dazzled with gaudy plumage and painted wing; but our feathered companions were chiefly sombre doves and pigeons fleeing before us *multo cum strepitu*. Our first camp was a dirty one, and we were introduced to another delightful experience—water that you might almost cut with a knife. If we had succeeded in getting our baggage ship-shape, we had not done so with the men; they were in a most disorderly state, and were very noisy till the small hours of the night began to be succeeded by the larger ones. Even a heavy

shower seemed to have no effect upon their intense joviality; the consequence was, neither they nor we were in proper marching trim when daylight dawned. Then again, we had not yet learnt to manage our commissariat department properly, nor was there anybody to give us advice, so that we started away with next to nothing to eat before the march, and about 11 a.m. we were found under a tree in an exhausted condition. Sugar-cane was presented to us by one of our men (I hope it was not stolen), and, like Jonathan, our eyes were enlightened, and we struggled on to the camping-ground, only to find the natives had decamped, and that nothing was to be bought. In this state we had to choose a site for the tents—no small difficulty, for one cried one thing and one another; the fact being, that we had arrived at a very beautiful spot and there were many desirable situations. Even when this momentous question was settled we had to wait a tremendous time for our baggage, for the men were tired after their noisy night, and many threw their burdens in the road and refused to go on. They often want no little skill to manage them, and the more so when they have so much advanced wages in their possession, and are so near the coast. What an experience the first explorers must have had, ignorant of the language of the proper camps, and of the ways of their men! they must have been entirely at their mercy, and I can assure anybody that it is not very tender. It was an immense advantage to us having Stokes' experience at our service; we cannot be too grateful to him for undertaking this work.

Every day had its adventures. Almost a volume might be written about the march, the scenery, the camp, the natives, the trials we had with our men, and so forth, even on one day. But one cannot stop to dilate; it is only a circumstance here and there that must detain us. On the 8th July we arrived at our first stream. Loud had been the warnings that we should not wade through or bathe while on the march for fear of fever, for it was here that one man nearly died from his imprudence. I was very hot when I reached its banks, and needed no advice. Well, just at the time there were no head-men up, and I was going to wait patiently, when my boys volunteered to carry me over, a thing they could very well have done. But the ambitious Johar must needs have all the honour and glory to himself; he rushed and seized me, bearing me off in triumph. I felt an ominous totter, and yelled to him to return. But in vain; he refused to listen. More tottering, entreaty to return; but no. Swaying to and fro like a bulrush in a gale of wind, I clenched my teeth and held my breath; they shout from the bank for Johar to return, but it has not the slightest effect; he feels his only chance is to dash right on. Mid-stream is

now reached, and my hopes revive; I think perhaps—but the water deepens, the rocks become more slippery, a huge struggle, and down we go flat, Johar collapsing beneath me, as an india-rubber ball punctured by a pin. Far better to have walked through with all my things on, for I should then only have got wet to the knees; but now no part of me could claim to be dry. Fortunately I did not get fever as I expected. I had some symptoms of it, but the next day's adventure completely turned the current of my thoughts.

It was Sunday. We had just had our morning service, and all but myself had retired for their midday nap, when I noticed that the prairie (we call it "pori" out there) was on fire. I at once ran off to hear Stokes' opinion about it. He was dozing serenely, and on catching sight of the flames leaping high in the air, bounded from his bed, seized the drum, and beat to quarters, asking me to see that the tents were struck and everything prepared for flight. This done, I followed him and the men who had dashed off to beat down the fire. It was splendid to see the flames and to hear the crackling of leaves and grass, mingled with the excited yells of the men. After a time it was subdued, and the men began returning, very quietly as we thought, to the camp. But it was not so; they had found out that the natives had fired the grass maliciously, on purpose to burn us out; so they stole away with their guns and bows and arrows to take vengeance, and burn the village to the ground—a nice thing for the Missionaries' caravan to accomplish.

By-and-by Stokes dashed past our tents in the most excited state, crying out in the strongest Irish accent, "Write it down in ye diaries, gintlemin: me min have gone to burnn the village, and I can't stop thim." I did not wait to get out my notebook to jot this down at the time, but tore after him as fast as I could, and we, but more particularly the head-men, many of whom are chiefs, succeeded in stopping them. Only one man had been wounded with a war-club in the head. I took him back to my tent, dressed his wounds, and gave him a present; then, thinking all was over, we sat down to dinner. We were no doubt discussing some delicious goat-soup, when the cry of fire was once more raised. This time it had broken out in a still more dangerous quarter, and threatened very soon to consume the camp. Off I dashed, leaving the others to see after the tents, and arrived about fourth on the scene. The fire was simply terrific. At the spot where we came upon it, the grass was far over one's head, and there were, too, a number of palm-trees with dead leaves attached to their trunks, which carried the flames high in the air. These conflagrations can only be got under by following them up from behind, and beating them

out down wind. For one moment I quailed, as I had to set my face at the flames and dash through them before we could begin work ; but it was merely the matter of a moment, and I was soon through, and followed by the rest.

Now began the battle, and it was glorious. No fifth of November excitement ever came up to it, in my opinion. The naked figures of the men, leaping, yelling, and dashing about like so many hundred demons; the roar of the fire at times almost drowning the men's cries of "Piga moto!" ("Beat down the fire!"); the brilliant flames, amid dense columns of smoke—formed a scene that I expect few have witnessed; and which wants a better pen than mine to do it justice. In the midst of it all, there I was, scorched, dripping with perspiration, dashing about and urging on the men with all my lung-power. It was all very well for me among the hot embers, but I don't fancy it was quite so pleasant for the men with their naked feet, though only a few demanded treatment afterwards. In the confusion Stokes, who had attacked the fire from its other flank, fell into a hole, and was severely shaken ; however, there was not much time to think about it then, as we had much work before us. After a time we conquered our good friend, but bad foe. One thing I certainly learnt, namely, that the American tales about prairie fires must be greatly exaggerated. Fire does not travel at the pace they make out, and anybody with a stout stick could beat his way, as I did, right through it. I was disappointed, too, in another respect ; there was no stampede of wild animals, nor did I see even a reptile hurrying away from destruction. But then the fire in the afternoon had given alarm to any game there might be in the neighbourhood ; nor do I think there is much in this locality at the best of times.

Following on our journey, we came to a broad and deep branch of the Wami. Here the vegetation assumed an entirely different aspect, and we beheld for the first time what is generally understood by the expression "tropical forest scenery." Magnificent trees, towering aloft and supporting endless creepers and parasitic plants, presented to the eye every shade and variety of foliage: there a mass of jasmine perfumed the air ; there a euphorbia, like the candelabra of the Jewish temple, stood stiffly erect ; and from the boughs of those trees which overhung the stream the great belted kingfisher watched for his shining prey.

The natives possessed a small dugout canoe, which tempted me to go for a short paddle midst the fairylike scene ; but the evil spirits in the vasty deep below in the shape of crocodiles soon caused me to retrace my steps and make for the less enchanted ground of the camp. This stream it was that we probably crossed after about three days' march by a curious native

bridge of poles and trees and living creepers pitched and tangled together in a most marvellous way. Living poles one has often seen used. I remember four trees being topped and the roof of a shed put on them, and the shed gradually getting taller and taller; but this was the first time I had seen living ropes binding the bridge together, and stretching across to form a hand-rail for the wayfarer. It was intensely picturesque, but equally inconvenient, and took the men with their loads about two hours to cross. There was not the general activity amongst them that I expected; some almost wanted to be carried over, as well as their loads, though others bounded across like monkeys. While at the river-side I heard a sharp but familiar note, and looking up I beheld our gay old friend the English kingfisher in his bright blue uniform, by far the prettiest bird I had yet seen in Africa. Only one load was dropped over the cobweb-like parapet of the bridge, but that, of course, was a box of cartridges, being one of the most spoilable things they could find; however, it was better than a man being snapped up by a crocodile.

Within a mile of this we had to cross the stream again. Here the river had considerably widened, and was spanned by a huge fallen tree of enormous girth and length; it could not have been much less than 200 feet long. On arriving at the village we found that a false report had reached the natives that we were exceedingly hostile; accordingly they had fled pell-mell, leaving behind them nothing but empty huts. In cases of this kind it is exceedingly difficult to prevent the men from robbing the sugar-plantations and banana-trees, for they must have food. Then, if they steal, the natives naturally say the report was right, and the white men are bad.

This district was very swampy, and I think here we began to get incipient fever. It was a remarkable sight to see the swamps at night literally blazing with fireflies, darting about like millions of miniature meteors; here, too, we met with another accompaniment of marshes, which did not amuse us in the least, namely mosquitoes, in equal myriads.

The very next day brought us to one of the most beautiful spots in this neighbourhood, the Zingwe or Rocky River, a clear stream descending from the Usagara Mountains, and, with the exception of the foliage, we might have been encamped on the banks of the East Lynn in North Devon. I was crazy to ascend to a greater elevation to botanize, but would not suggest a day's rest, as the great object we had before us would ill brook delay: was it not fortunate that an urgent appeal came from the men to rest? On the morrow I started off at sunrise with two others to ascend the highest peak of the chain. The Sultan has a garrison here; and the Arab in charge, hearing

of the expedition, sent a soldier to protect us; but we soon left him curled up fast asleep at the foot of a tree, and had it not been that we managed to secure a native guide, we should have had to return. The path was exceedingly circuitous, as it went from village to village; and often we had to ascend a small peak only to come down to the same level on the other side. Nearly all the villages about here are well situated on elevations, forming natural strongholds. At last we got clear of habitations, and a really stiff ascent commenced. Mountain plants, too, began to show themselves in the shape of lycopodiums, sedums, ferns, and mosses; it was here I found the new *Selaginella Mittenii*. I had previously estimated the height of the mountain to be about 5,000 feet; and this is what, from our observations, it turned out roughly to be when, after no small difficulty, we had reached the top. We descended by another route on the north side of the mountain, and here the vegetation was truly magnificent. Ferns towered far above our heads, while others, together with orchids and lycopodiums, covered the trees. Two sorts of ginger-plants abounded, the acid fruit of which was a great favourite with the men; nor was it to be despised by a thirsty European. The climbing indiarubber-tree is very plentiful on these hills, and though its foliage is generally far above reach and recognition, yet it is easily known by the milky juice immediately congealing in the hand. There also grew that extraordinary bean, the pod of which is densely covered with short red hairs, which, if handled, enter the skin, and sting far worse than the well-known devil's-ring caterpillar; so bad is it that the natives recommend washing with ashes, and if possible potash, to get rid of it. It is reported to be used as a torture for slaves by scourging them with it, and using it in manners too horrible to describe, in which cases it produces madness and death. This venomous plant is exceedingly beautiful, climbing as high as fifty feet, with large clusters of white flowers, the shape of bunches of Muscat grapes. I found three species—a second with purple blossoms, a third at the Victoria Nyanza, which was a much more glabrous plant. When I first seized the tempting bait I was nearly driven mad myself with pain, and was a long time discovering the source of the mischief; for, unlike the nettle which immediately resents handling, this does not develop its evil effects until some time afterwards. Even when I knew its malicious propensities I never could gather it without suffering for it, even though I used the utmost caution as I examined or attempted to dry it. This chain of mountains is densely populated, I suppose on account of the wonderful fertility of the soil and the beautiful Alpine climate. Villages were to be observed almost to their summits.

The natives of some of those we passed through betrayed great alarm at the sudden influx of white men, and began driving their chickens and cattle away to places of safety; nor was it an easy task to assure them we were peaceably inclined. It was in this neighbourhood that fever first began to develop itself among us; nor was it to be wondered at, as swamps border all these rivers, and the luxuriant vegetation must produce miasma from its rapid growth and decay.

As we journeyed on, more rivers had to be crossed. At one I had an amusing adventure with our hospital donkey, which we kept for the transport of invalids. It happened to be up at the time I wanted to cross, so, having had an experience of a two-legged donkey, I thought I would try the four-legged one. The wretch had no saddle or bridle on at the time, but he let me get well into the stream, and then he began to kick, and threatened to lie down and roll; however, the head-men saw my predicament and rushed at me, caught me up as if I was a wisp of straw, and bore me in a horizontal position over the donkey's head to the farther bank. At the next stream I selected two men, and was assured it was exceedingly narrow, and so it was; but there was no exit on the other side, an impenetrable fringe of reeds and jungle hedging us in, so we turned up stream. I had to urge, and urge, and urge them not to drop me until we reached a small sandbank, where I stripped and waded the best part of a mile before we found a break in the dense tangle.

July 21st we reached our first Missionary station, Mamboia, about 150 miles from the coast. Here our good Missionary and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Last, met and welcomed us, and instantly carried me off to their comfortable quarters, for by this time I had had no less than five attacks of fever.

The house, or if I call it bungalow it describes it, is prettily situated on the mountain-side about 3,000 feet above sea-level, and commands most extensive and beautiful views. Immediately on the west side rises a precipitous cliff, in which a grand old eagle has its eyrie; to the east the mountains form an amphitheatre, and bold jutting crags add a wildness to the scene; all that it lacks to make it surpassingly beautiful is water.

The soil is most productive, and the climate sub-Alpine, so that our English vegetables grow to great perfection; and the flower-garden in front of the house was a mass of geraniums, nasturtians, petunias, and other denizens of our home gardens. We had not had enough of the wild-flowers of Africa to care much for these. How differently I felt about twelve months later! Next to the house was the church—a very original structure. Circular mud walls had been built to the

height of about six feet, which were covered by a deep sloping roof, open in the centre, from which rose wooden stanchions, which in their turn supported a cap roof, thus a large open space was left between the two roofs for ventilation. The luxury of pews was not needed, the natives preferring to sit on the ground; and two chairs served for the ordinary European portion of the congregation. The Sunday we were there of course was an exception. On this occasion the church was quite full. Part of our prayers were read in the Kiswahili, as well as the lessons for the day. Two or three hymns were sung; and by giving them out a verse at a time the natives were able to join. Then followed the sermon, which always takes the form of catechizing, or is even more conversational still. Although, in these early days, no definite results in the way of conversions are known of, yet it is most encouraging to see the natives listening attentively and sending their children to be educated.

A short scientific expedition was organized for my benefit, and some mountain localities of great beauty were explored. It was here I found the new *Asplenium Hanningtoni*, and several mosses which promise to prove new to the world. While examining the bark of a tree for beetles we disturbed the nest of a variety of trap-door spider, which sprang at Mr. Last with the ferocity of a tiger, and naturally caused him to bound away from it as if he had been shot.

Under the bark of another tree we found some bright emerald-green earth-worms, which at first sight roused the suspicion that we had come upon a small but exceedingly venomous variety of snake, though examination soon showed that they were *genuine* worms. The flora was exceedingly varied and beautiful. I could well have spent days in this charming locality, but it could not be; as it was, some of our party, who have no botanical turn, had already vowed that nothing should induce them to go out for another natural history excursion: they could not see any fun in poking about over a lot of rotten wood and grubbing for little bits of moss.

On 25th July we were fain to proceed, our friends accompanying us as far as they could; but at length a river decided the question, and with many heart-achings we said farewell. With one, Mrs. Last, we were to meet no more on this side the narrow stream of death. The march was a long one. We crossed a lovely looking rivulet, clear as crystal; but its waters had a strong taste of Epsom salts, and the effect produced by drinking them was much the same. There are many saline springs and streams to be met with in Africa: woe betide those who are unwary enough to partake of them! When the wave of civilization spreads over the land, these places will be

the Baths and Buxtons of East African society. Presently we came upon a thick dirty brook, the water of which was pronounced by the men to be very beautiful, and here they had placed our camp. For the first time the men had the choosing of it, as we had delayed with our friends. It was no small misfortune this; for their one idea is to take the site of an old camp, because there are some dirty old huts left by the last comers, and wood and stones for making fires are generally ready to hand. It is in these old camps that small-pox is picked up and carried from place to place. It is nothing unusual to have two or three, or even more, cases in a caravan, and to find dead bodies left in the huts as they died of this loathsome disease. Therefore, if it could be helped, we never allowed the men to pitch upon old sites; sometimes, however, from swamps and jungles, it was unavoidable.

This part of the country abounds with game. On one occasion a herd of antelopes crossed the path as tamely as if they had been sheep; and the tracks of giraffe and larger game were frequently seen. Guinea-fowl were so plentiful that one of the white men at Mpwapwa told us that he did not trouble to fire at them unless he could ensure killing two or three at a shot. I had two narrow escapes in one of my walks with a gun in search of game. I came to a belt of jungle so dense that the only way to get through it was to creep on all fours along the tracks made by hyenas and smaller game; as I was crawling along I saw close in front of me a deadly puff-adder: in another second I should have been on it. The same day, on my return, I espied in one of these same tracks a peculiar arrangement of grass, which I at once recognised to be over a pitfall; but though I had seen it I had already gone too far, and fell with a tremendous crash, my double-barrel gun full-cocked in my hand. I had the presence of mind to let myself go and look out only for my gun, which fortunately never exploded. On arriving at the bottom I called out to my terrified boy, Mikuke Hapana, "There are no spears,"—a most merciful Providence, for they often stake these pitfalls in order to ensure the deaths of the animals that fall into them. The pitfall could not have been less than ten feet deep, for when I proceeded to extricate myself I found that I could not reach the top with my uplifted hands. Undaunted by my adventures, and urged on by the monotony of nothing but tough goat-meat on the sideboard, I started before the break of day the next morning in pursuit of game, and was soon to be seen crawling on hands and knees after antelope, I am afraid utterly unmindful of puff-adders and pitfalls. By-and-by the path followed the bed of a narrow stream, which was completely ploughed with the tracks of buffalo and giraffe as fresh

as fresh could be. Our impression was—and probably it was right—that the former were lurking in the dense thicket close by. The breathless excitement that such a position keeps you in does much to help along the weary miles of the march, and to ward off attacks of fever. All experienced hands out here recommend that men should, while not losing sight of their one grand object, keep themselves amused.

My nephew, Gordon, and I, with our boys, had led the van all the morning. He, having lately had fever, complained of being tired, and begged me to continue in pursuit of game alone, merely taking my one faithful boy with me to carry my gun; but I refused to leave him, for never had I complained of an ache or a pain but what he was by my side to help and comfort me. After living in the same tent, and never being separate until I left him at the lake, I say we have no more gentle and heavenly minded man in the Mission field. We sat down and rested, and the other brethren, with a party of a dozen or fourteen, marched on ahead. They had not gone many hundred yards before I heard the whizz of a bullet. "They have found game," said I. Bang went a second shot—it is a herd; then another—yes, it must be a herd; then a fourth, and it dawned upon me that they were attacked by robbers—the far-famed *Ruga-Ruga*. "Stay where you are," I cried; and dashed off, closely followed by my boys. The bangs had now reached seven, and we had not the slightest doubt that it was an attack by robbers, and so it proved to be. My anxiety was relieved by seeing our men intact, standing together at bay with a foe that was nowhere to be seen. I soon learnt that, as they were quietly proceeding, a party of the savage Wahumba tribe had swooped down upon them; but seeing white men and rifles among the party, had fled with the utmost precipitation, without even discharging a poisoned arrow. To make their flight even more rapid the white men had fired their rifles in the air; and one in grabbing his gun from his boy had managed to discharge it in such a manner as to blow off the sight of his neighbour's rifle. Finding that danger was at an end for the time being, I begged them to remain as they were, ready to receive an attack, while I returned with my boys to Gordon, and got the stragglers together, after which we all proceeded in a body. I have always thought that it was I who had the greatest escape of all; for had I gone on, as Gordon proposed, with only one, or at the outside two boys, I should most probably have been attacked, and should have had no hesitation about laying low the first man who advanced upon me. I felt truly thankful we were all preserved. Surely we had traces of an ever-watchful Providence every step of the way.

The march was a long and anxious one after this, for it was not until we saw all arrive that we could feel certain there had been no stragglers cut off. When we reached the halting-place a desirable-looking site was pitched upon, and preparations were made for the erection of tents, etc., when something was found to offend the olfactory nerves, which led to the discovery of three dead men, who probably had perished from smallpox. Not even a black man could stand taking up his abode in such a quarter, so with a groan and a grumble a move was made farther on. The cooks next chose a spot that had been fired—the chances were that it had been burnt because of an infected camp having been stationed there. Even if it were not so, all the ground was outrageously dirty from the black ashes; and the result of such a place is that tents and everything get in a filthy state, so I insisted on a further move to a piece of entirely fresh ground. This thoroughly put the cooks' backs up; the consequence was, the boy was an immense time fetching water, and when it was fetched the fire would not burn, so breakfast was not finished until 4 p.m. This meal over, I made up my mind to proceed to Mpwapwa, twelve miles farther on, and was accompanied by two headmen and one boy. Most of the march was by night; but I had no fear of robbers, in spite of the recent attack, for, take it as a rule, unless the attack is a premeditated one on a village, they prefer doing their dirty work by daylight. I was a little astonished, as we passed through mile after mile of dense forest, that but very few sounds of wild beasts were heard. Now and again the sharp cry of the fence broke the stillness of the evening, or a porcupine rustled away from almost beneath one's feet; but this was all, although other game abounds in the neighbourhood.

At Mpwapwa, about 200 miles in from the coast, we have our second station; and as the peaceful occupants of the Mission buildings were thinking of turning in, two sharp cracks of a rifle announced our arrival. They were not too sleepy to immediately respond to the summons, and almost before my men had had time to impart the news that they had brought the *Bwana Mkubwa*—literally, the great master—I had received a hearty welcome. News, business, future plans, occupied us far into the small hours of the night, and enabled me to digest the hearty meal I made of the European luxuries, in the shape of bread and cheese, that were set before me. When one goes for weeks, and sometimes months, without tasting bread, friends at home have little idea what a treat it is to sit down to a loaf, nor how quickly, after a thirty miles' march with its fatigue and excitements, it disappears.

JAMES HANNINGTON.

ART. II.—OUR LORD'S PRESENT WORK AS THE
HIGH PRIEST OF HIS CHURCH.

IN a former article, on this subject¹ it was shown that the intercession of Christ, as at present carried on, is properly sacerdotal. It is as High Priest of His Church that He appears before God and pleads her cause in heaven.

We now proceed to inquire how far Holy Scripture enables us to determine the manner and circumstances of His priestly intercession, and the relation in which it stands to the worship of the Church on earth. It will be remembered that the special object of this inquiry is to discover whether any countenance is lent to the assertion, that

“the most holy Body and Blood of Christ, the alone acceptable Victim to make our peace with God, are offered, that is, continually presented and pleaded by Jesus Himself in heaven, naturally, as we may say, and openly;”

an assertion on which is based the theory, that

“the same most holy Body and Blood are continually presented and pleaded before God by Christ's representatives, acting ‘in His name,’ and ‘by His commission and authority’ on earth.”

In prosecuting this inquiry, we shall confine our attention in the present paper to the evidence to be gathered from the typical institution of the Mosaic economy, by which the priesthood of Christ was foreshadowed; with a view to ascertain what light is thrown by it on the question before us. Other parts of the subject we shall hope to enter upon in the two following numbers of *THE CHURCHMAN*.

Our warrant for seeking evidence from the Jewish institution is to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The law, so that Epistle teaches us, had “a shadow of the good things to come;”² that is to say, it represented them, though it did not contain them; just as the shadow represents, though it is not, the substance. And the shadow which the law had was an accurate shadow, a divine adumbration of the eternal verities which it really and designedly portrayed. As such we may study it with profit, and gain from it a clearer insight into them. And not that only, for if the typical and material institution be indeed a shadow, projected on earth from the heavenly archetype, “the pattern shown in the Mount,”³ then the dimensions and main features of the one must correspond with those of the other. Then from the shadow here we may

¹ *THE CHURCHMAN* for April, 1883. The delay in the appearance of the second Article has been occasioned by the illness of the writer.

² Hebrews x. i.

³ Exod. xxv. 40; Hebrews viii. 5.

argue back to the substance there ; and may, if need be, correct and modify our conception of the spiritual reality, by the divinely delineated material type of it which we possess.

But the Epistle to the Hebrews, which thus supplies the warrant for consulting profitably the Old Testament Institution, supplies also, so far as our present inquiry is concerned, definite limits within which to pursue it. Out of the whole body of types which the Mosaic institution contained, the inspired writer of this Epistle makes choice of one person and one service only as the subjects of his infallible comment. It is not in the Jewish priests generally, but in the high-priest alone that he finds a type of our Lord as Priest.¹ Throughout the Epistle no typical significance is assigned to the ordinary priests of the Jewish economy. One only, the head and chief of the order, the high-priest, is the chosen type of "The Apostle and High Priest of our Confession." All other Jewish priests fall entirely out of consideration.²

Nor is this the only limitation which is imposed by the Epistle to the Hebrews upon our present inquiry. It is not only on the single figure of the high-priest, in his ideal unity,

¹ This is surely a consideration which has an important bearing upon the question whether the ministers of Christ are to be regarded as the successors of the Jewish priests, standing in the same relation to Him as they did to the high-priest of the house of Aaron. We look in vain for any such idea in this Epistle, where, of all places of the New Testament, we should most have expected to find it. It may be remarked in passing that if the theory referred to at the commencement of this article were true, if Christian ministers were Christ's "representatives," in the manner claimed for them, then not "priests" but "high-priests" would be their proper designation ; for the whole typical action, on which the supposed resemblance is based, was that of the high-priest, and of the high-priest alone. The ordinary priests never, in any way, imitated or repeated it.

² The expression (ch. x. 11) "Every priest" may be urged as an exception to this statement. We might answer that the reading is uncertain, that "high-priest," ἀρχιερεὺς, has considerable support, and that the Revised Version, though it does not adopt it, mentions in the margin that "some ancient authorities read *high-priest*." Or, again, if the better-supported reading, "priest," be retained, it might be held to mean, as it has been by some writers, "Every high-priest in succession." Adopting, however, as we prefer to do, at once the better-supported reading and the more natural interpretation, we are prepared to expound with Böhme (quoted by Delitzsch), "Stantibus Judæorum sacrificiis Pontifex cœlestes sedens e regione ponitur." In the grand climax at which he has arrived, the sacred writer brings for a moment into view, not the high-priest only, but all the priests of that earlier dispensation, in all the busy action of their daily-repeated because unavailing service, in order that he may set over against them in strongest contrast Him, Who "after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever," ceased from His accomplished work of sacrifice and satisfaction, and sat down "in the majesty of calm repose, on the right hand of God." But this is an exception which in no way invalidates the general assertion made above.

that our thoughts are to be concentrated, but on that figure as engaged in the one sacerdotal service of the Jewish Church year, which the high-priest only was permitted to perform, and which he was required to perform alone.

Having described with some minuteness the construction and furniture of the Tabernacle, the writer passes these things by without comment as things which are only subsidiary to his argument, and of which he cannot stop to "speak particularly."¹ He will not linger within the sacred precincts of the Holy Place, to expound the mystery of the golden candlestick and the table of shew-bread, nor of that golden altar of incense, which, occupying the central place in front of the mystic veil, may be reckoned among the furniture of the Inner Sanctuary itself.² Not even on the ark of the covenant, with its golden pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of stone graven by the hand of God Himself, nor on the overshadowing cherubims of glory, will he pause to dwell. The goal to which he is hastening lies through these things and beyond them. It is in the service for which they were prepared, and especially in one particular feature of it, one marked contrast which it afforded, that the Gospel of which he is in search is to be found. By the feet of many priests the floor of that first chamber is trodden daily. Within the awful enclosure of the second chamber the feet of the high-priest alone, on one day only in the year, may presume to enter. By this the Holy Ghost signified that while that "first tabernacle," the Holy Place in which the many priests ministered, was still standing, the way into the most Holy Place, the true access to God Himself, was not yet made manifest.³ Only when that first tent with what it signified had passed away by the destruction of the Jewish Temple and economy, was the second tent, shaking off its material shroud and earthly envelope, transformed into the spiritual reality which it had prefigured. When the true High Priest entered once for all, not into the most Holy Place made with hands, but into heaven itself, then "boldness to enter into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus" became the privilege of every Christian.

In this most Holy Place, then, and in the service connected with it, the Gospel mystery of the Jewish ritual is enshrined. In other words, it is to the action of the high-priest on the day of atonement, and to what he then did in the most Holy

¹ Hebrews ix. 5.

² Hebrews ix. 3, 4.

³ Hebrews ix. 8. It seems natural that the expression, "The first tabernacle," should have the same meaning in this verse as it has in the second verse of the same chapter, viz., "The first part of the tabernacle," "the Holy Place," as distinguished from "the Most Holy."

Place, that we must confine our attention, if we would learn what the type has to teach us as regards our Lord's present work for us as our High Priest in heaven.

The relation in which the day of atonement stood typically to the rest of the Jewish year, bore a striking analogy to the relation in which the Gospel verity stands spiritually to the whole Jewish figure. On that one day the imperfection of all the ceremonial expiations of the preceding year was plainly confessed. "All the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, in all their sins,"¹ though by the inferior priests they had already been atoned for in ordinary sacrifices, needed, as the solemn service of that day showed, yet another atonement by the high-priest himself in an extraordinary sacrifice, which gathering them all up as it were in one, should carry them beyond the veil into the presence of God Himself, and there procure forgiveness for them. While, therefore, that day itself was proved by its annual recurrence to be only a type, it was obviously the most significant type which the Jew possessed of the "good things to come." The ritual of the day was briefly this.² Clothed, not in his usual stately dress, but in a garb composed entirely of white linen, the high-priest first brought to the door of the Tabernacle a bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering for himself and for his house, *i.e.*, for the whole priesthood; for on that day reconciliation was to be made for all the priests, and for the Tabernacle and its furniture, as well as for the whole nation. Two he-goats were then brought for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering on behalf of the people. Upon the goats lots were cast, one for Jehovah, the other for Azazel. The high-priest, as a sinful man (the type herein bearing witness to itself that it was only a type), and therefore obliged to "offer sacrifice first for his own sins," now proceeded to slay the bullock which he had already presented. This he did at the altar of burnt-offering in the court without the Tabernacle. Then, taking a censer filled with burning coals from off that altar, and having both his hands full of incense, he entered the Tabernacle, and passing within the veil into the most Holy Place, he there cast the incense out of his hands upon the burning coals of the censer, and set it down upon the ground, in order that the cloud of smoke thus produced might hide the mercy-seat from his view; for there abode the mysterious Shekinah, the symbol of the presence of the Almighty, and no man might look on God and live. Leaving the censer there, as it would seem, to send up its cloud of smoke until the ministrations of the day within the veil were

¹ Leviticus xvi. 21.

² Leviticus xvi.

completed, he came out again to the altar of burnt-offering in the court, and taking in a bowl some of the blood of the bullock which he had slain, he carried it into the most Holy Place, and there sprinkled it with his finger, once upon the golden cover of the ark, which was called the Caphoreth or Mercy-seat, and seven times upon the ground in front of it. Coming forth a second time to the altar in the court, he now commenced his offering for the people. Slaying the he-goat on which the lot for Jehovah had fallen, he carried its blood into the most Holy Place, and dealt with it there in the same manner as he had dealt before with the blood of his own sin-offering. And now the transactions of the day, so far as the Inner Sanctuary was concerned, were concluded. The bowls of blood and the smoking censer were carried forth, and the mystic curtain fell, barring access to that sacred presence-chamber till another year should have run its course. Here, then, so far as we have now to do with it, the ritual of the day of atonement ended. It remains to be considered what conclusions are to be drawn from it as regards the inquiry in which we are now engaged.

I. It is important to observe that *there was no altar* in the most Holy Place.

There was no altar for animal sacrifice within the Jewish Tabernacle, or Temple, at all. The altar on which the bodies of those beasts, which were offered in sacrifice, were wholly or in part consumed by fire, was the brazen altar, which stood at the entrance of the court without. Standing there, it evermore silently testified to the Jewish worshipper that only through sacrifice, death undergone, blood shed, could access to God be obtained and acceptable worship rendered. In the first division of the Tabernacle, the Holy Place, there was, indeed, an altar, but it was the golden altar of incense, from which the fragrant smoke of spices, the type of prayer and worship, and heavenward aspiration, continually went up. In the most Holy Place, within the second veil, no altar stood. Neither brazen altar of sacrifice, nor golden altar of incense, had there a place. The ministry of the high-priest within the veil was *without an altar*. If, then, the type correspond to the anti-type, if the shadow be an accurate representation of the substance, as both the strict command given to Moses to copy the pattern shown him in the Mount, and the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews prove that it is, then there is no altar in heaven either.¹ The High Priest of our profession ministers

¹ It is true that an altar is introduced more than once into the imagery of the Book of Revelation, the scene being laid in heaven. But in no such case is there any reference to a priest at all, much less to our Lord as ministering at a heavenly altar. In the first passage,

at no altar there. But if that view be correct, which regards the worship of the Church on earth, especially in the celebration of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as the counterpart and resemblance of Christ's priestly action for His Church in heaven; if His priests, especially in that solemn service, are doing here by His authority and in His name what He is doing there, then surely it must follow that there can be no altar in the ministrations of the Church on earth, seeing there is none in the ministration of Christ in heaven.

The type, indeed, would seem to go further and exclude altogether the view to which we have referred. Certainly there is nothing in it to sanction the doing by priests on earth, in any sense or manner, what the High Priest is doing in heaven. On the contrary, on the day of atonement, which, as we have seen, is the proper figure of the Gospel verity, all other priestly action was superseded and set aside by the action of the high-priest alone. On that day no other priest was permitted to minister nor to come within the Tabernacle till its special service was completed.

"There shall be no man [no priest, that is, for no other man could ever enter there] in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel."¹

But were the resemblance as clearly made out, as it appears to be clearly set aside, between our action as priests on earth and His action as High Priest in heaven, it would still conclusively follow, so far as the teaching of the divinely constituted type is concerned, that we serve not as priests at any altar here, seeing that at no altar He serves so there.

II. Nearly related to this conclusion is another, to which the teaching of the type seems no less inevitably to lead us. There was no altar in the most Holy Place, and of consequence *there was never any victim there.* In point of fact, no victim ever came within the Tabernacle or the Temple at all. The fat of some sacrifices, choice portions of others, the whole carcasses of others, were offered to God on the brazen altar without. But no part of any animal sacrifice, except the blood, was ever brought within the sanctuary. It would have

(vi. 9) St. John sees "under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." This altar has been thought to answer to the altar of burnt-offering in the court of the Jewish Tabernacle. But whatever interpretation we put upon it, it has obviously nothing to do with our present argument. In other passages (viii. 3; ix. 13.) the *golden* altar, corresponding to the altar of incense in the Holy Place, is distinctly specified.

¹ Leviticus xvi. 17.

traversed the whole idea of sacrifice, in its relation to worship and access to God, if it had been. Sacrifice for sin is the means, not the end. It stands on the threshold, nay, before the threshold, of worship and communion.

But if this be so, does not the view of the Holy Supper with which we are dealing, again transgress the conditions which are plainly imposed upon us by the type? The advocates of that view allege that Christ, as our High Priest in heaven, is not, indeed, *repeating*—any such repetition they emphatically deny—but *representing* Himself as “the alone acceptable victim to make our peace with God,” and that in like manner His Church represents Him, offers, in that sense, Him, His most holy Body and Blood, in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. The authors of a memorial, presented some few years ago to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and signed, among others, by the late Dr. Pusey, Canon Liddon and Archdeacon Denison, affirm :

“We believe that as in heaven, Christ, our great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His sacrifice of Himself once offered on the cross : so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the blessed sacrament of His Body and Blood.”

But if, as this statement declares, “as” it is done there, “so” also is it done here, how can it be said that His sacred Body is offered here? For assuredly, so far as the type is our guide (and with that alone we are dealing now), it is not offered there. Writers of the school of theology to which these statements belong are wont to speak of our Lord as continuing still the “victim-state” in heaven. But no victim, no flesh, no body of a sacrifice was ever seen in the most Holy Place of which heaven is the antitype. The blood alone was admitted there. It may not be out of place to remark here, though this consideration belongs properly to a later stage of our inquiry, how entirely the Epistle to the Hebrews confirms the correspondence of the antitype with the type in this particular. It is never as “victim,” but always as high-priest, that our Lord is there represented as appearing for us before His Father in heaven. And not only so, but the writer of the Epistle in one place expressly states that the analogy of the type was preserved in this very particular, and that the sacred Body of our Lord was not presented to God in heaven *in the character of a victim*.

“For the bodies of those beasts,” he writes, “whose blood is brought into the most Holy Place by the high-priest for sin, are burned without

the camp. Wherefore [seeing this is so, and that the antitype must answer to the type] Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate."

The direction of the law was :

"And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung."¹

In other words, the bodies of victims whose blood was carried within the veil were to be annihilated. "Wherefore," in order that all things that were written of him might be accomplished, Jesus, Whom these victims represented, suffered not within the enclosure of "the holy city," but in an unclean place, "the place of a skull," outside. And suffering there, He annihilated the "victim-state," brought it for ever to an end; inasmuch as with a body that *could* die, that *could be* a victim, He has never more anything to do. "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For the death that He died, He died unto sin once for all."²

Surely, then, if all this be true, and if the view we are combating is to be accepted, we are driven to the strange conclusion, that seeing it is His Blood only that Christ offered in heaven, it can only be that same precious Blood that we offer below in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist. And then does it not follow, that if this be the pattern on which that holy sacrament is modelled, we must needs re-construct the error of the Church of Rome, and deny, not the cup, but the bread, not to the laity only, but to all who are partakers of that holy sacrament? For His "flesh, which is meat indeed," no place would then be found in that holy ordinance.

III. One other point to be noticed in the typical teaching of the most Holy Place is *the presence and the significance of the atoning blood*. There was no altar within the Holy of Holies. The victim never entered there. The blood came alone within the veil. But how did it come? As living blood or as dead? Not as living, but as dead. Not as the emblem of life, lived on unbroken and unimpaired, nor even of life taken up again and lived anew; but, as its separation from the body plainly intimated, of life forfeited, of life parted with—in one word, of death undergone. It is the eternal canon by which the

¹ Leviticus xvi. 27.

² Romans vi. 9, 10. Revised Version, and Margin. The description of our Lord in the Book of Revelation (v. 6) as "a Lamb as it had been slain," as justifying the idea of His retaining the "victim-state" in heaven, will come under consideration in a future paper.

awful sacrifice of Calvary and the sacrifices of the Jewish Tabernacle alike were governed—the shadow in nothing more true to the substance than in this, that without “shedding of blood is no remission.”¹ Nor are we left in ignorance of the principles on which this canon rests. Death is the wages of sin. “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” was the primeval sentence on sin, which has never been repealed. The life is forfeited by sin, and the life must be paid in penalty if remission is to be obtained. But “the life of all flesh is the blood thereof.”² Therefore, the blood was chosen as the instrument of remission.

“The life³ of the flesh,” said God, by Moses, “is in the blood : and I have given it [the blood] to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls : for it is the blood that maketh an atonement, by [virtue of] the life³ which is in it.”⁴

This, then, was the significance of the blood, as it was smeared or sprinkled on the brazen altar of sacrifice, on the golden altar of incense, upon and before the Mercy-seat within the veil. It was a proof given that the penalty of sin had been paid, that the life which was forfeited had been surrendered ; and therefore it made atonement. One life for another ; the innocent for the guilty ; “the just for the unjust,” in the blessed mystery of substitution, had been laid down. Here was the proof of it offered and presented before God. His awful justice was satisfied. The guilty was pardoned and went free. These were the atonements, the “coverings,” as they were significantly called, from which the great Jewish day derived its name.⁵ The sin existed as a fact. It had intruded into all man’s relations with God. It stood as a witness against him even in the most Holy Place, the presence-chamber itself. But the blood, no longer coursing with life-giving energy through the veins, but shed, poured forth, had dropped upon it, and beneath its influence the deep dark stain had melted quite away. The sin was gone, for the penalty was paid. Covered for ever it was from the sight of God Himself, by the virtue of that shed and sprinkled blood.

Again we ask, if this be so, how can the priestly action of Christ in heaven, if it fulfil the type, be the model to which, as it is alleged, the action of His priests in the Holy Supper is in this respect assimilated ? The confusion of thought and metaphor, involved in the view we are combating, appears to

¹ Hebrews ix. 22.

² Leviticus xvii. 14.

³ Or “soul.” It is the same word that is rendered “souls” in the middle of the verse.

⁴ Verse 11.

⁵ יום הכיפורים—Leviticus xxiii. 27, 28 ; xxv. 9.

us to be complete. The resemblance between the supposed action of the High Priest of our profession, now in heaven, and the action of the Jewish high-priest before, and of Christian priests since, He came, alike fails entirely. The Jewish high-priest appeared in the most Holy Place with blood which had been shed without the Tabernacle, and which was now separate from the body in which once it flowed, in his hand. How can that type possibly be fulfilled by our High Priest presenting before God in heaven His most holy Blood, not separate from His sacred Body, not as shed upon the Cross, but as living in closest union with that Body? It is impossible to suppose that the conditions of the type are satisfied by the presence of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary in His Resurrection Body, composed of flesh and blood united.¹ On the other hand, if our Saviour Christ presents to the Father in heaven His most precious Blood, not as separate from, but as contained in His most holy Body, how can we be said to be doing here what He is doing there, by offering to Almighty God His Body and Blood in the holy Eucharist, not united, but distinctly and emphatically separated, the Body "broken," the Blood "shed," and represented by two separate elements of bread and wine, and by two separate acts both of consecration and administration? The alleged action in heaven is at variance both with the type which prefigured it, and with the service which professes to represent it on earth.

Under this division of the teaching of the type, it is further to be noticed that the blood was not presented continually, but once for all, by the high-priest in the most Holy Place. Twice in one day, as we have seen, first for himself and then for the people, he entered with blood within the veil. But when the blood with which he first entered had been sprinkled on and before the Mercy-seat, the atonement which it procured was perfected. No continuous dealing with it was needed, nor, indeed, was possible, for that first completed act was immediately followed by a second, which could only be entered upon through the completion of the first.

By the one act of once sprinkling, his own sins were put away. And now, being reconciled to God himself, he could discharge the ministry of reconciliation for others. The atoning blood could now in like manner be sprinkled by him for the people. But that too was a single, not a continuous

¹ On a subject like this we are content to accept the statement of the rubric at the end of our Communion Office, "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven," without discussing the question, which, as is well known, has been raised by some, whether our Lord's risen Body contained blood or not.

act. Done once for all, it was done sufficiently. Repeated, indeed, it was, year by year; but that was to show, not that it was the single type of a continuous action, but that it was the continued type of a single action. Once for all, then, by the ruling of the type, must the Blood of Christ be offered in the true most Holy Place. The virtue of the offering lives on for ever, even as it reached back to "the foundation of the world;"¹ but the type forbids us to believe that the offering itself is continuous. There is, indeed, a continual dealing with that most precious Blood. But of that dealing, earth, not heaven, is the scene. There is a repeated sprinkling of it by Him, the true High Priest. But it is not before the Mercy-seat above, but on penitent and believing hearts here below, that He so sprinkles it.

The teaching, then, of the typical institution clearly is, that the action of the high-priest within the most Holy Place furnishes an accurate, if not a complete, representation of our Lord's action as High-Priest of His Church in heaven. And the analogy which it affords warrants the conclusion (with which we bring this part of our inquiry to a close), that not with altar, nor with sacrifice, but only with blood, and that as shed, and not continually, but once only, and once for all presented, does He minister there. By blood, once shed and once offered, the sins of the whole nation throughout the year were typically and ceremonially atoned for. By Blood, once shed and once offered, the sins of the whole world, throughout all the ages, were really and spiritually taken away.

T. T. PEROWNE.



ART. III.—WEATHER FORECASTS.

"ALMOST everyone," writes the Secretary to the Meteorological Office, in his admirable manual of "Elementary Meteorology,"² "imagines himself to be a born meteorologist." The remark is certainly so far justified, that upon questions connected with the science of meteorology people are in the habit of expressing themselves with a confidence which they would not venture to exhibit in reference to any other science with the principles of which they were not familiar. There are probably few persons who would attempt to predict a solar or lunar eclipse without having first mastered the elements of

¹ Revelation xiii. 8.

² "Elementary Meteorology," by R. H. Scott.

astronomy ; but there are numbers who consider themselves quite competent to deal with the far more complicated problem involved in predicting the weather for months, or even years, beforehand, apparently without having thought it necessary to acquaint themselves with the first principles of the science of meteorology. And hence it comes to pass that when questions bearing upon weather predictions are under discussion, one frequently hears the wildest speculations advanced, and the crudest rules and maxims laid down, with a degree of confidence which, to those who have given some study to the subject, is simply amazing.

Strange as it may sound, it is probably to the exceedingly complicated nature of this science that this result is in the main due ; inasmuch as it is only quite recently that sufficient observations have been accumulated to lay the foundations of a science of weather prediction. And while scientific men have been waiting patiently for further light, and have forbore from laying down rules until they had obtained the data which would justify them in doing so, the less competent (as so often happens) "have rushed in" where the more competent "feared to tread."

Still, though meteorology is yet in its infancy, there are certain well-established laws which are now universally accepted by meteorologists ; and if the present state of the science does not warrant us in going very far in the way of weather prediction, it at any rate enables us to demonstrate the futility of a large proportion of the weather rules that have obtained general acceptance with the public.

It will be the aim of this article, after glancing at some of the principal of such attempts to forecast the weather, to point out where these fail, and to explain the principles upon which alone a sound system of weather prediction can be based.

I. In the first place, then, all predictions on the large scale, all attempts to foretell the weather of a year, or even of a season, must be pronounced utterly unreliable. They are at best mere guesses, if they are not, as in the case of some of the prophetic almanacs, attempts to trade upon the credulity of the uninformed. So far as such predictions have any scientific foundation at all, it is to be found in the assumption of the existence of what is called the cycle of the weather. That is to say, it is assumed that the changes in the weather follow a regular course, extending over a definite period of time, and that at the end of that period they begin anew, and are repeated again in the same order. For instance, it was at one time supposed that the Metonic cycle (discovered by Meton the Athenian, B.C. 443), a period of nineteen years, at the commencement of which the new and full moons begin to occur again on the same days of

the same month as they did nineteen years before, furnished such a cycle of the weather. But as this supposition seems now to have been generally abandoned, we need not waste time in showing that no such cycle exists. More recently the sun-spot cycle, a period of about eleven years, during which the spots on the sun go through a complete series of changes, passing from a maximum of frequency to a minimum, and back again to a maximum, has been brought into requisition. But though it has been shown, with a considerable degree of probability, that the changes in the number and frequency of the sun-spots are accompanied by some corresponding changes in the weather of the world as a whole, the relation between them is at present far too complicated, and too imperfectly understood, to admit of predictions being founded upon them for any particular locality.

It may, however, be right to say, that a few scientists of acknowledged eminence have given the weight of their names to the theory of the sun-spot weather cycle. But when it is added that the most eminent among these, the distinguished mathematician and astronomer, Professor Piazzì Smyth, staked his reputation as a weather prophet on the prediction (avowedly based on the sun-spot cycle) that the year 1879 would be one of exceptional heat and drought, it will, we think, be admitted that any presumption in favour of the theory in question that might be derived from its advocacy by so high an authority, has been more than neutralized by so unlucky a prophecy. For it can hardly be necessary to remind our readers that the year in question proved to be one of the coldest and wettest that has been experienced in the present century.

A rule for predicting the prevailing character of the coming summer or winter, which appears to meet with considerable favour, is one founded on the direction of the wind at the time of the vernal or autumnal equinox. If the wind is from a northerly or easterly point at the time of the equinox—so it is that the rule is commonly stated—a dry and cold season may be expected to follow; if, on the other hand, the wind is from the south or west, the coming summer or winter, as the case may be, is likely to be warm and wet. Now, to say nothing of the extreme improbability of the character of a whole season being determined, or even indicated, by the direction of the wind on a single day some months beforehand, the inherent absurdity of the rule may be exposed by a glance at the weather charts issued daily by our Meteorological Office. Those who are in the habit of seeing these charts know that it is no uncommon thing, even over so small an area as that of the British Islands, for the wind to be blowing, in different localities, from every point of the compass on the same day and at the same

hour, so that, *e.g.*, it may be northerly over the west of England, westerly in the south, southerly in the east, and easterly in the north. This, indeed, would be the normal state of things, if a depression happened to be passing centrally over England—no uncommon occurrence at either equinox. And thus the rule, if it had anything in it, would indicate seasons of a different and even opposite character at places only a few miles apart.

A similar consideration at once disposes of nearly all the weather rules that have been framed on the assumption of a connection between the changes of the moon and changes in the weather.

The belief in some such connection is, indeed, so deeply rooted in the popular mind, that all argument on this subject seems in most cases thrown away. It is in vain to tell the confirmed believer in lunar weather rules that the so-called "changes of the moon" involve no real change in that luminary; but that when we speak of a change of the moon, we merely mean that the moon, as seen from the earth, occupies a certain position in regard to the sun, so as to present to the earth varying portions of its illuminated surface. It is in vain to tell him that there is no reason why the moon should, at these particular points, affect the weather on our earth, more than at other points in its course. Nor will it probably avail much if we add that nearly all the rules of this kind have been tested by careful and systematic comparison of the rule with the actual weather, and found wanting. But when it is shown that while the changes of the moon occur at the same time for the whole of our country, the most various kinds of weather may prevail in different parts of the country at the time of change, the most bigoted lunarian must admit that it is difficult to believe that the same influence can produce all these different and even opposite kinds of weather at one and the same time.

But it may, perhaps, be said, "Is it not an acknowledged fact that the moon exercises a powerful influence on the tides of the ocean? and may it not therefore exercise a similar influence on the great aerial ocean in which our globe is enveloped? And is it not reasonable to suppose that it may in this way affect the weather?" To this it may be replied that there is little doubt that the moon does affect our atmosphere in this way, but that the effect of such an influence, if it were perceptible, would not be to produce such changes in the weather as are popularly attributed to the moon, but to cause tides in the atmosphere corresponding to those of the ocean, and following the same course, so as to occur as much later every day as the moon is later in coming to the meridian. Now, if this were really the case, it would of course be shown by the barometer,

inasmuch as every increase or diminution in the height of the aërial ocean overhead, produces a corresponding rise or fall of the mercurial column, exactly proportioned to its amount; and as no such tidal variation of the barometer is observed, we must conclude either that the influence of the moon upon the atmosphere is too feeble to be appreciable by the most delicate instruments, or, as is more probable, that it is masked and overlaid by other and more powerful influences.

II. And now it is time to consider some of the less ambitious but more useful popular weather prognostics in which practical observers have embodied the results of their observations of the weather.

These are, for the most part, short rules or sayings founded on appearances in the sky, or clouds, or on the movements of animals, birds, plants, etc., indicating changes in the atmosphere already in progress, and such as are likely to lead to further changes either in the direction of rain or improving weather. The indications of this kind which portend the approach of rain have been so well summed up in the well-known lines of Dr. Jenner, that we can't do better than quote them, giving at the same time a rationale of the principal prognostics referred to by him, as read in the light of the most recent discoveries, bearing upon the connection of the weather with cyclonic or anti-cyclonic systems.

The hollow winds begin to blow,
 The clouds look black, the glass is low,
 The soot falls down, the spaniels sleep,
 And spiders from their cobweb creep.
 Last night the sun went pale to bed,
 The moon in halos hid her head.
 The boding shepherd heaves a sigh,
 For see! a rainbow spans the sky.
 The walls are damp, the ditches smell,
 Closed is the pink-eyed pimpernel.
 Hark! how the chairs and tables crack!
 Old Betty's joints are on the rack,
 Her corns with shooting pains torment her,
 And to her bed untimely sent her.
 Loud quack the ducks, the peacocks cry,
 The distant hills are looking nigh.
 How restless are the snorting swine!
 The busy flies disturb the kine.
 Low o'er the grass the swallow wings,
 The cricket too, how sharp he sings!
 Puss on the hearth, with velvet paws
 Sits wiping o'er her whiskered jaws.
 Through the clear stream the fishes rise,
 And nimbly catch the incautious flies.
 The glow-worms, numerous and bright,
 Illumed the dewy dell last night.
 At dusk the squalid toad was seen
 Hopping and crawling o'er the green.

The whirling dust the wind obeys,
 And in the rapid eddy plays.
 The frog has changed his yellow vest,
 And in a russet coat is dressed.
 Though June, the air is cold and still,
 The mellow blackbird's voice is shrill.
 My dog, so altered is his taste,
 Quits mutton bones on grass to feast.
 And see yon rooks, how odd their flight!
 They imitate the gliding kite,
 And seem precipitate to fall,
 As if they felt the piercing ball—
 'Twill surely rain—I see with sorrow
 Our jaunt must be put off to-morrow.

Here then, in the first place, the rising of the wind, accompanied by a falling barometer and threatening sky ("The hollow winds begin to blow, the clouds look black, the glass is low") indicates the approach of a cyclonic depression, which, as it passes over, almost always brings with it more or less rain. The halo round the sun or moon is another indication of the same thing, inasmuch as halos are formed in the high, thin cirro-stratus cloud which usually precedes the denser masses of vapour which accumulate round the centre of the depression. The pale appearance of the sun or moon later on, shows that the cirro-stratus is thickening, and therefore that the depression is still advancing. The falling of soot in chimneys, the dampness of walls, the offensive smells proceeding from ditches, etc., are the result of the damp, close condition of the air in front of an advancing depression. And to the same cause may be attributed the rheumatic pains in the joints, the shooting of corns, etc., experienced by many persons upon the approach of rain, as well as the low flight of insects, and of birds in search of them, the creaking of the wood-work of furniture, and the restlessness of many animals, as shown by their cries or movements; while on the other hand, the appearance of toads and glow-worms in unusual numbers, and the singing of blackbirds, are indications furnished by animals to which damp weather is welcome. The unseasonable chilliness of the air in summer ("Though June, the air is cold and still") is also, in many cases, one of the first indications of the approach of the great mass of cloud and vapour which accompanies a depression. And to the same cause is to be ascribed the closing of the pimpernel and other flowers specially sensitive to cold or damp. And lastly, an unusual transparency of the air, technically known as "visibility" ("The distant hills are looking nigh") is one of the most generally accepted signs of rain, though meteorologists are not agreed as to the explanation of it. The

following local proverbs may be quoted as showing how generally this has been observed :

"When the Isle of Wight is seen from Brighton or Worthing, rain may be expected."

"When to the people about Arbroath the Bell Rock light is particularly brilliant, rain is expected."

"About Cape Wrath, and along that part of the coast, when the Orkney Islands are distinctly seen, a storm, or a continuation of bad weather, is prognosticated."

"When from Ardersier and the adjoining parish on the south-east side of the Moray Firth the distant Ross-shire hills are distinctly seen in the morning, rain is expected that day."

"To the people in Eaglesham, in Renfrewshire, when the Kilpatrick hills appear near, a change to wet is looked for; but when they appear remote, dry weather will continue."

It may be added that "audibility"—that is, a state of the air in which sounds are more easily heard, or at greater distances than usual—is also regarded as an indication of rain, though in this case also the reason is uncertain.

We have only space to mention two or three of the principal signs of fine weather. When the wind, after blowing for some time from the S.E. or S. with rain, veers to W. or N.W., an improvement in the weather may shortly be expected; the reason of this being that the shift of wind shows that the depression which had caused the disturbed weather has passed over, and is moving away. The improvement may, however, in this case be only temporary, as at certain seasons the depressions follow one another rapidly, and the approach of the next will bring about a renewal of the unsettled weather.

On the other hand, the occurrence of unusually heavy dews at night is generally a sign of settled fine weather. This is explained by the fact that the calm still atmosphere and clear skies that accompany anti-cyclonic conditions are favourable to the rapid formation of dew. Under such circumstances an exceptionally thick mist in the early morning is often the precursor of a fine cloudless day. It should, however, be added that in winter the stillness of the air under an anti-cyclone often promotes the formation of dense local fogs, such as, to a great extent, neutralize the favourable effects of the prevailing high atmospheric pressure.

Again, when the wind, being light in force, tends to follow the course of the sun, or when, at the seaside, it is "in by day and out by night" (the equivalent in these latitudes of the tropical sea and land breeze), it may be taken as an indication of settled weather. The explanation of this is that these light breezes are ordinarily merged in the more powerful currents which prevail when depression systems are passing over our islands or their neighbourhood, and are only noticeable when an anti-cyclone has been formed over us—a state

of things which is, of course, favourable to the continuance of fine weather.

III. It will have been gathered from the foregoing remarks, that it is to a combination of local weather prognostics with the weather rules based on what, for brevity's sake, may be called the Cyclone theory, that we must look for a reliable system of forecasts. The information obtainable by a Central Weather Office (such as our own Meteorological Office) from a number of telegraphically-reporting stations, and embodied in synoptic weather charts, valuable as it is, especially in relation to the issue of Storm Warnings, is not sufficiently definite to enable the staff to frame daily forecasts that shall be of much practical use to any particular locality, except at times when some great disturbance, causing rains or strong winds over the whole country, is passing across our area.

On the other hand, the observer who has nothing but local indications to guide him will be at a great disadvantage as compared with one who, by the aid of the telegraph, is made acquainted with the state of the weather, and especially of the barometer, at a number of other stations at a considerable distance from him. But if some plan could be devised for combining these two sources of information, so as to embody the local knowledge available in each district in the daily forecast issued for that district, there can be no doubt that the forecasts would be attended by a much larger measure of success than they have hitherto attained.

It should, however, be added, in justice to the staff employed in our Meteorological Office, that they have some special drawbacks to contend with, such as make their task, in framing daily forecasts, a more than ordinarily difficult one.

While the United States Central Weather Bureau has an immense area from which it can draw its information, and most of the European observatories have the advantage of the reports telegraphed from this country, and thus receive from us from twenty-four to thirty-six hours' notice of the approach of any great storm coming from the westward (from which direction most of our disturbed weather reaches us) our own office has to the westward a great blank space of two or three thousand miles of ocean from which no information can be received. Something might perhaps be done, were the means forthcoming, by means of signal-ships moored out in the ocean, to remove or diminish this disadvantage. But it will probably be a long time before this is accomplished. And even with this additional help, the problem to be solved would still be a very complicated one. In the meantime it is well to realize the limitations imposed on us by the present imperfect state of Meteorological science, and to recognise the fact that the most

that is attainable, under existing circumstances, is to give a few hours' warning of the approach of any great storm, and to frame probable forecasts of the general character of the weather from day to day.

G. T. RYVES,
(F. R. Met. Soc.).



ART. IV.—INFALLIBILITY.

IT is a subject for deep thankfulness that the Protestant world is now bestirring itself, and is making an organized attempt to uphold the principles of the Reformation. Of course, such an effort is sure to call out a corresponding one on the part of the Romish Church, but believing (as we do) that the truth is on our side, we need not fear opposition so long as it is open and above-board. What gives peculiar life to the present movement is, that it circulates round a given individual, Martin Luther, the great Reformer; and as he is thus our centre-piece, it is well for our cause that his character and conduct can bear close inspection. When we say this, we do not mean to imply that Luther was free from marked and decided defects; but admitting these, we must also admit that his moral conduct was unimpeachable (whatever Rome may allege to the contrary), and that his sincerity is unquestionable. Indeed, so strongly is this latter quality exhibited in those severe mental struggles which he underwent before quitting the Church of Rome, that the study of his life ought to lead every candid mind to the conclusion, that if the peculiar doctrines of that Church were really of divine origin, Luther would have found rest, peace, and satisfaction there. For *he* certainly (if ever man did) gave them a fair trial. But being weighed in the balance, they were found wanting.

The tribute to this great man's memory on the four hundredth anniversary of his birth, and still more to the great revolution which was brought about through his instrumentality, is now being paid in various forms, by sermons, by speeches, and by publications, all bearing directly or indirectly on the great Romish controversy; and we would fain contribute our mite to this vast mass of thought and information, which we trust will prove effective in strengthening our Protestant brethren, checking the advances of the enemy, and perhaps winning over some stray sheep into the right paths. As our space is limited, we thought we could not do better than take the subject of infallibility, because this doctrine lies at the thres-

hold of Romanism, and when once thoroughly believed, involves the reception of *every* other doctrine which she may choose to communicate; and also because we suspect that this is a dogma against which Protestants are not so well armed as they might be. How vulnerable even the clergy were on this point in former years, the following anecdote (which was told us by the late Archbishop of Dublin) will show. The Archbishop was once in company with a party of Irish clergymen who were talking of a recent controversy, which had created a great sensation, between Dr. Pope (a Protestant clergyman) and Dr. Maguire (a Roman Catholic Bishop). On *some* points, they said, Dr. Pope had the best of the argument; but on the subject of infallibility, the advantage was on Dr. Maguire's side. "I see," said the Archbishop; "Dr. Pope took some of Dr. Maguire's pawns, and received checkmate." By which, of course, he meant, that if the existence of an infallible Church could once be proved, there would be comparatively little need to prove anything else; for in that case, the more apparently absurd were the doctrines which that Church enunciated as articles of belief, the more praiseworthy would be the faith which accepted them. "But the fact is," said the Archbishop, "the Roman Catholics know more about our religion than we do about theirs. And now," he added, "I will take the part of a Roman Catholic priest, and see if you can answer my arguments on the subject of infallibility." He tried them, and drove them all into a corner, so that they were obliged to ask him to help them out of the difficulty! On a subsequent occasion he related this story to a party of English clergymen; and on their expressing astonishment at the ignorance of the Irish clergy, he challenged them to a similar controversy, and found them equally unable to answer his arguments. This incident occurred, as far as we recollect, more than forty years ago; had it been of recent date, we should not have related it. But it is to be hoped that our clergy are now better instructed in the Romish controversy. In any case, however, the story has its moral, for it shows how liable we are, for want of a little thought and circumspection, to leave the citadel of truth unguarded at the very door where it most needs defence. The Archbishop's arguments on the occasion referred to, were the same that Roman Catholic priests, we believe, use now. In substance they were pretty nearly as follows:—"You Protestants hold that the Scriptures are an infallible guide. But what is the use of such a guide without an infallible interpreter who can explain its true meaning? Now you do not even *pretend* that your Church is infallible. Your guide is your own individual private judgment; and yet you see in what different directions it leads you. It causes

you to split up into different sects, each of them holding divergent opinions. Now it is manifest that they cannot *all* be right." Some one then suggested that the Holy Spirit was their infallible guide. What the Archbishop said to this we do not distinctively recollect, but he might very well have answered, "Yes, you all profess to be guided by that Spirit; but as it does not lead you to anything like unanimity of sentiment, *some* of you must be self-deceived: and how can you be sure that you are not *all* in like manner deluded, as we think you are? Now the existence of an infallible Church, secures us from such self-deception." These are some of the *à priori* arguments by which Romanists have endeavoured to support the reasonableness of the Church's claim to infallibility.

We must dispose of these before noticing the passages of Scripture on which they ground their claim. In the first place it is to be observed, that the very act of deciding (*à priori*) that God must adopt a certain course, is, in itself, an act of private judgment, and a most presumptuous one, for it presupposes that God's "thoughts" must be as *our* thoughts, and His "ways" our ways, a notion which is contradicted both by His Word, as just quoted, and by our experience of His dealings. Which of us is there, who, if he had the ordering of the world and of the circumstances of his own life, would not order them differently from God? Thus it is evident that on the very borders of Romanism there lies a Rubicon of the most *presumptuous* private judgment, which must be crossed before we reach that land where we are supposed to part company for ever from such a guide. It may perhaps be answered to this, that it is safer to make *one* act of private judgment than *many* acts. But is it really safer, when the act makes up in *quality* for what it wants in quantity? which it certainly does in this case. For, in the first place, it is a peculiarly *audacious* act; and in the next place, it is like consolidating a number of small debts into one great one. It causes us to stake our whole spiritual life, and perhaps also the salvation of our souls, on a single throw. Of course, if the Church of Rome were able to prove satisfactorily from Scripture that God required of us this one effort of private judgment and no other, then it would be our duty to act accordingly. And *she* will tell us that she *has* proved it; but let her not also say that we are *never* to use this faculty (in spiritual things), for on her own hypothesis we are *obliged* to employ it in deciding the most important of all questions. And we may go further than this, and affirm that she cannot honestly say that only *one* act of private judgment is required of us before we accept her guidance. For we must first believe that there is a God; then, that He has given us a revelation; then, that He has given us a Church to be

an infallible interpretation of that revelation. And lastly, as there are several churches *all* claiming infallibility, *i.e.*, the Church of Rome, the Greek Church, the Mormonite Church, and the Irvingite Church, it is necessary to decide between their conflicting claims.

Moreover, it must be remembered that the Church of Rome herself has left her children to their private judgment on several important questions connected with religion. She has never (except, perhaps, in certain cases) authoritatively declared what sins are venial and what deadly, and writers on the Confessional have differed on these points. And the distinction must be even more important in her eyes than in ours, for *she* holds that one deadly sin, unconfessed, involves the certain loss of a soul. Again, in spite of what is said on the subject in the Council of Trent, Romanists differ as to the degree or kind of adoration which should be paid to images.¹ Again, it is well known that there have been rival Popes, each professing to be the successor of St. Peter, and supported by rival parties in the Church, who of course had to use their private judgment in order to decide who was the rightful claimant. Again, had we space we could show that there have been differences as to how far the limits of infallibility extend.

But let us now look at the question from another point of view. Let us consider how God deals with us in the ordinary affairs of life. Does He not oblige us, to exercise our private judgment in order to decide, not only what is the *expedient*, but what is the *right* course to take, in affairs of great moment? And it has been truly remarked that the matters in which it is possible for us to arrive at the most absolute certainty, are precisely those over which we have no control, as, *e.g.*, the motions of the heavenly bodies, etc. Judging, therefore, from analogy, we might reasonably expect that God, though He gave us a revelation, and offered us His own Spirit as the interpreter of it, would not give either in such a manner as to preclude the

¹ As to the opinions held by Roman Catholics on the subject of the adoration due to images, the most extraordinary variations may be quoted. The Council of Elvira, which sat in the reign of Constantine, strictly enjoined that neither paintings nor images should be introduced into churches. Gregory expressly condemns the adoration of images. The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754, decreed the abolition of image worship. The second Council of Nice, A.D. 787, reversed the Decree of the Council of Constantinople, and stated, "Those precious and venerable images, as is aforesaid, we honour and salute; and honouring, *we adore* them." The Council assembled by Charlemagne, at Frankfort, A.D. 794, and the Council assembled at Constantinople by the Emperor, A.D. 814, each rescinded the Decrees of the Council of Nice, and condemned image-worship. But, in the year 842, a Council assembled by the Empress Theodora, at Constantinople, reinstated the Decree of the Council of Nice.

use of private judgment. Therefore, even the *antecedent* probability lies on our side, and not on the side of the Church of Rome. Besides, though we cannot pretend always to account for the ways of the Almighty, yet in this case we may, to a certain extent, see His reasons for dealing with us as He does. If His highest gifts—pardon, eternal life, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the gift of heavenly wisdom, which is imparted through that Spirit, were obtained without labour on our part (not, of course, by way of payment, for they are free gifts, but by way of discipline)—if, we say, such were *not* the case, our life would not be so much one of probation and of growth, as of indolent reception, which would hinder us from profiting by what we received. Now, to apply this to the subject before us, what would be the result of a revelation which was so given as to enable us to dispense with the use of our reason? In that case we should probably embrace a *dead* instead of a *living* truth—the outward form, without the spirit. As it is, we have good reason to fear that many Protestants thus embrace the truths they have been brought up in. They lie on their minds like lumps of marl in a field. They cannot fertilize them. Now the tendency to receive truths in this indolent manner exists among Protestants because it is part of human nature; but, with the earnest-minded among us, the spirit of inquiry keeps it in check. But there is no such check to prevent even a *devout* Romanist from swallowing whole, without digesting, whatever his Church teaches him; and even wholesome doctrine, when thus received, cannot really profit. Of course there is a danger on the other side. We may *abuse* our private judgment by making a god of it, and rejecting the guidance of the Spirit of Truth. But God saw—to speak with deepest reverence—that the danger in the other quarter was still greater, and more universally pernicious in its consequences.

So much, then, for the *à priori* arguments for and against the existence of an infallible Church. Though we do not pretend to have stated them all, we have mentioned the most important. Now as to the passages in Scripture upon which Rome bases her claims to infallibility. These are (as most people know) those in which our Saviour tells His Apostles that He gives them the power to bind and to loose, etc. But it is evident that even if those passages imply the conferring of the gift of infallibility, it does not follow that every power with which the Apostles were endowed was to be continued to their so-called successors. Our Saviour's promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," whatever it means, *cannot* mean *this*. For instance, we know that the power of working miracles (whatever Romish legends may say to the contrary) is not continued in the Church. But, after all,

the Apostles certainly did *not* either *claim* or *possess* infallibility in the sense in which the Church of Rome claims it for the Pope, whose official decisions it affirms to be valid, even if he be a bad man and an infidel. They must, indeed, have *known* the truth; but they were not miraculously guarded from teaching error. The Apostles Peter and Barnabas were led by false shame to disguise the truth; and St. Paul expressly tells the Galatians that if he, or an angel from heaven, were to preach another gospel than that which they had already received, he should be accursed.¹ In his farewell charge to the Church at Miletus, he not only warns the members of that Church that false teachers will come among them, and will even arise out of their own body, but he points them to no Church, Apostle, or General Council for guidance and direction. Had he known of any such infallible guide, he would certainly have pointed it out, and had God provided such, he *must* have known of it, for the Saviour promised His Apostles that the Spirit should teach them all things.

We never heard of any adequate answer to these arguments. Certain dignitaries in the Church of Rome once published a sort of reply in which they objected that the doctrine deduced from them was a *dreary* one. But this is, in reality, no answer at all; for our Saviour never led His disciples to suppose that their Christian life would be a bed of roses. On the contrary, He expressly says, "In the world ye shall have tribulation." It is true He also says that in Him they should have peace; but the peace which the Saviour promised was not the sort of peace which Roman Catholics derive from the surrender of their private judgment. We knew, indeed, a pervert to the Church of Rome, who professed to have found in the bosom of that Church the peace which passeth all understanding; and we doubt not that many others, if questioned on the subject, would affirm the same thing, and some of them in sincerity. But such persons are probably deceiving themselves. They feel a sort of rest, the rest of those who have been long tossed about with doubts and difficulties, and who have at last thrown all these aside. But the peace which is thus purchased is a superficial one, more smooth, perhaps, on the surface, and maybe more unvarying, than that which many a true Christian enjoys in this life, but only skin-deep, not penetrating into the inmost recesses of the heart. And this state of mind is generally pictured in their faces. There is, in the eye of almost every devout Roman Catholic, an expression

¹ They certainly were miraculously kept from *writing* error, or the Word of God would not be a safe guide. But, thank God, "*all* Scripture is given by inspiration."

which gives the idea that he is suppressing something—that a veil is over his mind and heart.

But now, it may be asked, in spite of all that has been said against it, Has not this doctrine of infallibility some foundation of truth in it? The answer to this is—as a doctrine it is undoubtedly erroneous, but, like most other errors, it is the perversion and exaggeration of a truth. It cannot be denied that the opinion of the wise and good, and, to a certain extent, that of a large majority, ought to influence us; and so, when we thus defer to their judgment, we sometimes make our own give way to it, or at least to a certain degree build our opinions upon it. And such deference to authority is undoubtedly right and proper. But this germ of truth has been often expanded into error, and it has sometimes been made a vehicle through which the doctrine of infallibility has been introduced into our Church, a doctrine which our Reformers would most vehemently have repudiated. It has been called presumptuous to set up our judgment against that of wiser and better men than ourselves, and those who have given theological subjects more attention. But then, of course, the difficulty suggests itself, whose opinion are we bound implicitly to defer to? There are so many conflicting opinions. The Church of Rome answers this question decisively, if not satisfactorily; but those Anglicans who try to make out that our Church is either wholly or partly infallible, cannot so easily define their position. They have sometimes professed to be guided by the old test, "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus;*" and any recorded opinion where these requisites were supposed to be fulfilled, they called the voice of the Church. But where is this unanimity of sentiment to be found? and, if found, who is to prove for certain that it is found, where we have to examine the opinions of so many hundreds of writers? No wonder that many who thus sought for infallibility, feeling the unsatisfactoriness of their position, have taken refuge in the Church of Rome. Indeed, an appeal to numbers, and numbers alone, is an unsatisfactory way of settling a question, even if we could form a correct estimate on this point. For, in order to know the relative value of the united testimony of two parties holding opposite opinions, it is necessary to weigh, as well as to number them; and when this test is applied, sometimes the minority kicks the scale. And such a test ought to be applied to the Church of Rome, when her members appeal, as they sometimes do, to their numerical superiority. A Roman Catholic once used this argument to one of our Protestant parishioners in Ireland. The latter might have answered that the numbers of the Buddhists and Mahometans far exceeded that of the Roman Catholics. But

perhaps the other would have repudiated a reference to any but professing Christians. What he did answer was this: "I read in my Bible that 'broad is the way which leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go therein!'" To which the other replied: "Oh! if you come to the Bible, I can't argue with you!" The answer, which might have been most within his comprehension would have been this: The belief of one sincere and sensible Protestant is, in point of testimony, worth that of many Romanists, because the latter, being for the most part brought up to believe in the infallibility of their Church, have never thought of questioning it, and therefore never question anything else which their Church teaches. In point of testimony, therefore, their opinion is of no weight.

In what we have now said, most true Protestants would go along with us, for we are pretty generally agreed that the right of private judgment is the privilege which we ought especially to claim and to contend for. But there are exceptions even to this rule. We once heard a decided Protestant and devout Christian man strongly deprecate the use of private judgment in spiritual matters. Now, as hardly any opinion, whether right or wrong, is held only by a single individual, we cannot but think that the view which we are speaking of must be shared by others, and is therefore worth noting. Of course, those who hold it do not hold it in the Romish sense: what they dread is a man's leaning to his own understanding and not following the guidance of God's Spirit. But they do not see that they propose a wrong, and indeed an impracticable way of avoiding this danger. If all men were to act on this principle there would be no converts from Rome, or, indeed, from any false religion. The Jews of Berea, upon this principle, ought not to have investigated into the truth of St. Paul's teaching, and we should be left to believe any spirits without trying them. But in point of fact God does not throw away as useless any of those faculties or feelings which He has implanted in us; He gives them a right direction. It is true, indeed, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." But the understanding, like the affections, may be sanctified. And many a man who has undergone this spiritual baptism could tell us that the very things which he before rejected as foolishness, now commend themselves to his reason. Undoubtedly, what leads many of us to dread the use of reason in spiritual things is, that great intellectual power is often a snare to its possessor, and is a hindrance, rather than a help, to his acceptance of the simple truth as it is in Jesus. But the same may be said of riches, and, indeed, is said by our Lord Himself. And yet we know that material riches may be consecrated to the service of God, and why not mental riches?

It cannot, indeed, be denied that reasoning and trusting imply two different states of mind, and therefore seem to pull us in opposite directions ; but they are not really antagonistic, unless we make reason a substitute for faith. The office of reason, when under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is to direct our faith, which otherwise might stray into forbidden paths, and lead us, as it does with some, into the wildest extravagances, under the impression that we are guided by the Spirit of God. In spiritual matters, and to a great extent in earthly ones also, the Christian's decision should be confirmed by two witnesses, the outward and the inward witness, each of which, in turn, should be endorsed by the Spirit of God. This is the safest way of arriving at the truth. But, in spite of all our precautions, we must, while we are upon earth, be liable to make mistakes. If we say that we have no error, we deceive ourselves just as much as "if we say that we have no sin." And yet it is both natural and right that we should desire to be free from both these evils. And not only so, but the very existence of such a craving is a proof that it will ultimately find its gratification if we go the right way to seek it. But some are not contented to wait for the fulfilment of this desire. They want to be able in this life to say, "I have attained." And in this, as in many other cases, the wish is father to the thought. Accordingly, some are found who hold that sinless perfection is attainable in our present condition, while others hope to find an infallible guide, which is the same thing as hoping to become infallible ourselves, that is if we expect always to be able to follow such a guide. Now certainly we Protestants believe that we have an infallible guide in the Holy Spirit ; but the humble and right-minded among us know that they will never in this world yield themselves so entirely to His influence and guidance as to be quite free from error. The clouds which sin interposes between us and the truth, and especially the sin of faithlessness, straitens us in ourselves. But in Him we are not straitened. The promises of the gift of the Spirit to all who seek Him, and of wisdom to those who ask it, are full and free (see James i. 5, and other passages). And these promises will one day find their perfect fulfilment in the case of every true Christian. For such an one has within him that Spirit Who is the real fountain of truth ; and if he presses on towards the light, seeking in patience and humility and faith for direction and guidance, all his mistakes will be cleared away in that day when he will no longer see through a glass darkly, but face to face. "In Thy light shall we see light."

E. WHATLEY.

ART. V.—REPORT ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

EVERY compromise must necessarily be illogical; that is to say, it never can be expected to commend itself as theoretically reasonable to either of the contending parties, if both parties have been professedly basing their whole claims upon reason. It is unnecessary to inquire whether both of the two parties now contending over the body of the National Church of this country have been reasonable in their claims, or whether only one has been. At all events, the maintainers of the Established Church must not expect to find the compromise lately proposed by the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission entirely satisfactory to their sense of logic and justice. That the proposals of the Commissioners are in the nature of a compromise between the different members of the Commission is manifest to everybody. Whether they can be accepted by the loyal party is a question which it is hopeless to discuss with any man who cannot make up his mind to accept what appears to him unreasonable and unjust. In coming to the consideration of the question, we cannot forbear from quoting what we must say seem to be the very sensible words of the new Dean of Windsor—words which, whether we agree with them or not, suggest reflections which must be reckoned with by all reasonable people.

Speaking at the Reading Congress, the Dean said :

“The Commissioners had to consider not merely what they or other people would like, but what they or other people could get. We have to consider in a report of this kind, not our *à priori* idea of a good Church and a good Court, but practically what in these days and in this land of England could be got for the Church we love, and want to make as good as we possibly can. . . . It is impossible for any Commissioner to lay down a scheme to which no hypothetical objection could be imagined. But in the report of the Commissioners, we have a plan given to us which is deliberately intended for the existing state of things, in order to meet difficulties which have been fully and candidly stated by a very large body of witnesses. . . . It will be a responsible task indeed which will devolve upon those who have to introduce in Parliament any measure founded upon this report. When they bring it forward, let their hands be strengthened instead of weakened. We should help them so as to enable them to go forward with their difficult task, not with the certainty that men will rise on every side primed with extracts from Church and secular papers, professing to give expressions to the views of a large body of Churchmen who object to the report. No; enable them to come before the Legislature, and say that the report has been before the eyes of England for so long, and that, taking it all in all, it has been favourably accepted by the Church at large. Let them ask the Houses of Parliament to accept this report—to give it validity, because it will bring about the peace of the Church we hold so dear, and because it is the voice,

not only of the Commissioners, but the practically unanimous voice of the Church of England at large.¹

Now, first, what is our own position? *We* are not the people who caused the appointment of this Commission; *we* were not dissatisfied with the Constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is not *we* who dispute the spiritual validity of the established tribunals; we are not the impugnors of the Queen's supremacy; we, duly considering whose authority she hath, whose minister she is, to whose service she was anointed by the Archbishop² on the 28th day of June, 1838, find no difficulty in allowing her from our hearts the position and powers of the godly prince, which have been enjoyed with more or less tranquillity by all her predecessors in this realm, and are still in words conceded by every clergyman who owes thereto his own position and income. We are satisfied, and have been all our lives satisfied, as our fathers before us were satisfied, and as the ritualist clergy were (or are presumed to have been) satisfied when they, by their own free choice and individual wish, took their orders in the Church, that the Protestant Church of England, as by law established, was and is a true member of the Catholic Church of Christ, and that none of its established institutions are inconsistent with true doctrine or edification. It is an article of our religion that to the Queen the chief government of all estates of this realm of England, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain.³ We have no desire to draw the article aside in any way, but we submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof, and take it in the literal and grammatical sense.⁴ We have, indeed, been occasionally surprised and perplexed at first sight by the judgments of the Privy Council, as for instance in the Bennett case, and in that part of the Ridsdale judgment which related to the position of the consecrating minister; but taking them all in all, as the Dean of Windsor would have us take this report, we are not dissatisfied with the general result.

But we have to deal with men who declare that in spiritual things there must be no appeal to the Crown;⁵ who cannot see their way to any final appeal to the Queen, even though the Court advising the Queen were composed wholly of ecclesiastics;⁶ who admit that they were not dissatisfied till the Courts decided against them;⁷ and that no Court would satisfy

¹ *Guardian* of 17th October, 1883.

² "As kings, priests, and prophets, were anointed."

³ 37th Article of Religion.

⁴ Declaration prefixed to the Articles.

⁵ Rev. Berdmore Compton, Q. 2691. Hon. C. L. Wood, Q. 939, 964.

⁶ Rev. Berdmore Compton, Q. 2833, 2836.

⁷ *Ibid.*, Q. 2664.

them which would not reopen the Ridsdale judgment;¹ who quote Gardiner and Bonner as the proper authorities to explain away the Royal Supremacy;² whose general wisdom is such, that they cannot recollect a case in which they have had difficulty in "saying ditto" to Mr. Bright for thirty years except in matters of religion;³ and, worst of all for the prospect of that peace which the Dean of Windsor anticipates, who openly repudiates all finality in the compromise, and proclaim that they will accept it only as a basis, and not as a coping-stone.⁴

We do not for a moment mean to say that all the ritualists agree in all the above points, except perhaps the last. On the contrary, nothing is more remarkable than the total want of any agreement between them either as to the fundamental principles on which they profess to rest their objections, or as to the historical facts which they imagine or invent to support them; or as to the remedies they propose for easing the burden which the recollection of their solemn undertakings must necessarily cast upon their consciences. But this very circumstance is an additional reason why it is so hard to make concessions to demands which are based upon no common ground or settled principle except that of "Home Rule."

For this is really what we are asked to do. We are to give, but not to take. The one thing really pressed as a matter of principle before the Commissioners was the abolition of the iniquitous episcopal veto; but even this is denied us. It is absurd, therefore, to recommend our acceptance of this Report, on the ground that it will place us in a better position than we are in at present. On the contrary, if it were a mere question of approving or disapproving the Report as it stands, apart from the chance of peace, we should reject it without the slightest hesitation whatever.

But it would undoubtedly be a serious mistake to allow the question of the acceptance of the Report to be settled off-hand upon that consideration alone. If peace is to be restored to the Church by means of the adoption of a certain set of recommendations, the result would counterbalance a great deal that is highly objectionable in the recommendations themselves. The individual Commissioners, differing as we know they do in matters of religion, have yet found it possible to join in signing this Report; and the question, therefore, is forced upon us, If the Commissioners have agreed, cannot the parties also whom the Commissioners represented be brought to

¹ Dean of Manchester, Q. 4483.

² Hon. C. L. Wood, "Minutes of Evidence," p. 42.

³ Dean of Carlisle, in the *Times* of 23rd October, 1883.

⁴ Mr. Beresford Hope's speech at the Reading Church Congress, *Guardian* of 17th October, 1883.

agree? The loyal party in the Church will not be found to refuse agreement where agreement is possible; and even if agreement be impossible, still acquiescence may be found not incompatible with even outspoken disapproval.

The first recommendation which demands notice is, that the primitive and almost legendary duty of judging in their own consistorial and provincial Courts is to be restored or given to the Bishops. In point of practical common sense, the proposal is about as rational as if it were suggested that the Queen should again sit as judge in the Court of Queen's Bench. But it is one of the contentions of the ritualists, not adequately disposed of before the Commissioners, that laymen ought not to be judges where spiritual matters are concerned. They have not yet settled whether, if a Bishop appoints a layman to be Chancellor, it is a mere impropriety or a fatal objection to his spiritual validity.

Now we may trace most of our present difficulties to the introduction of the Bishop in person, as distinguished from the Bishop acting by his legal deputy, which was effected by the Church Discipline Act of 1840. Till that time the Courts worked smoothly enough for all practical purposes. The delights of a clerical Chancellor, at the present day, may be appreciated on reading the evidence of Mr. Shelly, given before this Commission (Q. 3097-3136).¹ The confidence inspired by the Bishops may be measured by the fact that in not a single instance has the power given by the Public Worship Regulation Act, of leaving the whole matter to the Bishop without appeal, been accepted by the clergyman whose conduct has

¹ Extract from the abstract of Mr. Shelly's evidence :

"The practice of the Court (the Consistory Court of Exeter and Truro) is, that before the petition (for a faculty) is presented, a draft of the petition with plans annexed must be sent for the Chancellor to peruse; and if the Chancellor objects to the draft as he sees it, he requires it to be altered; and if it is not altered to his satisfaction, he will not allow it to be filed at all. In a case in which he was concerned, an application was made for a faculty to authorize the erection of a reredos containing a representation of the crucifixion, some years ago; the Chancellor had the draft and the sketch of the reredos presented to him, and he refused to allow the petition to be filed. The witness had a large quantity of evidence, and had given great attention to the subject, and he believed that it would be legal, as it has since been held to be; but in that case he had no power of appeal, no hearing was granted, and he could move no further (3097). In the end, the reredos was put up without a faculty (3099). No doubt the Chancellor's action was not in accordance with the law of the Church (3103), and a mandamus might have been obtained; but the cost would have been great (3105). . . . Practically, the Chancellor of the diocese, who is a clergyman (3125), privately decides beforehand what shall come before him publicly as judge in these faculty matters (3123). He does not know of any other kind of court in which a similar practice prevails (3130)."

been in question. A similar power was given by the Church Discipline Act of 1840, and its general rejection accentuates the same conclusion. The judicial qualifications of some of our present Bishops are illustrated by the way in which they have exercised their veto. This subject was discussed in the CHURCHMAN of November.

However, it cannot but be that if the scheme of the Commissioners remains undisturbed for any length of time, we shall have a set of Bishops more of the Thirlwall and Tait type, with considerably more legal knowledge and experience than their lordships as a body at present possess, and consequently (as we cannot help thinking) a wider diffusion among them of the more modern standards of rectitude.

The fact is that we live in an age of reaction, disintegration, relapse. The canker has begun at the head. In matters of personal purity, for instance, the force of public morality is powerful enough to have forced into suicide two *innocent* victims of mere suspicion, within the last twelve months. But in the higher sphere of what we may call intellectual purity, is it not our frequent experience to hear ordination vows and their breach treated as almost equally matters of course, or at all events as fit subjects for a casuistry which no one would venture at present to apply to the simplest commercial contract? Surely, when a young man taking orders finds that by a tacit agreement between himself and his fellow-candidates on the one hand and the Bishop on the other, the question of entering the Church with the full intention of acting like Mr. Mackonochie or Mr. Green is never discussed unless raised by the derided scrupulosity of some unsophisticated lad, the "spiritual authority" of that Bishop can have for him only a conventional reality. And when laymen see such scandals going on year after year, is it to be wondered at if you have to rely on Acts of Parliament for the support you refuse to accept from Morality?

Now this is what we may, with considerable confidence, hope to change for the benefit of our posterity by making judges of our Bishops. The necessity of finding a remedy for the discredit attaching to the clergy, from the present state of things, is too urgent to allow us to be squeamish over details, or to regard the ridicule which already hails our future Fathers in God as Fathers in Law.

The next point is the Court of Final Appeal. The Commissioners, in dealing with this question, assume "that every subject of the Crown who feels aggrieved by a decision of any such Court," viz., an Ecclesiastical Court, "has an indefeasible right to approach the throne itself with a representation that justice has not been done him, and with a claim for the full investiga-

tion of his cause. No Ecclesiastical Court can so conclude his suit as to bar this right." Nothing can be more satisfactory, so far as words go. The ritualist theory, at all events, is not accepted. And this language is a very fair acceptance of the doctrine of the State supremacy as laid down in the thirty-seventh Article. It is really matter for congratulation that our fears lest that Article might be found explained away after the fashion of the day, have not been verified.

Of course this must be paid for. The price is (in part) the Judicial Committee. That is to be thrown over. "We have a law, and by our law it ought to go," was the cry of the nonconformists; and to that cry it has been found expedient to yield. That is what it comes to. But it is the occasion of the proposed change, and not the change itself, which is to be lamented; for it does not much matter whether the Crown is advised by the Judicial Committee or by any other competent body of judges, ecclesiastical or lay. It is proposed that the appeal to the Crown shall be heard by a permanent and exclusively lay body of judges learned in the law, members of the Church of England, of whom not less than five in number are to be summoned for each case by the Lord Chancellor in rotation.¹ So long as this arrangement lasts, Churchmen need not object to it. If the ritualists can be satisfied with the change proposed, it would not be the part of a wise man to object strongly to it, on the ground that it represents the gratification of superstition or even spite. These judges, in cases of heresy and breach of ritual, are to have the power of consulting Archbishops and Bishops upon specific questions put to them for their opinion, and are to be bound so to consult them on the demand of any one or more of their² number present at the hearing of the appeal.³

¹ "By the Lord Chancellor in rotation." By this method it is of course intended to secure the impartiality of his selection.

² It is to be presumed that this means "upon the demand of any one or more of the *judges* (not *Bishops*) present at the hearing of the appeal," although the ideas of the learned Commissioners have at this point overrun their command of English.

³ The minutes of the proceedings in connection with this point afford a glimpse of what may be termed the comical aspects of these Blue Books. It is first proposed and agreed that the judges of the Court of Appeal *may* ask the Bishops for advice on specific questions; then Sir Richard Cross's suggestion is acceded to, that the Bishops *shall* be consulted whenever any one or more of the judges shall so wish. All this is reasonable enough, though people may differ as to its expediency; but then comes Lord Devon, and actually proposes in his appended reservation that the Bishops shall *always* be consulted on these specific questions, whether any of the judges wish it or not! His lordship does not vouchsafe to explain what the specific questions are to be, where *ex hypothesi* no single one of the judges requires such assistance, nor who under such cir-

Now as to this consultation of Bishops, it is obvious that it is desirable for judges to obtain as much relevant information and assistance from every available source as they can. And so far we have no objection to make to the proposed arrangement. But the important question is, how is this idea to be carried out? Are the Bishops to hear counsel? Are they to give their opinions *seriatim*, as is considered so essential in the case of the lay judges? Are they to give reasons for their opinions? Are they to be open to prosecution for heretical answers? Are counsel to have the opportunity of arguing before the lay judges the effect of the clerical deliverances? It is obvious that all these questions are left open by the Commissioners, and we are therefore at liberty to discuss them freely, without transgressing the lines drawn by the Dean of Windsor. It will never do to have these Bishops pronouncing *ex cathedra* some unreasoned and unreasonable opinion on the most important questions, without hearing any arguments. The proper course, the only fair course, if a man is to be prejudiced by the Bishops' answers, will be to allow him, or the Court at his suggestion, to ask the Bishops for explanations and reasons. The position claimed for the Bishops is that of expert witnesses. (Q. 2428.) It would probably not be thought consistent with their dignity, or with general convenience, that they should be put in the box and cross-examined as if they were at the Old Bailey; but some safeguard of an analogous kind must be devised.

The true principle is that when you desire to interpret the legal effect of a document, the most probably correct interpretation is that which is arrived at by a trained lawyer, before whom the point has been argued by trained advocates. It may be preferable that your trained lawyer shall have been trained in that particular subject. Look at the Judicial Committee. They are all trained in English law. It is not because they have been trained in the Hindu or Mussulman law of India, or in the law of the old French monarchy prevailing in Lower Canada, or in the Civil Code of Napoleon administered in Mauritius, or in the Roman-Dutch law of the Cape or Ceylon, or in the ancient customs of Normandy which base the law of the Channel Islands, or in the yet different jurisprudence of the Isle of Man, that they truly and indifferently and satis-

cumstances is to frame the questions. Perhaps the judges would resort to the Church Catechism, and ask questions thereof in turn. That would at all events be safe, and perhaps gratifying. It is to be presumed that Lord Devon's reservation conveys some definite idea to the four Commissioners who gravely concur in it; but what that idea may be, probably no one but the gentlemen themselves can tell.

factorily minister appellate justice to the inhabitants of those different countries. Would anyone contend that, inasmuch as they have not been trained in Ceylon law, therefore, as judges of Ceylon law, they are no better than any other Englishman, and far inferior to a Ceylon planter? The fact is that the legal training is the important thing, and the actual contact with the particular system is of quite secondary importance.

In legislation it is just the other way. If it is a question of *changing* the law in Ceylon, six Ceylon planters are clearly better advisers than six barristers of Lincoln's Inn, or even six judges of the Queen's Bench Division.

Now in administering and interpreting Ecclesiastical law, there being no question of legislation, the untrained Bishops are no more likely to be superior to trained lawyers, than in interpreting Ceylon law the six Ceylon planters are likely to be superior to the Judicial Committee.¹

The next important alteration is that this Court of Final Appeal is not to pronounce sentence, but to send the case down again to the Archbishops' Court, in order that the decreed sentence may be there pronounced. This is a concession to sentiment; it is a variation from the Reformation Settlement (because the Courts of Delegates pronounced their own judgments); and if there is any danger of a contumacious Archbishop, it will plunge us straight into anarchy again, and of a more certainly irremediable kind. The possibility of this catastrophe would probably be much diminished if the Bishops consulted by the Court of Appeal have been properly cross-examined, for we are satisfied that no Court of Appeal would decide against the opinions of Bishops who had maintained them successfully against a reasonable cross-examination. It must be observed, in this connection, that the Report contains no provisions for the trial of Bishops. The Commissioners say:

"It is desirable that *any scheme*² of Ecclesiastical Courts and discipline should make provision for the trial of offences alleged to have been committed by Bishops or Archbishops, *and for*² compelling on their part obedience to the law; but on a consideration of the language of your Majesty's Commission, it does not appear that this subject is properly within its scope; and on this ground only it seems improper to deal with the subject in our report." (P. liv.)

¹ It is openly claimed, indeed, that the clergy should have the interpretation of the ecclesiastical law on the same grounds on which it is said that they ought to have the making of it; which in effect means that, when they don't like the law of their Church, they are to be at liberty to nibble it away in the law-courts like a rat behind a wainscot.

² The italics are our own.

Bearing in mind the words of the Dean of Windsor, we will forbear to criticize this conclusion. But it is clear enough from the language itself that until the omission is supplied, we shall only be following the advice of the Commissioners themselves if we decline to run the risk so plainly foreshadowed at the Reading Congress. When the omission is supplied, and with the safeguard of a suitable cross-examination of the Bishops who have advised the Court of Appeal, we think the objections to the idea of sending the case down again for judgment will not be found insuperable.

The next proposition is that only the actual decision of the Final Court of Appeal in the particular case shall be binding, but the principles of decision shall always be open to be disputed. It may be admitted that the modern notion of attaching an almost superstitious authority to the reasons given in judgments of co-ordinate or superior courts has been, of late years, carried to an excess. Thus it is no unheard-of thing in the temporal courts, that the Court of First Instance has considered itself bound by a previous decision of a Court of Co-ordinate Jurisdiction, but has been reversed on appeal, because the Court of Appeal has thought that previous decision to be incorrect, and, being of higher rank, has felt itself at liberty to overrule it. There must be something wrong when you find the Court of First Instance bound to pronounce a decision which they fully believe will be reversed by the Court of Appeal, and yet the individuals composing both Courts are all of the same opinion as to the way in which the law ought to be interpreted.

On the other hand, it is very forcibly argued that if previous decisions are not held binding, her Majesty's subjects will never know where they are; there will be no finality, no certainty, nothing on which a man can shape his conduct with safety to himself; nothing by which he can know what he is undertaking when he enters the Church. But against this it may be replied, that even as things are at present there is no finality in any decision on a new point short of the House of Lords; and even if you have got a decision of the highest Court, though according to the modern idea, it can only be reconsidered (even in future cases) by an Act of Parliament, which in fact amounts to attributing to it legislative power; yet, even then it cannot be altogether depended on, even in a similar case. In point of fact no two cases are *exactly* alike; and when they are *very nearly* alike, whether the Court will discover a tenable distinction between the two, depends very much on the question whether the earlier decision does, or does not, command the assent of the Court which hears the second case. Suppose the distinction taken. Afterwards a third case may come for decision, the facts of which we will suppose to

be rather more like the facts of the earlier of the two previous cases, than those of the later of them, but very like the facts of each of them. Now, if the Court in this third case thinks the earlier of the two former decisions to be bad law, they will very probably consider that no valid distinction can be made between the facts in the two earlier cases, and that those two cases are contradictory of one another, and that under such circumstances the later of the two must govern. And so the earliest decision becomes in fact overruled, and of no "authority" in the future. You do not therefore, in fact, get the finality which this modern theory is supposed to give you; and you are not even supposed to get it, except in the very small number of cases which are carried up to the highest Court of all.

The proposition of the Commissioners, therefore, has, at all events, this in its favour, that the opposite principle has, in the opinion of many people, been ridden too hard. Lord Penzance's separate Report deals with this question. He thinks that if the new proposal means only that *obiter dicta* are not to be considered binding, it expresses no more than what is now law; but that if it means that every case is to be argued out *ab initio* as if it were *primæ impressionis*, it will be very pernicious. There can be little doubt that the proposal is not limited to *obiter dicta*; but we do not think it necessarily follows that every case will have to be argued out as if it were *primæ impressionis*.

It ought to be mentioned that the majority of the Commissioners also propose that the judges of this Final Court of Appeal are not to be bound to give reasons for their judgment, but that if they do give them, they shall do so *seriatim*, and not by one single judgment as at present is the practice of the Judicial Committee. Now, suppose a case where the judges are unanimous in coming to a given decision, but all arrive at that conclusion by different (and it may be inconsistent) processes of reasoning. Any lawyer will at once see that the actual decision in such a case will be of far greater weight than the reasoning. This actually happened the other day in the House of Lords, in the case of *Dalton v. Angus*, which the learned reader will find reported in full in the sixth volume of the "Law Reports," Appeal cases.

Now it is difficult to see any good argument why the reasoning of the judges should *theoretically* be considered of any greater or more binding force where they agree than where they differ. Of course there must be *practically* a great difference. Suppose a barrister has to advise on a case brought before him after such a decision as that of *Dalton v. Angus*. Now, if he finds the facts exactly correspond, he will, of course, have no

difficulty in foretelling to his client how his case will be decided ; but if the facts are slightly different, he will have to consider, and any Court before which he argues it will have to consider, which of the different lines of reasoning in the former case is the most correct. But if all the judges had agreed on one line of reasoning in the former case, the barrister would feel that it was practically probable in the extreme that the minds of the judges would again follow the same line, and he would confidently so advise his client. There is no need, therefore, for establishing a *theory* of the binding force of the reasoning ; and we must say, that if the barrister thought there were considerations which had not been brought before the notice of the Court in the former case, and which would probably have induced the judges to decide otherwise, it is unjust and undesirable that those considerations should be for ever excluded by the mere fact of the former decision. To hold otherwise is to make the rights of Englishmen depend upon the comparative industry or negligence of previous litigants. It tends in important cases to produce a race for a decision, if the later litigant is to be prejudiced by the fate of the earlier.

It is just on this point that we respectfully think the modern tendency is mistaken. The injustice of it is occasionally recognised. The Ridsdale case, for instance, ought, according to the modern theory, to have been irrevocably decided in the Purchas case. But in the Purchas case one side did not appear, and the decision was consequently given after hearing one side only ; and it was felt that the ritualists ought to be allowed a chance of a fresh argument. The same reasoning would apply, though in a less degree, if the Purchas case had been argued on behalf of the ritualists, but only by some ignorant, inexperienced, or perhaps negligent counsel, or even if new facts bearing on the question had been discovered since the previous arguments. Another evil, if it be an evil, is produced by the fashionable theory. The importance of the first decision inevitably tends to excite a very practical interest in others beside the actual litigants, an interest very different to that of a mere sympathizer. Hence the lavish expenditure on preparation and counsel's fees, and the only means of providing for such expenditure, viz., the Church Union, and its sequel, the Church Association, *et cætera similia*.

The reader will gather from the foregoing considerations that the proposal of the Commissioners possibly meets an evil. It is, however, difficult to see whether the proposal does not go considerably beyond remedying this evil, and lay itself open to the strictures of Lord Penzance.

There is, no doubt, an enormous sacrifice involved in consenting to throw away the valuable decisions already obtained

by the expenditure of so much trouble and money. And it may be questioned whether it would have been possible to yield the point, if we were not haunted by the dread of appearing to defend, on merely technical grounds, decisions which ought to rest, and, as we believe, do rest, on unassailable, though perhaps somewhat abstruse, reasoning. One thing, however, we think ought plainly to be demanded, and as plainly ought to be readily conceded, and that is, that those clergymen who have taken orders on the faith of the existing law, shall not be prejudiced or liable to be prosecuted by reason of any change which may be made in that law.

And here we must draw attention to a very singular and important discrepancy between the report itself and the resolutions of the Commissioners on which it is supposed to be founded. At their sixtieth meeting, on the 5th April, 1883, the Commissioners passed the following resolutions: "That in cases of heresy and breach of ritual, the judges" (that is, the judges of the new Court of Appeal which the Commissioners have been voting about), "shall not be bound to state reasons for their decision; but, if they do so, each judge shall deliver his judgment separately, as in the Supreme Court of Judicature and the House of Lords." Upon that, it was next moved and carried: "That the following words be added, 'And the actual decree shall be alone of binding authority; the reasoning of the written or oral judgments shall always be allowed to be reconsidered and disputed.'" It is perfectly clear that the idea of making this principle retrospective never entered into the minds of the Commissioners at that time. They were only thinking of the new Court which they were recommending. That being so, we should like to know how the voting went when the Commission determined to make this principle retrospective. The minutes do not show any vote on this point. And if there was no such vote, we should like to be told who is the draftsman responsible for the following sentence of the report (p. 53): "We hold it to be essential that only the actual decree as dealing with the particular case should be of binding authority in the judgments *hitherto or* hereafter to be delivered, and that the reasoning in support of those judgments and the *obiter dicta* should always be allowed to be reconsidered and disputed." We have a right to know by what authority this most important difference between the language of the report and the language of the vote was made. It is the more astonishing, because in another passage of the Report (p. 58), the language of the vote has remained unaltered. It will be a great comfort if it turns out that the obnoxious words, "hitherto or hereafter to be delivered," have not, in fact, the authority of the Commission.

One thing we are glad to see left untouched, and that is the common law remedy by indictment. This is not because we want to see it used in the future any more than it has been used in the past. But it is a good thing to leave this old, and perhaps rather obsolete, Brown Bess in the armoury. It is a standing protest against the idea that temporal judges were never intended to decide on the meaning of the rubrics to the Prayer Book; for the remedy by indictment for non-conformity is given by the very same Act that established the Prayer Book. The same fact shows the baseless character of the episcopal claim of veto, for, of course, the Bishop could not veto an indictment.

Now, if we endeavour to take a broad view of the results, actual and probable, of this Commission, we shall inevitably find that they separate themselves into two distinct classes. One of these classes consists of the positive proposals of the Report itself. But quite independently of these proposals, whether they pass into law or not, the fact remains, that owing to the labours of this Commission much light has been thrown, not only upon the constitutional history of our present Church, but upon the statements and reasoning of those who would re-write that history. Their attack has been developed, and we know the worst. Truth must gain by every investigation; and the investigations of the Commissioners, inadequate as they are in many ways, and even where the conclusions drawn are manifestly erroneous, possess a permanent value which the actual recommendations cannot destroy. "*Magna est veritas, et prævalebit,*" is the assured faith of every Protestant; while "*Magna est varietas*" is the motto of the chaotic congeries of propositions and claims which the ritualist spokesmen, in the pages of these two blue volumes, have crystallized for the benefit and amusement of posterity. This is an actual result; a harvest already garnered, which we may thrash out at our leisure.

But the present and the immediate future must always possess a temporary prerogative of interest for a practical generation.

The question, therefore, to be decided is, whether this Report is, or is not, too high a price to be paid for peace? There are some things that may be loved unwisely, may even be loved too well. And it is by no means clear that the peace we are offered is not one of them. But it is a very serious thing to reject a prospect of peace. We must remember, too, that every parliamentary interference with Church Courts will be an additional argument in the future as to the National status of our Church Establishment.

It is not necessary to decide this question at once, and it is

highly inexpedient that anyone should decide it without very mature consideration. The present writer will set an example in this respect by withholding his own provisional conclusions.

But inasmuch as the only thing that could possibly induce us to make these sacrifices would be the prospect of a permanent settlement, it must be confessed that the way in which the Report has been received by the ritualists seems at first sight such as to make it unnecessary to bestow any further consideration on the matter. If it is to be a mere instalment, if there is to be no peace, not even a truce, but only a shifting of the battlefield; then we shall say, and we shall claim the sanction and approval of such men as the Dean of Windsor in saying, that we prefer to remain as we are. We must, therefore, take guarantees of permanency.

A LAYMAN.

Review.

Apostolic Succession. The Teaching of the Church of England on the Alleged Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in Unbroken Succession from the Apostles, to the Valid Ministration of the Word and Sacraments. By the Rev. JOSEPH BARDSLEY, D.D., Vicar of Bradford and Rural Dean. Hatchards. Pp. 21.

This is a pamphlet of no ordinary value. The substance of it was read at the Lay and Clerical Conference held at Southport, May 30th, 1883. The work contains, in a short compass, so much important historical matter, and so clearly reasoned, that it may well be strongly recommended to the laity and clergy generally for their careful perusal.

The work is especially seasonable, as the subject on which it treats is engaging the serious attention of some eminently learned and influential men, Presbyterians as well as Episcopalians.

The following extract from Dr. Bardsley's able argument will exhibit the value of his work :

Mr. Perceval, in a letter to Dr. Arnold, says that "the *first* of the points which the Tractators agreed to put forth was, the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as a rule of practice; i.e. (1) That the participation of the body and blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual. (2) That it is conveyed to individual Christians only by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates. (3) That the successors of the Apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands, and that the delegates of these are the respective Presbyters whom each has commissioned. . . ." In one of the "Tracts for the Times" we are told that any person who presumes, without such a commission, to minister "in holy things, is all the while treading in the footsteps of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram." Palmer, in his "Treatise on the Church," declares that "the Presbyterians in Scotland separated themselves from the Church; that their rejection of the authority and communion of the existing successors of the Apostles in Scotland mark them as schismatics;

and all the temporal enactments and powers of the whole world would not cure this fault, nor render them a portion of the Church of Christ." In Froude's "Remains" we read that "the attempt to substitute any other form of ordination for the Episcopal, or to seek communion with Christ through any non-Episcopal association, is to be regarded, not as a schism merely, but as an impossibility."

Dr. Bardsley then proceeds to prove that the Reformers held the very opposite views to those embodied in the passages above cited; and that the compilers of our Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies gave no countenance to these doctrines, but taught the reverse. . . . Scarcely any of the Reformers did more than claim for Episcopacy that it had *Apostolic sanction*; but few, if even one, maintained that it was founded upon any positive command or precept of the New Testament. They believed Episcopacy to be the best form of Church government; but they never dreamt that it was essential to the being of a true Church, much less that without it there could be no sacraments or salvation. . . . "They maintained that it could be justified by *Apostolic precedent*, but could not be enforced as required by *Divine command*. That this was the view they held is capable of the clearest proof." The Reformers who lived in the times of King Edward VI., and of Elizabeth, acknowledged the non-Episcopal Churches of the Continent as sister Churches.

Archbishop Whitgift states, in a work written at the request of Archbishop Parker, and which Strype describes as "one of the Public Books of the Church of England:"—"We see manifestly that, in sundry points, the government of the Church used in the Apostles' time is, and hath been of necessity, altered. . . . Whereby it is plain, that any one certain form or kind of external government, perpetually to be observed, is nowhere in the Scripture prescribed to the Church. . . . This is the opinion of the best writers, neither do I know any learned man of a contrary judgment." Such was the language of the chosen defender of the Church's form of government against its Puritan assailant.

Dr. Bardsley proceeds to inquire what the Thirty-nine Articles teach on this subject. In the nineteenth, "Of the Church," and in the twenty-third, "Of Ministering in the Congregation," Episcopacy is not so much as mentioned, though in one we have a definition of the Church, and in the other a declaration touching the authority by which ministers are sent into the Lord's vineyard. Whilst it is impossible to account for this omission on the theory that the compilers of these Articles believed in the necessity of Episcopacy to the being of a true Church, it is easy to account for it when we remember that those who penned them, though believing the Episcopalian form of Church government to be the best, did not deem it indispensable. Bishop Burnet, on the Thirty-nine Articles, considers that the general words in which this part of the twenty-third Article is framed, seem to have been designed not to exclude the foreign Protestant Churches; and Bishop Tomline, on the same Article, writes: "The Scriptures do not prescribe any definite form of Church government." And further, Dr. John Hey, Norrisian Professor at Cambridge at the end of the last century, declares "that this twenty-third Article seems to leave the manner of giving the power of ordaining quite free; it seems as if every religious society might, consistently with this Article, appoint officers, with power of ordination, by election, representation, or lot; and therefore the right to ordain did not depend upon any uninterrupted succession."

For many years after the Reformation, Presbyterian ministers were admitted into our Church, and authorized to preach and administer the sacraments *without re-ordination*. Bishop Hall observes:

I know those, more than one, that by virtue only of that ordination which they

have brought with them from other Reformed Churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling.

Having referred to Bishop Hall's statement as to a matter of fact, Dr. Bardsley cites his well-known remarks on the general subject under consideration :

Blessed be God, there is no difference in any *essential* matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. . . . The only difference is in the form of outward administration ; wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church, though much importing the well, or better being of it, according to our several apprehension thereof. But withal nothing hinders but that we may come yet closer to one another, if both may resolve to meet in that primitive government (whereby it is meet we should both be regulated), universally agreed upon by all antiquity ; wherein all things were ordered and translated by the consent of the Presbytery, moderated by one constant President thereof. . . . If the name of a Bishop displease, let them call their man a Moderator, a President, a Superintendent, an Observer ; only for the fixedness or change of their person let the ancient and universal practice of God's Church be thought worthy to oversway. And if in this one point (*wherein the distance is so narrow*) we could condescend to each other, all other circumstances and appearances of varying practices or opinions might without any difficulty be accorded. *But if there must be a difference of judgment in those matters of outward policy, why should not our hearts be still one? Why should such a diversity be of power to endanger the dissolving the bond of brotherhood? May we have the grace but to follow the Truth in love, we shall in these several tracts overtake her happily in the end ; and find her embracing of peace and crowning us with blessedness.*

This testimony from the pen of Bishop Hall is the more valuable, as he wrote at great length on the Divine right of Episcopacy. The argument of Dr. Bardsley is further strengthened by his reference to the canonical recognition of the Church of Scotland by the Church of England. In the fifty-fifth Canon we have these words : " Before all sermons, lectures, and homilies, the preachers and ministers . . . shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church ; that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." I think it can be made manifest that by the Church of Scotland, says Dr. Bardsley, is here meant the Presbyterian Church of that country. The Presbyterian Church had been authoritatively acknowledged as the Church of that country in 1195 and 1597. Episcopacy was not reintroduced till 1610 ; for what Church, therefore, can we be taught to pray, but for that Church which was the recognised Church of the country at that time ? These facts prove that Macaulay states the simple truth in the following words : " In the year 1603 the Convocation solemnly recognised the Church of Scotland, a Church in which Episcopal control and Episcopal ordination were then unknown, as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ."

Though it is not easy always to determine the exact time when erroneous tenets are first broached in a Christian community, this may be done with tolerable accuracy in the case before us ; and Dr. Bardsley's account of Laud's sermon on the subject is well worth quoting. He says : " When Laud presented himself at Oxford, to answer in the Divinity Schools, with a view to obtain his degree of B.D., in 1604, ' he maintained there could be no true Church without Diocesan Bishops,' for which Dr. Holland, then Regius Professor of Divinity, ' openly reprehended him in the Schools for a seditious person, who would unchurch

the Reformed Protestant Churches beyond seas, and now sow division between us and them, who were brethren, by this *novel Popish position.*' Such are the words of Prynne in his 'Life of Laud.' Heylin, in his 'Life of Laud,' says that 'he was shrewdly rattled by Dr. Holland as one that did endeavour to cast a bone of discord betwixt the Church of England and the Reformed Churches beyond the seas.' Hallam says, that Laud was 'reproved by the University of Oxford in 1604, for maintaining in his exercise for Bachelor of Divinity, that there could be no true Church without Bishops.'" Coming down a century later, we find Archbishop Tenison, in 1707, declaring that "he thought the narrow notions of all Churches have been their ruin; and that he believed the Church of Scotland to be as true a Protestant Church as the Church of England, though he could not say it was as perfect." But it is unnecessary," adds Dr. Bardsley, "to adduce single authorities, however eminent they may be, when we remember that we have had, in effect, the sanction of the whole bench of Bishops for several generations in connection with the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts":

"This Society was established some thirty or forty years after the Restoration, and it sent out and supported for a long time ministers not possessing Episcopal ordination. . . . The deliberate acts of an institution such as the Propagation Society, which numbers our Bishops amongst its Vice-Presidents and supporters, cannot fail, one would think, to exercise an influence in determining what our orthodox divines have thought on the subject under consideration. I submit that if there be one question in the whole range of theological controversy capable of clearer proof than another, it is that the Church of England has given no countenance, since the times of the Reformation, to the unscriptural dogma of Apostolic succession, as that dogma is defined and held by a party within our Church. I believe also that there is no error that is fraught with more mischief; for, when carried out to its logical consequences, it gives over to the uncovenanted mercies of God millions of Christians in our own country alone, who love their Bible and adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things, and to whom the whole nation is most deeply indebted for the vast services which they have rendered to the cause of true religion. . . . We shall do well to cultivate the spirit which animated the 'High Church' prelate, Archbishop Sancroft, when he enjoined the Bishops and Clergy of his day, 'that they warmly and most affectionately exhort our brethren the Protestant Dissenters to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of Peace, for the universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies; that all they who do confess the holy Name of our dear Lord, and do agree in the truth of His Holy Word, may also meet in one holy communion, and live in perfect unity and godly love.'"

With these truly Christian sentiments of Archbishop Sancroft, Dr. Bardsley concludes his very able argument. Our copious extracts from his pamphlet will show its special value, as containing in such short compass so much historical information on a subject of deepest importance at the present time. The work deserves a very wide circulation, and cannot be too strongly commended.

Soon after the Tracts appeared on the subject of Apostolic Succession, a powerful sermon was preached at the Archdeacon's Visitation at Hastings, May, 19, 1835, by Julius Charles Hare, the Learned Rector of Herstmonceux, and formerly Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. The following extract will be not an uninteresting supplement to Dr. Bardsley's argument. The sermon was on Matt. xxviii, 20,

“Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” and entitled “Christ’s promise, the strength of the Church.”

“Here” (says Mr. Hare), “I cannot but make mention of a notion which has been brought forward somewhat prominently by certain very amiable and pious men in our days—namely, that our Lord’s promise in the text was not made to the collective body of His Church, to that body of which He is the Head, the blessed communion of all faithful people, in all nations, and through all ages—but that it was confined to the Apostles exclusively, as the supposed representatives of the Episcopal body, and that none are embraced in it, none must flatter themselves they have the slightest share in it, except the same Episcopal body unto the end of the world. To some of you, perchance, my brethren, such an assertion may come with the sound of a novelty, and, in that case, I would fain hope of a most startling and offensive one. You would join with me, I would fain hope, in the earnest desire to purge our Church from all remains of that Judaizing Romish superstition, which would wrap up the free spirit of the Gospel in the swathing-bands of forms and ceremonies, and would tether it to a name. That amiable and pious men should have taken up such a notion, which leads straightway to the most revolting conclusions—according to which the chief part of Protestant Christendom is cast out at once by a sweeping interdict from the pale of Christ’s Church, nay, is recklessly declared to stand on a level with the heathen, and to be left to the uncovenanted mercies of God—that amiable and pious men should not shrink with awe from such a notion, that they should take it up under anything less than the clearest, most compulsory, most irresistible demonstration—that they should not look carefully and anxiously round for some mode of escaping from such appalling conclusions—might be deemed unaccountable, if we did not remember how prone we all are to convert every object of our peculiar interest and affection, even the objects of our purest worship, into idols. This is the last wall of the citadel in which the selfishness of man takes refuge and barricades itself; and it can hardly be thrown down altogether so long as we continue here below. Our form of government must be the only good form of government, not because it is a good one, but because it is ours. Our Church must be the only Church, not because it is founded on truth—few examine its foundations, still fewer examine the foundations of other Churches with patience and candour, and honesty and a righteous self-distrust. No; our Church is ours, and therefore it is the only true one. We still cannot bear to think that the veil of the temple should have been rent; we still cannot bear that the Gentiles should have a free approach to the Holy of Holies; we cannot bear that our neighbours should come to it by any other road than ours. Lovers of the Bible too easily degenerate into bibliolaters, lovers of the Church into ecclesiolaters. Everywhere the carnal mind attaches itself to the letter, the form, the dregs, instead of the free living spirit. More especially is a delusion of this sort likely to fascinate the noblest souls, when the object of their love appears to be feeble or in danger. . . .”

“This is not the place for me to speak concerning the Apostolical institution of Episcopacy; nor would the time allow me to set forth the reasons by which we are induced to retain that institution, or which seem to render it indispensable to the perfect development of the idea of the Church. There are too many important matters awaiting me, more immediately connected with the subject of this sermon. I can only express my regret that, where such strong arguments in favour of Episcopacy may be drawn from the history and idea of the Church, many

“ of its advocates, not content with proving that it is the best form of Church-government, have resolved to make out that it is the only one, and have tried to rest it upon Scriptural grounds, which, in fact, only weakens their case. For I cannot discover the shadow of a word in the Gospels to countenance the interpretation referred to. Feeble and flimsy as are the Scriptural arguments on which the Romanists maintain the inalienable primacy of St. Peter, they are far more specious and plausible than those derived from the same source, on the strength of which it has been attempted to establish the absolute necessity of Episcopacy to the existence of a Christian Church. I am aware the interpretation I am controverting has been maintained by some very eminent divines in former times. But a greater weight of authority is against it. Our Reformers, and the still more highly gifted men whom God called up in Germany and France to awaken the Church out of her spiritual sleep, knew nothing of the absolute necessity contended for; although they, too, would gladly have retained the Episcopal order in their churches, if the course of events would have allowed of it. And need I remind you what is the argument of the noblest work our Church has produced, *the Ecclesiastical polity*? You know that, instead of arguing that Episcopacy is the only institution conformable to Scripture, the point that Hooker undertook to prove was, that Episcopacy was not contrary to Scripture, as it was declared to be by the Puritans. He contends that, while in matters of faith there must be unity, because the object of faith is one, in matters of polity and discipline there may be diversity; yet that every established form of ecclesiastical government is rightly to be esteemed ordained by God, even as every established form of civil government is ordained by God. On this foundation he raises his structure; and thus the arguments in favour of Episcopacy, from the history and idea of the Church, become all the stronger, being freed from the strengthless props by which they are usually surrounded. . . .”

“ Let us, my brethren, carefully beware of that most hurtful and narrow-minded of monopolies which would monopolize the grace of God. The way of life is narrow enough; let us not throw up any fresh mounds by its side to render it narrower still. Let us rejoice in the blessed assurance, *that they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south; and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God.* Let us rejoice that the salvation which Christ wrought for His people is not tied to any one form of Church-government or other, to anything that man can set up, or that man can pull down. Let us rejoice that in Christ Jesus neither Episcopacy availeth anything, nor anti-Episcopacy, but a new creature. Let us rejoice that the Gospel was to be preached to all nations, and that all nations were to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Whilst this sermon was in the press Mr. Hare had the offer from the Bishop of Chichester (Dr. Otter) of the Archdeaconry of Lewes. Mr. Hare, with his characteristic fidelity, immediately informed his Bishop of the passage about Episcopacy which he had just preached and was printing. The Bishop wrote most kindly in return: “Print as you propose, but you must nevertheless be my Archdeacon.” Archdeacon Hare that same day showed this letter to the writer of this review.

It is with very deep pleasure and good hopes for the future that we observe how this grave subject is now being considered in Scotland. The Bishop of St. Andrews (Bishop Charles Wordsworth, D.C.L.), in his recent Charge of Sept. 6, 1883, refers to “an excellent lecture delivered in Edinburgh only a few months ago by Dr. Cunningham, of Crieff, wherein he thus speaks”:

If the Episcopalian, under the guidance of Bishop Lightfoot and Mr. Hatch were to renounce his belief in the Divine right of Episcopacy, as the Presbyterian has long since abandoned his belief in the Divine right of Presbytery, it might be possible to devise a middle system. Who can tell what may be? Men's minds are gradually softening. Bishop Wordsworth, who has never despaired, but has clung to the hope of union with a noble persistency, has entitled his recent Charge 'Prospects of Reconciliation between Presbytery and Episcopacy,' and we pray such prospects may become brighter and brighter every day.

Bishop Wordsworth says :

For my own part, I can assure my distinguished friend, the writer of those kind and encouraging words, that I have never "urged the Divine right of Episcopacy;" have never even (so far as I can remember) used the expression, having long since learnt from Bishop Sanderson, one of the most trustworthy of the English divines, that it is an ambiguous and misleading one. What I have urged—urged more or less continually during the last twenty years—has been the Divine right of unity, visible unity; and I am quite content that we should seek it under the suggested guidance of Bishop Lightfoot, who, as we have seen, agrees with Bishop Sanderson in advocating Episcopacy as *ex Apostolica designatione*, rather than as of *Divine positive right*, or, in other words, as founded upon any express Divine precept.

The Bishop adds :

I cannot conclude this address without alluding to the gratification which I have felt, and which I am sure you will all share with me, in reading, only two days ago, the letter of Professor Milligan which appears in the *Catholic Presbyterian* of the present month. Under the title of "Church Union," its avowed object is to advocate a unity in Scotland which shall embrace our Episcopal Church; and coming from an ex-Moderator of the Established General Assembly, and one of the most learned and most influential of living Presbyterian divines, it is to be hoped that some of you may live to see the happy effects which, under God's blessing, it is calculated to produce. In the meantime, we may well be thankful that a spirit so truly Christian, and so truly Catholic, should have found expression, so able and so just, in a channel which cannot fail to convey its sentiments to leading members of the Presbyterian Churches, not only in Scotland, but throughout the world. More than this, I trust that a Scottish Church Union Committee will be formed of Presbyterians and Episcopalians combined, mostly, if not exclusively, laymen, who will be at the pains to cause the letter to be reprinted, with Dr. Milligan's permission, and to be circulated widely among the middle and poorer classes.

The following passage from a letter which Bishop Wordsworth has just published, October 6th, 1883, will give additional weight to the argument of Dr. Bardsley's valuable pamphlet :

"For me," writes the Bishop, "during the last twenty years, at least, *the real question has been, not the invalidity of Presbyterian orders, but the sin and manifold evils of disunion among fellow-Christians living in the same land and under the same political constitution; and it is to remedy, or at least to alleviate these, that I have 'devoted the energies' of a great portion of my life. And how have I endeavoured to do this? By urging the course which both the past history of the Church and the present condition of Christendom—especially our own, i.e. the British part of it (taking the words in the widest sense)—combine to recommend as the most reasonable, and therefore the least unlikely to succeed—that is, the adoption of the threefold ministry; not because Presbyterian ordination is invalid, but because (to borrow the words uttered in Glasgow last year by the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Lightfoot)*

“ the three-fold ministry is the completeness of the Apostolic ordinance, and the historical backbone of the Church. And if you press me still further for my *opinion* about the validity of Presbyterian orders—though I must repeat that *this is not to my mind the main question*—I do not hesitate to say that, though, in the light of those words of Bishop Lightfoot, I cannot hold them to be *regular*, I hold them to be *valid* for great and manifold spiritual good ; or to express what I think in the language used by the late Bishop of Cape Town, and approved by his South African colleague, Dr. Cotterill, now Bishop of Edinburgh, in addressing the Presbyterian ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church : “ We do not dispute that your members receive through the Sacraments administered by you that which your Church leads them to expect they will receive ; nor do we doubt that the Holy Spirit works in the conversion of souls to God in and through your ministry. It would, in our judgment, be *sinful to doubt this*. Wherever there is godliness, there must be grace, and the Author of it.’ These words I also quoted with approval more than five years ago in an article ‘ On the Law of Christian Unity,’ in the *Nineteenth Century* (May, 1878).”

Short Notices.

Conditional Immortality Tested by Scripture. The substance of Addresses given at Clifton and Tunbridge Wells, 1882 and 1883. By Rev. R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. Hamilton, Adams and Co.

This ably-written pamphlet of only twenty pages, large print, a real *multum in parvo*, will repay a very careful perusal ; it merits, indeed, serious study ; and in the case of readers not biased by publications which appeal to sentiment, it will generally, perhaps, be thoroughly accepted as conclusive. The pamphlet, as we have said, is strong and full ; it gives the result of patient thought and inquiry within a very small compass. But it is in the calmness of its tone, its critical candour, or fairness, as regards assertion and inference as well as reply, and the close connection of the whole argument with its title-page profession—*tested by Scripture*—that its persuasion has power.

If we quote two or three passages from some of its leading sections we shall show the author's method and excite the interest of our readers. To give such extracts as may make it seem unnecessary to purchase the pamphlet is by no means our intention. On the contrary, we desire to recommend the pamphlet, which, it may be said in passing, is cheap and may well be lent or given away, as well as bought.

First of all, having referred to the teaching of Scripture as to the believer's spiritual life, Mr. Girdlestone says :

Thus far there is a general agreement. There is “immortality” for the true Christian, and it is “conditional” on his being what he professes to be. Of any other immortality (excepting always that which God has by virtue of His own nature), Scripture knows nothing.

Secondly, on “The Judgment to Come :” it is appointed unto men once to die, but after that the *Judgment*. And we are led to this important conclusion :

In all the passages of the Bible which speak of men *dying, perishing, or being destroyed*, these words must be understood with reference to the physical or mundane side of their existence. They are not extinguished, obliterated, annihilated, when they die, perish, or are destroyed ; for they are all to be judged according to their works.

In his third section—"Man's Continued Existence after Death"—Canon Girdlestone gives a needed warning in regard to teaching the "natural immortality of the soul." The words "natural" and "necessary," not seldom, are badly used.

Fourthly, Daniel xii. 2—"shame and everlasting contempt"—is expounded.

Fifthly, the teaching of the New Testament on the destiny of the ungodly is brought out. The concluding paragraph of this section runs thus :

There are other passages bearing on the principles, the nature, and the method of the judgment of the ungodly, but they do not directly point to its duration.

What shall we say then to these things? The case seems to be this : that there are some who will find on the Day of Judgment that through rejecting the Grace of God, they have not only judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life, but have woven for themselves a destiny like that of the devil and his agents, a continued and—so far as we can see—a conscious existence under the blaze of God's displeasure. They have sown the wind; they will reap the whirlwind. Their curse is that no fruit shall grow on them for ever. Nor is there revealed in the New Testament any termination to the permanent state of being which they shall enter at the Judgment.

In the sixth section the Principal of Wycliffe Hall examines certain expressions which are supposed to teach annihilation; and he then proceeds to make some comments—very brief, we are inclined to say *too* brief—on Mr. White's "Life in Christ," particularly with regard to Hellenistic Greek. It is as regards the leading Greek words that Mr. White's book, we fancy, has peculiar power with thoughtful persons who are well educated, but not *scholars*.

Mr. Girdlestone's concluding words are wise and weighty. A harsh tone and over-positive assertions in dealing with so solemn a subject make many stumble.

Wearyholme. A Tale of the Restoration of Charles the Second. By EMILY SARAH HOLT, Author of "Mistress Margery," "The Maiden's Lodge," etc. John F. Shaw and Co.

We heartily recommend this book—a charming gift-book. It is undoubtedly one of the best of the many excellent tales for which a large circle of readers are indebted to Miss Holt. It is thoroughly readable from beginning to end, and gives a great deal of curious information, social and religious, of the time in which the scene is laid. The principal character-pictures are drawn with care and skill. Dr. Middleton, Vicar of St. Michael's, Bath; Mr. Hunter, Lecturer at St. James's; Miss Olivia Hunter, and Deb, for example, are admirable; but all the work—never a bit scamped or slovened—is worthy of the esteemed author's high literary reputation. The description of the little chapel-meeting called to censure the Minister, whose daughter once wore a pink gown cut of a worldly fashion, with the speech of Hosea Wilson, the bellman, and the remarks of "Sister Mehetabel," Lornhamah Atkins (helpmeet of Saved-by-Grace Atkins, bricklayer and Elder), is full of interest. To the various small sects¹ of that seething day a brief allusion appears here and there. A bit from the letter of Madam Warrender (wife of the Squire of Winterslow) may well be quoted, adding the remark that her education was a fairly representative one for a gentlewoman of her day :

This letter comes hoping to finde you well, as it leves us boath at present. It will alwayes give me greate plesure to doe anie thing you requier, & I have

¹ Those persons are greatly mistaken who suppose "Anglo-Israelism" to be a production of the nineteenth century. It was one of the principal tenets of the Fifth Monarchy Men.

ax'd my husband to find out what you wissh. He tells me there is three meeting-houses withinn five mile of Wintarsloe: one of the presbiters, one of the ana-bapptiss, and one of the quaykars, or adamitse.¹ I kno not well wh. are the warst of all these people.

Heralds of the Cross. By F. E. ARNOLD-FORSTER. Second edition. Hatchards.

We gladly invite the attention of our readers, specially of those who are interested in juvenile Missionary meetings and books about Missions for parish libraries, to the second edition of Miss Arnold-Forster's excellent work. As soon as it appeared, the book was strongly recommended in *THE CHURCHMAN*; and we are by no means surprised to observe that the first edition was speedily exhausted. By far the best book of the kind, it cannot fail to win its way. India and Burmah; China and Japan; Africa; the South Seas; America, North and South, are the chief chapters. It is a good sign of the times that so honoured a name should appear on the title-page of so thoroughly *Missionary* a book.

Two Old Maids. By ANNETTE LYSTER. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The author of "A Leal Light Heart," "My Lovely Lassie," and other books which have been noticed in *THE CHURCHMAN*, has a high reputation among the rising writers of pure and wholesome fiction. In the present tale—which has the same quiet and graceful style—the chief characters—Margaret and Phyllis Arden, and Rosalind, their young sister—are drawn with taste and judgment. There are many pretty pictures of life in an old-fashioned Yorkshire country house; and the value of real religion as contrasted with worldliness (Rosalind having been trained solely by a selfish and thoroughly worldly father) is well brought out. The description of Rosalind's marriage is a very clever bit; but the whole narrative shows literary skill. In the remarks about Lord Fayningham's ascetic gloom and narrowness a party hit at "Puritanism" can hardly be intended. As a gift-book for girls of culture, this volume, which has some tasteful illustrations, will take a good place.

"*The Master's Call.*" A Sermon. Preached on the occasion of the death of the Rev. John Blake Honnywill, for twenty years vicar of Sompting, who entered into rest, Tuesday, August 28, 1883, Sunday afternoon, September 9th, 1883, at Sompting Church; by the Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury. Nisbet.

We copy the title-page of this sermon in full. It is an admirable exposition of John xi. 28, "The Master is come, and calleth for thee," with an application to an old and dear friend of the preacher, J. B. Honnywill, who frequently spoke of the Lord Jesus as "the Master." We respectfully pay our own tribute to the memory of a loyal and loving Minister; hard-working in his parish, quiet, faithful, and consistent, with great abilities, and a dislike of "pushing." Patronage in the Church of England is miserably managed; but J. B. Honnywill was quite content with his post as the Vicar of a small and unnoticed parish.

Merv. A story of adventures and captivity, epitomized from "The Merv Oasis." By E. O'DONOVAN, Special Correspondent of the *Daily News*. With a Portrait. Pp. 340. Smith, Elder, and Co.

The account of Mr. O'Donovan's Travels East of the Caspian, with his five months' residence among the Tekkés of Merv, was reviewed, not

¹ The Adamites were among the most extravagant of all the sects then flourishing, and conducted their services in the attire of Adam before his adoption of fig-leaves.

long after it appeared, in *THE CHURCHMAN* of last February. Published in two volumes, the work did not come within the reach of many readers ; and we are glad to see the present cheap edition, "Merv," an epitome of "the Merv Oasis." Political matter having been omitted, we have now the marvellous story of Mr. O'Donovan's adventures and captivity in a concise and popular form. A more graphic book of travels we have never seen.

Spiritual Gleanings from Creation and Daily Life. By the Rev. W. H. WHEELER, late Vicar of Barrow, Somerset. Pp. 300. Jarrold and Sons.

This is a book which a reviewer who places Gospel truth above all other claims may confidently commend. The tone is quiet, earnest, and thoroughly spiritual ; not a passage but is sweetened and sanctified by reverent aspiration, and submission to the revelation and will of God. In the first part appear sections on the sun, water, hills, trees, etc. ; the second part treats of books, meals, dress, friends, and government. The treatment is at once thoughtful and truly practical.

Lectures on Pastoral Work. By the Right Rev. W. How, D.D., Bishop of Bedford, Suffragan of East London. Pp. 156. Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co.

These lectures were delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, during the present year. The subjects are the equipment, dangers and difficulties, pastoral visitation, dealing with infidelity, preaching, and the pastoral epistles. The lectures—deeply devout and suggestive—are just what one might expect from Bishop Walsham How.

Self-Effort. The True Method of attaining Success in Life. By J. JOHNSON, author of "Living in Earnest," etc. Pp. 400. T. Nelson and Sons.

Emphatically a good book. Something like Mr. Smiles's "Self-Help," it takes its own line ; decidedly religious in both tone and treatment. A young man, willing to learn, cannot fail to read it with interest and profit. It is a neat volume, well printed, as are all Messrs. Nelson's books.

Kathleen. The Story of a Home. By AGNES GIBERNE. Pp. 324. Nisbet.

Miss Giberne's merits as a writer, whether of tales or graver books, are tolerably well known. The "Story of a Home," now before us, is very readable, and it teaches the true lessons of patient and full-of-peace trust. Kathleen is sensitive, and has many trials ; one very severe. At length her father marries again. Dr. Ritchie and Lady Catharine are true friends. Kathleen is happily married when the story closes.

Peasblossom. By the Author of "Honor Bright." Illustrated by H. J. Miles. Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co.

This is a clever, cheery and wholesome story, such as school-boys, or, for the matter of that, school-girls, will read with interest. It has its pathos, too. Piccola's bringing to the old grandfather the message of the Prodigal Son, "I have sinned . . ." is very touching. A tasteful volume.

Town Life in Australia. By R. E. TWOPENNY. Pp. 250. Elliot Stock.

This is a very readable book, and one which persons who have friends or relations in Australia may be glad to hear of. Melbourne, Sydney, and Adelaide are the towns described ; and there are special chapters on Furniture, Servants, Religion, Politics, etc. The work was originally written as a series of letters. The author was Secretary to the Royal Commission for South Australia at the Paris, Sydney, and Melbourne Exhibitions.

St. Augustine: his Life and Times. By Rev. R. W. BUSH, M.A., F.R.G.S., Rector of St. Alphage, sometime Select Preacher at Oxford. Pp. 212. The Religious Tract Society.

In the last CHURCHMAN we recommended an "Introduction to the Pentateuch," by Mr. Bush. The book before us is readable and informing; it shows good judgment.

Stephen, M.D. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World." Pp. 480. Nisbet and Co.

The present writer must confess, if asked, that he never liked "The Wide, Wide World." A great many people, however, on this side the Atlantic, as well as on the other, liked it, and thought highly of it; they will probably be quite as well pleased with "Stephen, M.D."

The Leading Hand. By MARY INMAN. Pp. 130. Manchester: John Heywood, 1883.

A story of Amy and Sybil, in a dressmaking establishment; simple and interesting, it teaches trust.

A volume of the "Golden Treasury Series" (Macmillan and Co.) lately published is, *Selections from Cowper's Poems*, with a preface by Mrs. OLIPHANT. In a literary point of view, this tasteful volume takes a high place. The selections are full of interest. But with the introduction, in regard to religious matters, we are not satisfied. At present, however, we may quote, without comment, two or three of the accomplished editor's sentences:

Even were the faith of the Evangelical party to return again—as perhaps, after the long reign of freethinking and over-liberality, it may do—the pious sentiment of Keble would still keep him afloat. But Cowper has little chance of gaining toleration either from the High Church or the indifferent world. . . . Everything has been relaxed: doctrine and statement, and the requirements of orthodoxy, and the practice of the devout. . . . We are not so earnest in anything nowadays as they were in their determination not to bate a word, not to soften a threat, to warn every man that his soul was forfeit, and that we must not lose a moment in fleeing from the wrath to come.

Dolly's Own Story—a story told in Dolly's own words—is a pleasing, tasteful little book, by C. L. SKEY, author of "Sunday Talks with my Boys;" just the thing for the nursery.—*Outline Pictures for Little Painters*, is another of the excellent books which are so much appreciated; the outlines are even better than usual.—A dainty little volume, with coloured pictures, is *From Do-nothing Hall to Happy-day House*, illustrated by Miss H. F. Miles. The running comment on the plates is very good: altogether it is a gem. These three gift-books are published by Messrs. Gardner, Darton, and Co., Paternoster Buildings.

In the *Quarterly Review*, which reached us too late for a worthy notice in the November CHURCHMAN, few readers are likely to be in doubt as to the author of the article on "Provost Hawkins," or on "Sister Teresa;" and the article on "Disintegration" is perhaps as justly ascribed to a noble Marquis, as the others are to a Dean and a distinguished historian. The article on the "Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Report" deserves all the praise which has been bestowed on it. By the Bishop of Liverpool, and by several speakers at Diocesan Conferences, it has been quoted. For ourselves, we may say that we thoroughly agree with the able writer. His concluding words, as to the influence of the laity, are most important.

The November *Quiver* begins a new volume, and begins it very well. It is a capital number. Dr. Maguire writes on Luther's hymns; Canon

Boyd Carpenter, in "Preachers of the Past," writes on William Howells of Long Acre; Mr. G. Weatherly's verses on that great hero of the faith, Martin Luther, run thus:

Burning with zeal, and full of honest rage
 At priestly craft and specious false pretence,
 At superstition and indifference,
 Luther stood bravely forth and cast his gage
 Right at the feet of Rome, and dared to wage
 Persistent war against its cruel power,
 And towered forth a giant in that hour,
 The grandest figure of the Middle Age.
 Four hundred years have swiftly passed away
 Since Luther saw the light; and we rejoice
 In Luther's work, and now again to-day
 We seem to hear the monk's strong, earnest voice
 Preaching that truth which shook the papal throne—
 Salvation by the power of Christ alone.

In the November *National Review* (W. H. Allen and Co.) appears an article on "Labourers' and Artizans' Dwellings," by the Marquis of SALISBURY. It has, of course, been talked about a great deal in every quarter, and it can hardly fail to make the magazine well known. To ourselves the subject has long seemed of the highest importance, and we are delighted to see an article on it such as this. Among articles in the *Review* is one by Mr. GILBERT VENABLES on "Civil and Religious Marriage;" curious, startling. "The separation of civil from religious marriages" would not only "lessen the number of marriages solemnized in church," but would "weaken the Church's position" really as well as "apparently" in our judgment.

From Messrs. Hildersheimer and Faulkner (41, Jewin Street, E.C.) we have received, as usual, a delightful packet of their Cards. It is difficult, as one opens the various envelopes, to apportion praise, as it is, indeed, to find due terms and phrases of admiration. We must content ourselves with brief allusions. No. 232, four designs, "Roses," by Kate Sadler, are splendid—four charming pictures, in fact, worthy of framing. No. 81, four designs, "Sprays of Flowers," by E. Wilson, words by H. M. Burnside, deserve special praise. No. 225, four flower studies; No. 7208, miniature screens, are excellent. No. 199, four flower studies; No. 156, four "Cats," from original paintings; No. 136, "Bric-à-brac," berries, etc., are beautifully designed and done. So interesting a selection of well-finished, high-class designs, is seldom seen. Not a single card in the parcel is commonplace or poor.

Paths in Great Waters, a clever and instructive Tale by the Rev. E. N. HOARE, shows Virginia's early troubles, with the true history of the Bermudas.—*Lia*, is a Tale of Nuremberg, by ESME STUART, whose "Isabeau's Hero" we commended last year. In *Lia* are some striking pictures of life in the day before the Reformation; there is life and stir with dramatic power. The heroine, Lia, is a Jewess.—*We Little Ones* is a charming book, printed in large, clear type. Jerks is excellent; but all are good. Little folks will enjoy this story.—*Home and School* is a story—pleasant and suggestive—for schoolgirls.—*The Pirate's Creek* is an interesting story of treasure-quest, by Mr. S. W. SADLER, R.N., whose "The Good Ship Barbara" we commended last year. These well-written books, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, are neatly got up, illustrated, and in every way suitable for Christmas-prizes. The covers are specially pretty.

The work done by Mr. GEORGE SMITH, of Coalville, a noble work on behalf of our canal population, children in brickyards, and the gipsies, is very well known. We are greatly pleased with his latest book, *I've Been a Gipsying*, "Rambles among our Gipsies and their Children in their Tents and Vans" (T. Fisher Unwin). The book (pp. 340) is not a bit too big, not a bit dry. By no means a daisy-bank, sentimental, twaddling gipsy-writer, Mr. Smith has sought after reality, and he tells matter-of-fact in homely fashion. We heartily pay our tribute of admiration and respect.

The Annual of the "Boys' Own Paper" (R. T. S.) is a volume of the highest attractiveness. Soon after that admirable magazine was started, and proved such a success, there were several rivals; but the original periodical for boys is now, we fancy, the only one left. To the contents in 1883 allusion has been made now and then in our monthly magazine-paragraphs: and we need only heartily recommend the handsome volume before us. It contains a mass of instructive as well as interesting matter. Much the same, *mutatis mutandis*, may be said of the *Girls' Own Paper*.

Dr. UHLHORN did a right good work in writing his *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church*; and the eminent Edinburgh publishers, to whom the Christian public of Greater Britain is indebted for so many excellent translations from the German, did well in publishing the book before us, a very good translation, having the author's sanction. (T. and T. Clark.) The book is full of curious facts.

A very interesting little book, just published by Messrs. John F. Shaw and Co. (a firm which has provided many of our best and most useful gift-books), we have pleasure in recommending; viz., Miss HOLT'S *The Way of the Cross, and other Tales*. The outlines of the story of the second century, so far as they relate to Bishop Symeon, the last of the House of David, are historically true.

What praises warm enough would a certain little reviewer we wot of find for the volume now before us, *The Snow Queen*, by HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN, illustrated by T. PYM? It is indeed a charming work—so dainty, so tasteful. Readers of fairy tales will enjoy it amazingly: a coloured picture on every page. Among the best of pretty Christmas Books, this from the well-known firm, Messrs. Gardner, Darton, and Co., will take a high place.

Our old friend the *Christian Remembrancer* (published by Messrs. Suttaby and Co.) is always welcome: a capital pocket-book, tasteful, thoroughly good.—From Messrs. Suttaby we have also received a timely gift-book, *The Fate of Castle Löwengard*, "a story of the days of Luther," by ESME STUART (some of whose tales have been recommended in THE CHURCHMAN). This is an interesting book.

From Messrs. John Smith and Co., 52, Long Acre, we have received *The Clergyman's and Church Workers' Visiting List* for 1884. This very carefully prepared pocket-book has been more than once recommended in THE CHURCHMAN. It is an excellent publication: we have found it very useful. It is strong, and will stand wear and tear. *The Curates' Visiting List* is smaller and cheaper.

Sunday is with little boys and girls a well-known magazine, always much enjoyed. The Annual for 1883 (Wells Gardner, Darton, and Co.) is a delightful volume, very tasteful, and in every way attractive; there are two hundred original illustrations by Seymour, Pym, and others.

A good Temperance Tale is *Heroism in Humble Life*, "the Story of Ben Pritchard and Charlie Campion," by the Rev. E. N. HOARE, M.A., Rector of Acrise (T. Nelson and Sons).

When *The Teachers' Prayer Book* was published (Eyre and Spottiswoode) a notice appeared in *THE CHURCHMAN*. The cheaper editions, in small type, were at that time sent to our reviewer. A very handsome copy, now before us, merits warm praise. Canon BARRY (we may call him *Bishop*) will go forth to his great work in Australia with the hearty good wishes of many Churchmen who do not on all points see with him eye to eye. We gladly recommend his latest literary work, "The Prayer Book for Teachers and Students, and for Home and School Use, being the Book of Common Prayer with Introductions, Analysis, and Notes"

The good work done by Mr. BULLOCK in relation to the press is possibly not as well known as it should be. The *Fireside News* is an excellent penny paper; and we earnestly commend it to the due consideration of our readers, whether clerical or lay. No less than 200,000 copies of the first number are printed. It is a capital number, with well-varied contents; a good, sound Church newspaper.

A well-written and wholesome story is *Lady Temple's Grandchildren*, by Miss EVERETT-GREEN (Nisbet and Co.); young people are likely to vote it "very good." The story—of "Indian" children in England under Grandmother's care—is sweetened with thoughts of Divine love.

From the Artistic Stationery Company (Dyer's Buildings, Holborn, E.C.) we have received several very tasteful Christmas and New Year's Cards, Etchings, etc., all showing skill and finish. Some of the Flower Cards are especially graceful, and the words on the back or by the side are not unworthy. The menus and programmes are well executed.

The author of "Consecrated Women" has done well to publish a companion volume, *Christian Womanhood* (Hodder and Stoughton). Mary Fletcher, Anna Backhouse, Elizabeth Duchess of Gordon, and Harriet Perfect, are some of the devoted Women whose life and work are sketched.

A charming gift-book, with illustrations, and tastefully got up, is *Five Little Birdies*, by Miss GIBERNE, Author of "Readings for the Little Ones" (Religious Tract Society). The Birdies were orphans—Indian children, whose real name was Bird.

A gem of a text-book is Dr. MACDUFF'S *Voices of the Good Shepherd, and Shadows of the great Rock* (Nisbet and Co.). On one page are the "voices;" on the other are the Scriptures which speak of "the shadow of a great rock" (Isa. xxxii. 2).

From Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode we have received, as usual at this time of the year, a packet of really tasteful Cards. Many of them are simple and cheap; all are attractive, and, of the higher-priced ones, some are specially artistic. The Plate Calendar is pretty.

Little Queen Mab (Cassell and Co.) is a very pleasing little book for the younger boys and girls. Mabel and Percy "lost" in the hut at night is very good. Miss SILKE tells a story well, and teaches good lessons.

Delight in the Lord, by a well-known London layman, zealous in good works, Mr. HENRY MORRIS, may be strongly recommended; a short, simple, and deeply spiritual manual of private devotion (W. Hunt & Co.).

Luther and the Cardinal (Religious Tract Society) is an historic-biographical tale, an adaptation from the German. It will be read with special interest at the present time.

By Uphill Paths (Nelson and Sons), a story of everyday life, of Christian sympathy and the doing of duty, is very readable. One of the illustrations is a soldier being turned away by a pew-opener.—"An American Bag of Stories"—chiefly Missionary—has for title *Mother's Queer Things* (Nisbet and Co.); an earnest little book.—*Fighting an Omen* is a story of the good Religious Tract Society Series, "Shilling-

books for Adults."—We are pleased to recommend *Miss Marston's Girls and their Confirmation*; a really good gift-book. Rose Collins, Eliza Thompson, and two others, are the "girls" of the Bible-class. The story is very practical; its keynote is that beautiful prayer, "Defend, O Lord, these Thy servants . . ."—*Angel Meadow*, by ALICE LANG (Religious Tract Society), is a well-written story of work and duty in the East-end: simple, affectionate, and likely to do good. It is illustrated.

The Diaconate, an Ancient Remedy for Modern Needs, two Sermons, by the Rev. A. C. DOWNER, M.A., Vicar of Ilkley (Church of England Book Society), is well worth reading.—In the November *Church Missionary Intelligencer* appear some deeply interesting extracts from the journal kept by the Bishop of LAHORE during his recent visit to Persia; also some comments on the honoured Bishop's Congress paper.—A good little book for Mothers' Meetings is *Messages for Mothers*, Lessons from the Lives of Women of the Old Testament, by LUCY MARSHALL (Religious Tract Society).—In the *Church Sunday School Magazine* we are pleased to see, with several good papers, the paper read by Mr. GOE at Reading on "Sunday Teaching for Children;" we hope it will do much good. Why do so many of our Sunday scholars, when grown youths and maidens, forsake the school and the Church? This is a most serious question. We heartily wish the *Church Sunday School Magazine* a prosperous year, rich in spiritual results.—*Witnesses to Truth*, by the Rev. Canon HOARE, an excellent little work (Church of England Book Society, 11, Adam Street, Strand), has five chapters: "Difficulties," "The Races," "The Jews," "Palestine," and "The Sacraments;" simple enough for general circulation, clear, and interesting. A valuable tractate, also written by Canon HOARE, and published by the same Society, is *Conformity to the World*. We are pleased to see a third edition of so suggestive and deeply spiritual a writing.—We cordially commend a new book by Mr. EVERARD, *His Steps, traced from the Great Biography*. Mr. Everard's writings are widely known as sound and useful; well adapted for parochial reading, lending, or giving away. *His Steps*, "Practical Readings in the Life of our Lord" (pp. 128), is an excellent little book.—*Stray Leaves from Cousin Mabel's Sketch-Book*, by Miss E. J. WHATELY (Religious Tract Society), a sort of sequel to "Cousin Mabel's Sketch-Book, warmly commended in THE CHURCHMAN a year ago, gives some thoroughly practical lessons about intolerance. Complaints of *sensationally* religious persons, who gad about from Bible-reading meeting to service and prayer-meeting night after night, are fairly criticized in this tiny volume.



THE MONTH.

AT the Guildhall banquet the Prime Minister made no reference to the programme of the coming session. He stated that a portion of the British troops would at once be withdrawn from Egypt. His references to France have been gratefully acknowledged by the Paris newspapers. The French ambassador, M. Waddington, made a very telling speech.

A not very satisfactory apology, with the offer of pecuniary compensation, has been tendered to Mr. Shaw. The French, it is said, are preparing to march upon Antananarivo.

The difficulty between the French Government and China is becoming more grave. The Tonquin expedition may, in the end, prove a very serious matter, not only for France. M. Ferry is, just at present, the only possible Premier; and now that he is rid of M. Challemeil-Lacour he may carry out a strong and peaceful policy.

The Transvaal delegates have had an interview with Lord Derby. The state of Zululand is grievous. Cetewayo's return has worked sad mischief.

Mr. Errington, an agent or a representative of the English Government, whose position no one has defined, has again an interview with Cardinal Jacobini.

About the results of the Ilbert Bill in India many well-informed persons have great fears.

The centenary anniversary of the birthday of the distinguished Jewish philanthropist, Sir Moses Montefiore, was celebrated at Ramsgate with great rejoicings.

The proceedings at some of the Diocesan Conferences have been of unusual interest. The weakness of such gatherings practically regarded, has been, by many critics, exaggerated; the movement, we are persuaded, gains strength and influence; but there is a danger lest the speeches and papers, in some subjects, should lead to no result. "Mere talk."

At the Conference of the diocese of Chichester, held this year at Lewes,¹ there was an animated discussion on the Ecclesiastical Courts Report. A resolution moved by Mr. Beresford Hope (supported by the Earl of Chichester) that the Report should be accepted as affording a satisfactory basis . . . was carried *nem. con.* The Dean (Mr. Burgon) remarked that these questions would never be settled and the blessing of peace be obtained so long as men insisted on being a law to themselves. An interesting paper on Church Services and the work of Laymen, embodying replies from the clergy of his Archdeaconry, was read by the Archdeacon of Lewes (Dr. Hannah). The self-supporting Diaconate, the Diocesan work of Missions (see CHURCHMAN for 1883, pp. 374), were among the points of importance brought forward.

At Liverpool, the Bishop's opening address was, as usual, vigorous and full of interest. The financial state of the Diocesan Institutions (specially the Church Building, the Church Aid, and the Education Societies), his lordship said, was discreditable; in providing funds, also, for cathedral services, there was great backwardness. The Diocesan "Home Mission" scheme for overgrown parishes was again to be

¹ From the first sanguine in regard to the Diocesan Conference movement, we have always held the opinion that it is well to have two or three "Conference" centres in a Diocese.

considered; he had no intention to interfere with the vested rights of any Incumbent. Chancellor Espin, in a paper on the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission Report, said :

He quite agreed that there must be some check upon frivolous and vexatious complaints; but he thought that application for leave to begin the suit should be publicly made in the Consistory Court, and if refused, refused with reasons rendered there and then. (Applause). . . . Let them all try to get their Church Courts constituted so that they might satisfy reasonable, sober-minded, loyal Churchmen of all parties.

There was a resolution in favour of the Report (by Rev. E. Carleton) and an amendment against it (by Canon Taylor); but an amendment moved by Archdeacon Bardsley, "That the Conference records its opinion that the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission has laid the Church of England under a deep sense of obligation, and cordially recognises the fact that the recommendations deserve and command the thoughtful consideration of all Churchmen," was carried by a substantial majority.

At Chester, the motion of Lord Egerton of Tatton, that the Conference "approves generally" of the Report, was carried *nem. con.* Ripon approves. At Wells, a resolution generally approving the recommendations was rejected in favour of Archdeacon Denison's amendment taking exception as regards the Court of Final Appeal. At Truro, a resolution hoping that the recommendations would be fully considered by the Legislature, was agreed to. Manchester pronounced them "satisfactory." Lincoln said the same, but with a rider excepting the final Court (which seems to have been carried without division). Exeter and Lichfield require more time for consideration.

The Bishop of Lichfield, in a letter to his clergy, has stated that the proposed Clerical Union is to bear the name of "The Pastoral Order of the Holy Ghost, for the higher fulfilment of the office and work of a priest in the Church of God." We honour the Bishop's motive; but we regret the institution of a new "Order."

We are happy to record a decided improvement in the health of the Bishop of Peterborough, after a very long and trying illness.

At the Norwich Diocesan Conference, in paying a tribute to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop said :

Looking upon that one of the great works which he was useful in securing to the Church, in moving the Government to advise her Majesty to issue that Royal Commission in reference to the Ecclesiastical Courts, and over which he presided with so much wisdom, influence, and energy, I feel that he left a very important legacy to the Church, for I believe it would never have been called out, and would never have been so useful a Commission to the Church as I believe it will prove to be, had it not been for the way in which he first started it and superintended it for so long a period.

The Report of the Committee on the Diaconate (a very interesting document) having been read, Archdeacon Perowne moved the reappointment of the Committee to consider the forthcoming Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocations of Canterbury and York on the subject, and to report to the Conference upon it. Canon Garratt, seconded the motion which (supported by Sir T. F. Buxton), was agreed to.

The Deanery of Exeter has been conferred on Dr. Cowie, Dean of Manchester. From Carlisle, where he has been Dean a year or two, Mr. Oakley has been invited by the Prime Minister to remove to Manchester. Mr. Gladstone's ecclesiastical appointments will give little satisfaction, probably, to the staunchly Protestant Churchmen among his political supporters.

The Oxford correspondent of the *Record* writes (November 7th) of a remarkable sermon in the University pulpit, by the Bishop of Derry :

One sentence especially seemed to electrify his audience. Speaking of an incident within his own knowledge, he said that a gentleman who had taken a prominent part in religious controversy being suddenly confronted with death in a most terrible form, wrote from his deathbed, "The Evangelicals are in the right after all. Christ in us and Christ with us is the one thing needful."

Many *In Memoriam* statements have been made in the press, in the pulpit, and in other ways, of our much-esteemed friend, Canon Clayton, who entered into rest, after a short illness, on Oct. 18, aged 70. Charles Clayton was "a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith."¹

Messrs Moody and Sankey have been holding a mission in Islington. The proceedings were most encouraging. It is eight years since the American Evangelists laboured in the metropolis. The Bishop of Rochester in an admirable letter to one of his clergy, Mr. Marshall, of Blackheath, has spoken in sympathetic terms of their work.

The Rev. Prebendary Wace, D.D., has been appointed Principal of King's College, London. Dr. Wace has edited the "Three Primary Works" of Luther, just published by Mr. Murray.

¹ Mr. Clayton's University career, as was remarked by Mr. Weldon, in his very interesting "Recollections of Cambridge" (CHURCHMAN of August last), was distinguished. He was Tutor of Caius, and Incumbent of Trinity Church, and then Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon, and Rector of Stanhope. Of his sermons and influence at Cambridge, remarks were made in the January CHURCHMAN. The leading article in the *Times*, so far as it related to the deceased Canon, was, in the main, appreciative and just. Remarks have been made, elsewhere, concerning Canon Clayton's faithfulness and deep devotion. We may add a word as to his kindness, sympathy, and generous readiness to advise and aid.—An excellent pamphlet has been published by the Rev. James Cosbey, Curate of Stanhope: *Joy in Divine Ordinances* (Darlington: Bailey).

The "Middle Class Schools" movement, we are pleased to note, is making progress. Even at Wells, Archdeacon Denison's attack on the "Conscience Clause" was defeated (by 94 to 55).

Bishop Ryan has been appointed to the Rectory of Stanhope. The Bishop has been doing right good service in Ripon diocese.

The annual meeting of the Craven Evangelical Union has been held at Halifax. The Dean of Ripon gave a full and very telling address. On the Diaconate a paper such as might have been expected from the Rev. Jackson Mason was read, with speeches by Mr. Sydney Gedge and Canon Jackson. Papers were read by Canon Bell (on Luther), the Rev. J. B. Whiting, and the Vicar of Halifax.

The Rev. Sir Henry Wellwood Moncrieff, an influential leader in the Free Church of Scotland, has entered into rest. Due tributes of respect have been paid to that courageous and consistent leader, the Rev. Dr. Begg.

The Duke of Connaught, with the Duchess, has departed to take command of the Meerut Division. The Marquis of Lorne and the Princess Louise have been warmly welcomed in Liverpool on their return from Canada.

The Luther meetings in Germany have been enthusiastic.¹ At Worms, at Wittenberg, and at Eisleben, and in other centres, the festivals were most successful.

Turning to England, on November 10th, the inaugural meeting for the metropolis was held at Exeter Hall. The Earl of Shaftesbury presided, supported by the Lord Mayor, Sir Harry Verney, Lord Ebury, Mr. Froude, Dr. Osborne (representing the Wesleyans) and others. Papers on the life of Luther were read by the Dean of Chester and the learned and honoured Congregationalist, Dr. Stoughton. On the 11th the Archbishop of York² preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey; Archdeacon Farrar preached in St. Margaret's, West-

¹ An article in the *New York Observer*, of October 11th, on the blessings of the Reformation, thus concludes: "The Protestant world will recognise these facts when on the continent of Europe, in England and Scotland, and all over free America, the 10th day of November, 1883, is distinguished by meetings, prayers, orations, and songs of praise to celebrate the day when a child was born who grew to be the masterman of the great Reformation."

² On Wednesday the 14th, a noble sermon was preached by the Archbishop at the Church of St. Michael, York. On the letters of the Dean of York, we prefer to make no comment. The success of the Ritualists at Oxford in preventing a vote of Convocation expressing sympathy with Germany, is criticized by the Oxford correspondent of the *Record*. He writes: "They were moved by hatred of Protestantism."

minster, and Dr. Leathes at Kensington parish church. A very telling address was given by Mr. Spurgeon. At Exeter Hall, on the 12th, Mr. J. Maden Holt presiding, an admirable paper was read by Dr. Boulton. These papers, we hope, will be published.

Many meetings in connection with the far-reaching Luther Commemoration have been held in this country.¹ At Bradford, for example, an address was given by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster. At Liverpool addresses were delivered by Canons Taylor and Lefroy. In Cambridge, with an admirable paper by Professor Lumby, there was an interesting meeting. At Leeds, a telling speech was made by Canon Jackson. At a meeting in Exeter, the Bishop of the diocese presided. Several telegrams were sent to the Emperor of Germany.

England is unmistakably Protestant.²

Some references at the present moment may well be made to a book in which the work and character of Luther are ably defended. Archdeacon Hare's sermons on the "Mission of the Comforter" were "preacht" before the University of Cambridge in 1840. In a preface to a new edition, dated Herstmonceux, November 12th, 1850, the Archdeacon says: "I have reserved the overgrown Note in vindication of Luther for a volume by itself."³ We are afraid that this Note has been of late years but little read; and few of our theological students, probably, are at all acquainted with it.

That this is so, appears from the noble protest contained in Dr. Ince's sermon the following Sunday. It is a matter for deep thankfulness that the two chief Divinity Professors at Oxford have been led by this question to declare themselves so publicly against the mediæval school, who are trying to undo the work of the Reformation."

¹ Sermons were preached and lectures delivered in Ireland. The following Resolution was passed at the Dublin Synod: "The united Dioceses of Dublin, Glendalough, and Kildare, in Synod assembled, desire—in view of the celebration, on the 10th of November next, by the Churches of the Reformation throughout Christendom, of the Fourth Centenary of the birth of Dr. Martin Luther—to record their deep thankfulness to Almighty God for having, in His providence, raised up His servant Luther for the purification of the Church from error and superstition; for the spread of the light of Gospel truth; for the security of freedom of conscience, civil and religious liberty, and a free and open Bible for all men."

² At the Mildmay Conference Hall an interesting meeting was presided over by the Bishop of Liverpool. A vote of thanks to his lordship was proposed by the Rev. Dr. Allon, and seconded by the Rev. Dr. Edmond, in very cordial and appropriate terms.

³ In the original preface, Archdeacon Hare says: "Those who swallow the theology either of the Fathers or of the Middle Ages, in the gross, find themselves out of place in a Protestant Church; and while they wish to revive the Church of the Middle Ages, and confound faith with credulity, they are just fitted for the surrender of their reason and conscience to the arbitrary mandates of the Papacy."

The edition of Archdeacon Hare's great work, which lies on our table, is in two volumes, 1846. In the second volume, Note W., the Luther note, extends from p. 656 to p. 878. This Note, as a separate volume, was published by Messrs. Parker and Son. We have made inquiries lately concerning it, and we find that Messrs. Macmillan¹ have a few copies of this "Vindication of Luther." We hope the books will soon be bought and worthily studied.

A few extracts from the original Note may be given. The Archdeacon writes :

It is not to be wondered at that Luther, as he was sent to reproclaim St. Paul's doctrine [justification by faith] which had been distorted for century after century by manifold sophistications, and which practically was almost forgotten and set aside, and often grossly outraged, by the teaching of the fallen Church, should in like manner have been assailed by similar reproaches. The oblivion that doctrine had fallen into, the mass of corruptions whereby it was overlaid and hidden, impressed him with the necessity of setting it forth continually in its naked power ; and though he also followed his great Master and prototype in continually enforcing every moral duty, not indeed on the ground of justification, but as its fruit and proof, yet as this did not save St. Paul from such *slanderos reports*, neither did it avail to save Luther. The charge has been renewed of late years in England, from several quarters ; and since it has become a fashion to decry the Reformation and its authors, has found acceptance with many, who catch it up with a parrot-like volubility in repeating ugly words."

The Archdeacon examines the evidence on which certain English writers thought themselves justified in imputing Antinomianism to Luther. He refers to Mr. Hallam (following Bossuet) ; he touches on Mr. Newman's "Lectures on Justification," and replies to Mr. Ward's and Sir W. Hamilton's criticisms and charges. He thus concludes :

"To some readers it may seem that I have spoken with exaggerated admiration of Luther. No man ever lived whose whole heart, and soul, and life have been laid bare as his have been to the eyes of mankind. Open as the sky, bold and fearless as the storm, he gave utterance to all his feelings, all his thoughts—he knew nothing of reserve—and the impression he produced on his hearers and friends was such, that they were anxious to treasure up every word that dropped from his pen or from his lips. No man, therefore, has ever been exposed to so severe a trial ; perhaps no man was ever placed in such difficult circumstances, or assailed by such manifold temptations. And how has he come out of the trial ? Through the power of faith, under the guardian care of his Heavenly Master, he was enabled to stand through life, and still he stands, and will continue to stand, firmly rooted in the love of all who really know him."

² The book passed into the hands of Messrs. Macmillan some years ago. Not many copies are left. The title-page runs thus : "Vindication of Luther against his recent English Assailants. Second edition. Reprinted and enlarged from the Notes to 'The Mission of the Comforter.' By JULIUS CHARLES HARE, M.A., Rector of Herstmonceux, Archdeacon of Lewes, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. London : . . . 1855."