

# *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/robbadshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

SEPTEMBER, 1892.

---

ART. I.—OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM IN RELATION  
TO FAITH AND TEACHING.

SOME time ago a certain amount of interest was aroused by the supposed discovery of evidence that threatened to dethrone Shakespeare from his pre-eminent position as the prince of poets. This interest languished for a little while, and we heard no more of it. But had all that was promised been fulfilled, the utmost that would have followed would have been to put Bacon in the place of Shakespeare. This would have been a blow to prejudice, but in no sense a loss to English literature. We should still have had the plays, but have called them by another name, a name already so illustrious as to need no accession of glory, while the lustre of Shakespeare would have been tarnished and his fame despoiled. But supposing the theory to have been proved, every one before long would have acquiesced in the result. What Shakespeare lost would have been transferred to the credit of Bacon, and no one would have been any the worse.

But with the Old Testament the case is different, and the interest that its criticism excites is the measure of the issues that are involved in it, and this because it is felt that the Old Testament is possessed of a traditional prestige that is totally destroyed by the so-called higher criticism. The books remain as they were before, their inherent features are the same, their beauty and sublimity are the same, their peculiar characteristics survive unchanged, but we feel that we have been cheated by them, or at all events deceived in them. It is not a mere matter of transference of authorship, as in the case of Shakespeare and Bacon, but the essential credit of the writings is destroyed. "Hamlet" is not less splendid than it was if Bacon wrote it, "Henry IV." is neither more nor less true to history whether it is Shakespeare's or not; but the history of

Israel is totally discredited if the general trustworthiness of its records is impeached. If the personal history of Moses, for example, is not history, but fiction, not the record of the time, but the ideal invention of ages afterwards, what becomes of the covenant of which he was the ostensible mediator? Is there any ground for supposing there was any covenant at all, except in the minds of the people who imagined it? Is there any evidence of any action on the part of God which can sustain the hypothesis of a veritable covenant? any proof that it was He and not chance or circumstance that was moving in and moulding the history of Israel? is there any clearer indication that He was teaching the world by their history, or teaching it otherwise than He was teaching it in the times of the Saxon kings, or the first hundred years or so that followed the Norman Conquest? This is why so much interest is excited by Old Testament criticism, because it is instinctively felt, let the critics say what they like, that more serious issues depend upon it than are involved in any question about the plays of Shakespeare or the dialogues of Plato.

Nor is this all, because it is sufficiently clear that the consequences do not end with the Old Testament itself, but have a fundamental bearing upon the New Testament also. If the general character of the Old Testament is discredited, the position of the New must be materially affected thereby. The general truth and authority of the Old Testament is taken for granted in the New, and therefore, as far as the New is based upon the Old, it must be intimately concerned in the fortunes of the Old. Everything which tends to invalidate the Old must weaken the foundations of the New, so far as the New is dependent upon the Old. Consequently it is impossible to be indifferent to the estimate that is formed of the Old Testament, unless we are prepared to regard it as an entirely independent field of study, and are willing to disregard altogether the aspect of it that is presented to us by the writers of the New Testament. There is, however, little doubt that the way in which we regard the authority of the New Testament is mainly derived from the way in which the writers of the New Testament regard the Old. When once the authority of the New Testament is accepted, it is felt that it is strong enough to stand alone, and we feel with Paley that it is unreasonable to make Christianity answer with its life for every statement and detail of the Old Testament. But this is something very different from entirely overthrowing the historical credit of the Old Testament.

It may be said that a person who *ex animo* believes in the living Christ is independent of all discussions as to the origin and authorship, the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the New Testament. It may be said that such a person can

stand alone. It matters not to him whether the fourth Gospel was written by St. John, or was a romance of the second century. He is not concerned in the ultimate origin of the Synoptical Gospels, or in the genuineness of St. Paul's Epistles. If he is an ordinary individual he is hardly possessed of the means of forming his own conclusion on the matter, and is compelled to leave it to the critics. But I would ask what kind of faith this would be? Is it anyhow distinguishable from obstinate ignorance or from ignorant obstinacy? Is it possible, for example, that faith in Christ can be independent of the historic authority of the Gospels? Does anyone really suppose that the cause of essential Christian faith can be independent of the genuineness of the fourth Gospel? that it matters not to our belief in Christ whether it was written in the first or the second century? It is true that the author says "These things are written that ye might believe, and that believing ye might have life," and the possession of life, it may be supposed, is a sufficient voucher for the faith; but it must be borne in mind that the same writer claims also to have been an eye-witness of what he records, and therefore the foundation of fact is pre-supposed, on which the faith rests and from which the life proceeds. And in the same way the New Testament rests upon the essential truth of the Old, and presupposes it.

For example, it will hardly be denied that Jesus claimed to be the Christ, and died in attestation of the claim; but we cannot understand or define "the Christ" without falling back upon the Old Testament as having created and fostered more than 400 years before the hope and expectation of the Christ. The idea may have been a vague one, but it was sufficiently definite to be substantial, and, however erroneous, it was deeply rooted, and was solid enough to be the immediate cause of the literature of the New Testament. The New Testament was the actual product of this belief, which was found only in the Old Testament. It stands to reason, therefore, that there must have been some foundation in fact for an expectation so peculiar, so general, and so deep, which was the growth of long ages, and survived the completion of the books that contained the record of it four hundred years. But for this foundation we could have had no Jesus Christ, and no Gospels or Epistles.

Surely, therefore, having been put in possession of all these things, it will not do to turn round upon the Old Testament and disparage its authority and reject its testimony. For however great Jesus may have been in Himself, He either was or was not the Christ, and if He was not the Christ it was not because He did not fulfil the ideal, but because the ideal was a misapprehension and a mistake. But then it is hardly possible

to deny that He acquiesced in this mistake, that He made use of it and encouraged it; and consequently, so far as He did this, He was compromised in the position He took up in claiming to be the Christ, and was not warranted in the course He adopted; that is to say, He laid the foundation of His Church in misconception and in fraud, which He either shared in or connived at, and Christ, Christian, Christianity, are all misnomers expressive of erroneous and false ideas. And consequently, it is not possible to discredit the Old Testament foundation of the New without undermining our personal faith in Christ. We cannot believe in His theocratic claims if His moral attitude is impeached, and that it most undoubtedly is if He was the victim of a mistake so radical, or made use of and encouraged a misconception so baseless.

But then, on the other hand, if this Christ idea was a justifiable verity, how are we to account for its presence in the Old Testament, and its presence there only? This anticipation of a Christ either was or was not the result of *promises*. If it was not, the *form*, at all events, in which it is presented and has come down to us is that of repeated and gradually developing *promises*. Now, if the *form* of these promises is not delusive and fictitious, we can only regard them as *promises*; but if they are promises, they must either be promises which, so to say, the people made for themselves, or which were made by their prophets and writers; or if they are what in form they seem to be, they were direct messages from the Most High. If, however, they were direct messages from the Most High, then we are compelled to postulate some unknown means of an extra-natural character whereby He held communication with those to whom they were made. That is to say, do what we will, if we even accept the merely substantial truth of the New Testament, we cannot dispense with certain elements in the Old which cannot be accounted for or explained on any natural principles, and which are distinctly upon the apparent evidence outside of and beyond the function and operation of nature to produce. And consequently I am brought to this conclusion, that, do what we will, it is impossible upon any fair dealing with the broad and patent features of the Old Testament to eliminate the supernatural element therefrom.

Now this brings me to the main subject of which I am treating. Because it is absolutely certain that the extreme conclusions of the so-called higher criticism not only tend to minimise the traces of the supernatural in the Old Testament, but are entirely fatal to the belief in it. The position of Kuenen is that the religion of Israel is one of the principal religions of the world—one of them, but not different in kind

from them. He says distinctly "Jahveh was worshipped in the shape of a young bull. It may not be doubted that the bull worship was really the worship of Jahveh." "The bull was an indigenous and original symbol of Jahveh."<sup>1</sup> To my mind it is not possible to distinguish such statements from simple blasphemy, but we must put sentiment aside. Is it possible, then, that bull-worship can develop naturally, because that is the point, into the worship of Jahveh? Why, then, we may ask, was He called Jahveh, if that was His name, which I do not believe? Is the ultimate origin of all religion, and especially the religion of Israel, the spontaneous worship of nature? Is the religion of the prophets and the Psalms the natural evolution of bull-worship? From what, then, does the protest against this kind of worship, which is so conspicuous in the Old Testament, arise? What is there in bull-worship to generate Jehovah worship? Verily, if we will blindly follow these critics in their baseless assertions they will not only rob us of our faith, but also of our common sense, which neither enriches nor belongs to them, and leaves us poor indeed. But there is a fascination about them which attracts the unstable and the unwary, the fascination of audacity and the charm of novelty.

We must beware, however, of imputing motives even to critics so reckless and unscrupulous as Kuennen. If it can be shown that Jehovah-worship was the natural and legitimate development of bull-worship, which, by the ordinary processes of evolution, it would grow into, by all means let it be shown, and the sooner it is shown the better. And especially if it can be shown from the natural, honest, straightforward treatment of the Old Testament records, I, for one, should be eager to see it. I do not know that I should *welcome* the demonstration except as a triumphant feat of critical ingenuity, for which, however, I am quite content to wait. We must by all means beware of imputing motives, but we should also be particularly careful that we be not blind as to results. And there can be no question as to the result of criticism such as this. It is manifestly fatal to anything like faith, not only in the Divine authority of the Old Testament, but also in its historical value. This position, however, of Kuennen's is an extreme position which will probably meet with few advocates at present. Still, it will serve as a landmark of "caution" as to whether some criticism may eventually carry us.

Let us come, then, to a more plausible statement, which has the authority of an Oxford professor. We have been told, and it has been repeated again and again even by those who should

---

<sup>1</sup> "Religion of Israel," Eng. tr., i. 235.

know better, that "Deuteronomy does not claim to be written by Moses," and that "the true 'author' of Deuteronomy is the writer who introduces Moses in the third person." Very well, then, be it so; such is the statement of the critics. What, then, is the statement of the "*true author* of Deuteronomy who introduces Moses in the third person"? In chap. xxxi. 9, he says: "And Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, and unto all the elders of Israel." "And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of every seven years thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing." And again: "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of *writing* the words of this law in a book until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, saying, Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God that it may be there for a witness against thee." That is to say, the *true author* of Deuteronomy affirms that Moses wrote this law and made these provisions for its observance; but on the hypothesis which is adopted by the Oxford professor, we are precluded from attaching any credit to his statement, and that on the ground that "Deuteronomy does not claim to be written by Moses." So when Thucydides tells us that he wrote the history of the Peloponnesian War, we in like manner are not to believe him, though all mankind have done so, and there is no reason why they should not.

But if the "*true author* of Deuteronomy is the writer who introduces Moses in the third person," what are we to say when he introduces him in the first? "I spake unto you at that time, saying," "I charged your judges at that time, saying," "Also the Lord was angry with me for your sakes," "And the Lord said unto me," "I stood between the Lord and you at that time to show you the word of the Lord," "Thou shalt, therefore, keep the commandments and the statutes and the judgments which I command thee this day to do them," and the like, over and over again. Surely this, on the hypothesis, is the false personation by an unknown writer of the age of Josiah of the character and function of Moses, who elsewhere introduces him in the third person. The writer pretends to be Moses. He appeals to what transpired between him and the people, and between him and the Most High. He solemnly enjoins the people, who had long been dead, to keep a law which he only pretends to have given them, and which he pretends to have made provision for preserving, though he knows that it was not preserved, and merely adopts this device to make believe that it had been so preserved. I would first ask whether under any circumstances this would be honest, or whether it would be permissible, except on the supposition

that the public whom the writer addressed would be perfectly conscious of the impersonation, and consequently in no sense liable to be misled by it (which the unbroken tradition of some five-and-twenty centuries proves was not the case). What should we think of that critic who should have the audacity to suggest that Cæsar's Commentaries were not written by Cæsar, but by some one, whom we know not, who "introduces him in the third person," and makes him the principal actor in events which were merely imaginary? How could we characterise such a work in any other way than as a forgery, or, at all events, a romance? And what would be its value as history? It would be simply worthless, for it would be hopeless and impossible to unravel and to separate the actual truth from the ideal fiction. What, then, becomes of the historical worth of Deuteronomy? and what becomes of the moral elevation of its teaching except on the unwarrantable hypothesis that the purity and sublimity of the end aimed at and secured justified the highly questionable character of the means resorted to?

I want especially to emphasise the fact that upon this theory the historical worth of Deuteronomy is absolutely destroyed. For example, "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God as ye tempted Him in Massah." Here is a precept based upon a presumed historic fact, for the confirmation of which we are forbidden to appeal to Exodus, because that, on the supposition, is a later document, or at all events a document later than the fact. If the tempting, then, in Massah was uncertain or fictitious, how do we know that there was adequate ground for supposing that the Lord was their God? And yet more, how do we know that this commandment, given in the name of Moses, but not the commandment of Moses, was actually and not merely ideally the commandment of God? And yet it was upon this commandment that the man Jesus took His stand as the commandment of God, when assaulted by the devil in the wilderness. Then on this supposition the position of Jesus was an untenable position: neither He nor His adversary knew what we now know—that this was no actual commandment of God such as He was bound to obey, but an ideal precept ascribed to Him by an unknown writer in the time of Josiah of no intrinsic authority whatever. Is this a satisfactory view to take of our Lord's temptation? Is it not sufficiently plain that it tends to make Him no less mythical than Moses himself? This precept either was or was not the commandment of God. If it was an ideal precept based on an ideal event, put into the mouth of Moses seven hundred years later, I fail to see how in any sense it could be the word of God; and consequently the position of our Lord, who thus

appealed to it, was untenable, for He was mistaken in supposing it to be the word of God, and the ground on which He took His stand was invalidated by an inherent and unsuspected falsehood.

Nor is it otherwise with His claim to be the Christ. If there was an inherent falsehood in that idea which was the product of unwarrantable expectations and misconceptions about the Divine action, then beyond all question the essential position of Jesus, which He maintained alike before His disciples and His enemies, and for which He laid down His life, is vitiated and rendered untenable. If we continue to believe in Him, we must do so on other grounds than those which He advanced of having fulfilled the scriptures of the Old Testament, for He only fulfilled them by destroying them. Then the Spirit of Christ, which was to lead us into all the truth, is only doing so by dissipating more and more the halo which has hitherto surrounded psalm and prophecy, by disintegrating and wearing away more and more the framework of divine history which we have accepted as children, but which was only meant for children. But then, in that case, not only is Jesus no longer the Christ, but Jesus is no longer Jesus, just as Moses is no longer Moses. All that we know of either is vanishing in uncertainty, and, instead of having its foundation laid deep and indestructible in the well-attested facts of the world's history, it is sublimated above the realm of experience and fact to the shifting and cloudy region of hypothetical conjecture and the unreal conceptions of romance.

Now, let us suppose some well-meaning priest of the age of Josiah, weary of the ungodliness and idolatry of Manasseh and Amon (though having little more than the book of the Covenant and the Ten Commandments to enlighten him) to have conceived the idea of working up the very hazy traditions about Moses which had survived in an unwritten form for seven centuries or more, and weaving them into an ideal story designed to have a highly moral and instructive tendency. We must bear in mind that the chief portions of the books of Exodus and Numbers on the hypothesis did not exist; there was nothing but the barest outline of detail which survived. But the actual outcome of this pious intention was the main or the so-called "parenetic" portions of Deuteronomy. The character of Moses, however, as there depicted was the creation of this unknown writer. The incidents and circumstances to which he refers were purely imaginary; the addresses referring to them were put into the mouth of the Law-giver as Thucydides puts speeches into the mouth of Pericles, as merely the ideal representative expression of what he might have said. It must be borne in mind that we know nothing whatever of the

authority which the writer imagined himself to have for doing this; all that we are able to surmise is that he felt an impulse to do it, with the hope of bringing about a reformation in the national religion, and that this impulse, which largely expressed itself in the conjectural and the imaginary, he not only supposed to have come from God, but the result and product of it was also the actual instrument or means chosen by God for accomplishing His own purposes and communicating His supposed revelation. We are continually reminded, by an exaggerated application of Bishop Butler's caution, that we are not judges beforehand of the way in which God would be pleased to give a revelation; but surely it is not possible that the God of truth would adopt precisely these methods of making known His will to man. Without presuming to determine how God would be pleased to reveal Himself, we may certainly say that a method like this would be deficient in every credential and in every proof, and would be dependent only for its evidence upon our own arbitrary supposition that this was the method that He chose. And for this supposition I can see no sort of testimony or ground of belief. The supposition itself rests wholly upon conjecture. It has not even canonical tradition to rest upon.

And there are three manifest difficulties that beset it. First, the paucity of materials which on the hypothesis existed, and consequently the enormous demands on the ingenuity and imagination of the writer. Secondly, the very great gifts of genius with which he must have been endowed to enable him to produce a creation like that of Moses in Deuteronomy, surpassing even the powers of a Walter Scott or a Shakespeare. And, thirdly, the entirely gratuitous and unfounded assertion that the Holy Spirit of God so highly approved of the writer's efforts that He made use of them as the channel of a special revelation to mankind—if, indeed, it was not He who inspired this unknown reformer and iconoclast to invent this portrait of Moses, and to produce this remarkable work which he, presumably with Divine permission, ascribed to Moses. Those who advocate this theory protest against the work being called a forgery, but we are unquestionably within the just limits of truth in characterising it as a fiction or romance; and unless the end may be allowed in this case to justify the means, the fictitious romance or the romantic fiction is very narrowly to be distinguished from a forgery. At all events, what is absolutely certain is that we can place no reliance on its historical statements as trustworthy matters of fact. And thus, to all intents and purposes, the character of the book is discredited.

Neither do I see how, under such circumstances, it can justly be regarded as the chosen vehicle of revelation. It

requires to be borne in mind that a book is either genuine or authentic—that is to say, it is the genuine production of the supposed writer, or the matters it professes to relate are those of fact and not fiction. Now, a work may be perfectly genuine but not authentic, as Xenophon's "Cyropædia," or Milton's "Paradise Lost"; or it may be authentic, but not genuine, as Defoe's "History of the Plague," ascribed to H. F.; or it may be neither genuine nor authentic, as "Robinson Crusoe." But in the case of the books of the Bible, if they are genuine they can scarcely fail to be authentic. For example, if Moses wrote Deuteronomy it can hardly be other than authentic. And, on the other hand, if they are authentic, they may well be genuine. For instance, if the history of the Exodus is authentic history, there is no one to whom we can so well ascribe it as to Moses, the principal actor in the events. And thus to attack the genuineness of a book is very often to deal a blow at its authenticity. For instance, if the history of Exodus is not genuine, we certainly cannot trust it, for we have no ground for doing so; or, at all events, the main ground for doing so is destroyed. And so with Deuteronomy. If its genuineness is destroyed, according to the modern theory, then its authenticity undeniably comes to an end.

To take a parallel case. If St. John's Gospel is written by St. John, there can be no reasonable doubt as to its facts. We may assume their essential truth. But if this Gospel is the work of an unknown writer in the second century who pretends to be St. John, then we can no longer trust his facts, for it is impossible that he can have had the materials to supply them; and, moreover, as he comes to us with a lie in his mouth, his testimony is thereby discredited. That is to say, if St. John's Gospel is of the second century, it is a forgery. If we cannot believe the writer when he personates St. John, how can we believe him when he personates Jesus, or professes to give us the words which He spake: such, for instance, as, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; or, "him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out"? Destroy the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, and there is an end to its authenticity—that is to say, its trustworthiness as to matters of fact and statement.

What, then, is there to show that it is otherwise with Deuteronomy? For, *a fortiori*, if Deuteronomy was written, not in the second, but in the eighth century after Moses, it is absolutely impossible to trust anything it tells us about Moses, or about the revelation, or the covenant of which Moses was the supposed mediator. So untrue, therefore, is it to say that

this view of Deuteronomy "concerns not the *fact*, but only the *form* of revelation."<sup>1</sup> If the *form* and accessories of the revelation are disproved, what is the evidence which remains for the *fact*? Why are we to accept it as a *fact*?

But I must draw to an end. There is a vague and floating impression abroad that the Church is the guarantee for the Christian faith, let the critics say what they will. And thus, whatever authority attaches to Deuteronomy is derived from the position it always held in the Jewish Church. But how, I would ask, did it acquire that position? and how could the Jewish Church give that which was not hers to give? how could it bestow an authority which did not exist? how could it supply the place of an origin which must come from God, if it caine at all? We have seen that according to the theory there is no authority at all for Deuteronomy, except such authority as it derives from its place in the canon. But what is the value of this if we know not how it came there?

In like manner it is often assumed that the authority of the Church and the creeds is sufficient for the Christian, let the critics say what they will. But this is not so. The Church itself has, and can have, no authority apart from the credentials on which it rests. It cannot declare itself free from and independent of those credentials. For example, if St. John's Gospel is not genuine, the Church cannot make it so. The Church can do nothing but bear her own testimony to its genuineness, it is for others to test and disprove that genuineness, if they can; but if they do, the Church must assuredly suffer accordingly. It is not hers to restore that which has already been taken from her; and so with the other Gospels and the Epistles. The Church cannot make the evidence of the Gospels to be trustworthy, it is the trustworthiness of the Gospels which makes the Church what it is and creates the Church. If the evidence of the Gospels is disproved, the foundation of the Church is overthrown; for "if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain." If the validity of the history of the Acts is destroyed, and the genuineness of the Apostolic Epistles is disproved, it is impossible that the Church can sustain or survive the loss, for part, and a very large part, of the evidence on which the Church herself depends is thereby destroyed. It is throwing dust in men's eyes, then, to say that criticism may go where it will and the Church is bound to follow, and may safely do so, and take no harm, for that the life of the Church is independent of the results of criticism. Because it is these very so-called results which sap, by the total destruction of miracle and prophecy and the general discrediting of the history, the essential foundations of the Church.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Driver's "Introduction," p. xvi., *Cont. Rev.*, Feb., 1890.

The stability of any building is destroyed when its foundation is rendered insecure, just as the life of a tree is destroyed when its tap-root is cut.

It behoves men, therefore, to be on their guard when they are told that it is only the "form" and not the "fact" of revelation that is affected. There can be no shadow of doubt that if the "parenetic setting" of Deuteronomy is of the time of Manasseh or Josiah, the credentials of the Mosaic revelation are virtually obliterated, they are rendered so indistinct that it is impossible to discover them. But the credentials of the Mosaic revelation cannot be destroyed without those also of the Christian revelation being impugned, for Christ said that Moses wrote of Him ; and if he did not, or it was not Christ of whom he wrote, then either St. John has misrepresented his Master, or, most certainly, it has been reserved for the so-called criticism of this age to do what His own was unable to do, and convict Christ of falsehood, *i.e.*, of sin.

STANLEY LEATHES.



## ART. II.—THE SERVANT OF CHRIST.

### NO. IX.—THE GOLDEN RULE.

THERE is no honour done to our blessed Lord by any laborious attempt to prove that everything that He taught was absolutely new. Just as He did not come speaking and revealing the language of heaven, but used the words and ideas of His own country, and wove them all into the eternal speech like which never man spake before, so He took the great simple moral truths which had been made known to men in past ages, placed them in their true proportions, freed them from the growth of corruptions and misunderstandings which had obscured them, added what was new where it was necessary to His purpose, laid stress by His employment of paradox and parable on what was most important, and so unfolded for us the mind of God.

This principle of our Lord's method is illustrated for us by the Golden Rule. Something like it had been understood by a few of the wisest and best men in different lands and in different ages. We believe that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in Christ ; and we believe that the Word of God, before His incarnation, was present in varying degrees of clearness in the hearts and minds of all who anywhere sought for God. But never till the Lord Jesus Christ spoke on the hills of Galilee was the royal law set forth in all its comprehensive fulness and perfect beauty as the true way of life.

In the time before Christ there was once a great Hebrew expounder of the law named Shammai, whose fame for learning and wisdom was enormous. And there was a foreign inquirer who came to Jerusalem. He had heard long moral lessons about what he ought to do and what he ought not. What he wished for now was something short. He was seeking for the whole law in a nutshell. He went to Shammai, and asked to be taught the complete duty of man. "Be brief," he said; "*tell me while I am standing on one foot!*" The proud old rabbi turned away in anger. But there was another teacher in Jerusalem of no less reputation, whose name was Hillel. Of Hillel the foreigner made the same demand. Hillel was a better man than Shammai; he saw that the inquirer was not playing him a trick; there was an earnest zeal in his question which deserved an answer. The sage turned to him and said with benignity: "*Whatsoever thou wouldest that men should not do to thee, that do not thou to them. All our law is summed up in this saying.*" And so the Gentile was satisfied, and became a proselyte, and worshipped the God of Israel.

But Hillel was not the first to give this great maxim. More than three hundred years before our Lord there was a pious Jew who wrote an interesting little tale of the captivity, the adventures of Tobit and his son Tobias. In one part of the Book of Tobit the careful Jewish father is giving instructions to his young son before he sets out on his journey from Assyria into Media. "*Do that to no man,*" he said, "*which thou hatest.*"

But yet farther back. Half a century before the time of Tobit there was living at Athens the illustrious philosopher Aristotle. Like Hillel, he was asked a deep question: How should we act towards our friends? "*As we would that they should act to us,*" was the reply of Aristotle, the noble answer of a soul illumined by the universal spirit of God.

But, again, half a century before Aristotle himself, was born at the same famous city of Athens, rich mother of brilliant sons, the celebrated orator Isocrates. Much the same lesson was taught by him as by Hillel. Whatever would be disagreeable to ourselves, that, if we would be perfect, we must refrain from doing to others.

And yet earlier still. Five hundred and fifty years before our Lord lived the immortal prophet of China, Confucius. "*True reciprocity,*" he insisted, "*consists in not doing to others what you would not want done to yourself.*"

All these are but so many proofs that the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world was shining in the world's darkness. Hillel caught glimpses of that light, and

the writer of Tobit, and Aristotle, and Isocrates, and Confucius. They were not themselves that light, but, like a greater than themselves, of that light they came each of them in his own degree and to his own people to bear witness. The wisest of their teachings and sayings pales before the teachings and the sayings of Him of whom it is recorded that all men wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth.

For these sayings are at best only commands not to do what is hurtful. They are not like the golden rule of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself; for that tells us not only not to do what is hurtful, but also actually to do what is positively pleasing. "*All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them.*" This is indeed an all-embracing principle. This is a motive not merely for self-restraint, but for all our actions. It is all things that it speaks of, and all men, and whatever we do. Wherever we have any dealings at all with other people it guides our conduct. Never had such an idea entered men's heads before. Even the saying of Aristotle, which comes nearest to its beauty, only refers to friends. Our Lord Jesus Christ refers to everybody. Well indeed has it been called "The Golden Rule."

And still higher thoughts come into our minds about this truest of all principles of action, when we consider for a moment how it is put. "*Therefore,*" says our Lord. To what preceding statement does He refer? What reason does the statement give for acting on the rule? His last words immediately before spoke of the philanthropy of God Himself. "*How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?*" "*Therefore,*" He goes on. God gives His good things in answer to our aspirations, if only what we desire is really for our good. It is man's highest blessedness to be like God, to be perfect, even as our Father in heaven is perfect; and, therefore, in this point also, we must try to resemble His revealed glory. It is only what is good that we ought to desire for ourselves. It is only what is good that we ought to wish our neighbours to do for us. It is only what is good that we ought to do to them in correspondence to what we wish from them for ourselves. So perfect and beautiful an idea none of the heathen or Jewish moralists had approached. "*This is the law and the Prophets,*" said our Lord; but it was a summary to be derived, not, hitherto, a maxim for daily use. The other sayings are wanting in the completeness of our Lord's precept. Still further do they fall below it if we look at the ground on which the precept rests. And even yet more at fault are they as to the power given to perform it. Their command is "*Thou shalt not be disagreeable,*" our Lord's is

"*Thou shalt be loving.*" Their precept is for friends, our Lord's touches all men. Their ground is mere prudence, our Lord's is that, as God gives all good gifts to us, we must in gratitude love what belongs to Him. They could point to no power at all which should enable men to carry out their principles ; our Lord reveals that grace and strength of God which can be had even by the weakest of us in prayer at His throne. Without Him I can do nothing ; *I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.* Yes, in spite of selfishness and self-interest, and the pervading atmosphere of the world, even in all things, whatsoever he would that men should do unto him, even so can the servant of Christ do unto them.

Need we be urged to remember that what is good for us and what is good for them is implied throughout this teaching ? To extend it beyond this would be wicked. With all the wishes of those whom we meet we cannot comply, nor ought we to desire that they should comply with all of ours. Those wishes may be foolish, they may be frivolous, they may involve self-indulgence or what is unfitting. That would be harmful. We might wish men to flatter us ; how could we suppose that God would think it right that we should flatter them ? We might wish men to do all our work for us, and allow us to be idle ; how could it possibly be right for us to humour them in the same way, however much we loved them ? No ! The rule is only safe when our own will has first been purified and brought into subjection to the law of Christ, so that we wish from others only that which is really wholesome, good and true. Reciprocity in evil or in folly is plainly altogether foreign to the holy and Divine thought of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Few men have been more thoroughly pervaded with Christian feeling and principle in daily life than our own King Alfred. On one occasion his forces had been defeated by the swarming hordes of the heathen Danes, and he had retreated to Somersetshire. A beggar came one day before his little wooden fort at Athelney, and asked for alms. The Queen, his wife, told Alfred that they had only one small loaf left, which was not enough for themselves and their friends. All but those two had gone out in search of food, and in that wild and waste country there was little hope of success. But Alfred told the Queen to give to that poor Christian one half of the loaf. He who could feed five thousand men with five loaves and two small fishes could certainly make that half of the loaf sufficient for more than their necessities. The Queen obeyed, and the poor man was relieved. And God did not forget that labour of love, for the little loaf was soon replaced by a great

store of fresh provisions, with which Alfred's people, beyond all their hopes and expectations, returned.

The best man in the whole history of France was King Louis IX., better known by that title of saint which he so well deserved. He was once returning home by sea with his Queen and children. There was a storm. Some of the planks of his ship started with the violent blows of the waves. He was very nearly wrecked. The captain came, and earnestly begged the King to go into another vessel which was in company with the ship on which they had embarked. It was calmer now, but if another storm came on he feared their own would go to the bottom. No, said the King; he would stay where he was. Those who were with him, most assuredly, were as fond of their lives as he could possibly be of his. If he left the ship, they would also leave it; the other was not large enough to receive them all, so they would all be drowned. He would rather intrust his life, and the lives of his wife and children, in the hands of God than be the occasion of making so many of his brave subjects perish. I think there was more there than would have been done by the most enlightened heathen, even according to the precepts of Confucius, or Isocrates, or Aristotle; more than a Jew would have done even if he had followed the exalted teaching of Tobit or of Hillel.

There was a wise and good Frenchman, who has only lately passed away, a member of the Reformed Church, that Church with which Bishop Cosin recommended Englishmen abroad to communicate, rather than with the corrupt Church of France. When his father died, he became entitled to a large share of property. But he had a brother who was far less well off than himself. So he and his wife made up their minds that as they had already more than enough, they would hand over to the brother this superfluous share which had thus newly become theirs.

I give these little homely instances in order to show that high as the golden rule undoubtedly is, yet it can be carried out by a heart that is really given to God. Whosoever we have any dealings with our neighbour it would be well to act on the motto of that wholesome novelist whose memorial adorns the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral, and put ourselves in his place. If our neighbour is of lower birth or position than we, we must think how we ourselves should like to be told, "*Stand by, for I am better than thou.*" If our neighbour is a servant, we must think in what style we should desire a master or a mistress to speak to us supposing we were suddenly subjected to such employment. If you enjoy your day of rest, see that you do nothing to prevent others from having for themselves that inestimable privilege. If our neighbour is a dissenter, we

must imagine for a moment that the Dissenters formed the National Church, and that we were only members of one of the many small sects, and consider how we should wish ourselves to be treated. If we belong at any time to the ruling political party, we must fancy ourselves reduced to opposition, and reflect in what way we should desire our interests and principles to be handled. If we have great power in our hands, we must try and picture to ourselves how we should wish to see that power used if we were one of those men or those institutions whom that power can make or mar. If we belong to any plausible and exemplary charitable society, we must put ourselves in the place of the defenceless poor, and reckon up in our mind what rage and indignation and gnashing of teeth would be ours if, whenever misfortune had overtaken us, and we needed a little Christian charity, our whole poor pitiful life, full of errors and sins, as we know it to be, was to be at the mercy of the ill-informed and malicious gossip of our neighbours, which gossip was to be remorselessly recorded in a book, and fixed with a number, and put into an index for future reference. If anyone is a smart master of epigram, and loves to make men's ears tingle with his brilliant wit or his masterful snub, let him remember how tyrannical is such use of caustic humour, and try to reproduce in his own self-complacent mind the poisonous venom which his cruel shaft has left to rankle in some modest and harmless breast. If anyone is so certain of all his own beliefs, down to the minutest detail, that he is sure that everybody who disagrees with him is wrong, let him endeavour, at any rate, to represent to himself how he would feel if they also, believing like himself in the Lord Jesus Christ, should, with equal superiority, call him heretic, and no Churchman, or some other sobriquet of unchristian contempt. Or if we are speaking of anybody behind his back, and gloating over his faults, and making merry with his eccentricities and mistakes, well would it be to pause a moment in the midst of our laughter, and think how we should wince and shudder if we could hear him at that moment doing the same by ourselves.

Who amongst modern Christians pays enough attention to the golden rule? Who makes all the excuses for his friend that he makes for himself? Who judges others by the easy standard which he sets up for his own conduct? And yet what depth of sympathy do we not owe to each of the sons and daughters of our loving and gracious Father in heaven? "Every single one of our kind," it has been said by one whose words command a hearing,<sup>1</sup> "is made in the image of God, street-arab and all alike. Each is a soul, a spirit, a Divine

<sup>1</sup> Carlyle.

apparition! Round the mysterious self of each, under all the outward differences of position, there has grown to each the same simple garment of flesh or of senses, woven not of men, but of the loom of heaven; whereby each is revealed to his like, and dwells with them for a short space of years in real union, and only seeming division; and " (according to the chances which his fellow-men give him) " each alike sees and fashions for himself a universe with azure starry spaces and long thousands of years. . . . All this comes equally into the mind of each, deep-hidden under that garment of flesh; swathed in he may seem and almost inextricably overshrouded with the false lights and forms and colours with which men have surrounded him, but all the same he is the son of heaven and worthy of a God" (else God would not have let him be born). ". . . Stands not each one of us alike in ever-stretching vistas of immensity, and where one eternity joins another? Each feels alike; to each alike has power been given to know and to believe; nay, does not the Spirit of Love, whom none have ever smirched or fettered, look through each of us at times, though but for moments, free in its celestial brightness? Well said St. Chrysostom with the lips of gold, 'The true Shekinah is man': where else" (unless it be in the audience-chamber itself) "is God's presence manifested not to our eyes only, but to our hearts, as it is in each and all of our fellows?" All are of the same dignity, all have the same rank, all may have the same worth, for all have the same mystery, and the same breath of God.

When once we have felt this, and that for all alike Christ has died if they will only believe it, that all alike He loves if they will only know it, then it is with quite other eyes that we look on the sins and follies that disgrace our human comrades. We begin to feel an infinite love, an infinite pity. "Poor wandering wayward man," we say with Carlyle, "is it not greatly the fault of thy brothers that thou art so tired and beaten with stripes, and failest so miserably? Whether thou bearest the royal mantle or the beggar's gaberdine, art thou not beset with the weariness and cares which others cause thee? 'O my brother, my brother!' we cry when we see the drunkard, the spendthrift, and the profligate, why can I not shelter thee in my bosom, and wipe away all tears from thine eyes? What can I find to do for thee that I may better thee, and remind thee of what thou art? Thus the din of many-voiced life is no longer a maddening discord, but a melting one; like inarticulate cries, or sabbings of a dumb creature, which in the ear of heaven are prayers; the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain together, waiting for the adoption of sons. And man, with his mad wants and mean endeavours,

becomes dearer to us, and even for his sufferings and his sins" (when we think of God in Christ), "we call him brother with no feigned lips."

If we love our Father in heaven it is easy to love our fellows, because they are dear to Him who is so good to us. That which belongs to one whom we love entwines itself with natural tendrils round our very heart of hearts. I think I see some of us (I am adapting words I once heard from Bishop Boyd Carpenter) going at times to some quiet country church-yard or silent crypt, and there, alone and apart from all eyes, our head droops and the unbidden tear starts, and the spot is more sacred to us perhaps than another. What is it that we find? Only a stone, only a gentle mound in the mown grass, only a few flowers, only a few ashes below the soil. Yet that place belongs to the memory of one we loved, and love it we must. Or who is there amongst us who has not some little private secret drawer, or box with careful lock, and sometimes we steal alone to our room and unfasten that little hiding-place which looks so common, and take out reverently some treasure which is perhaps more precious to us than gold? What is it? Only perhaps a little lock of hair, only a withered violet, only possibly a faded packet of old letters quite out of date, only perhaps a little baby's shoe. Yet there are old voices and memories connected with those slight things which makes their value to us quite inestimable. And as we look at them the sunny scenes come back of the days that are no more, and there is a magic in them which surpasses the wand of the magician. We love them for the sake of the beloved to whom they once belonged, to whom we feel they still belong!

So should it be with the things that belong to the living God, the men whom He has created in His own image. They belong to Him, they are His, they speak to us of Him, they are living witnesses to us of His love, His providence, His care. Him we cannot see, but we can see the human creatures which He has made. Them we must love, because He loves them, and we love Him. Them we must pity, because He pities them. For them we must think, and feel, and pray, and labour, because He, our own tender, heavenly Father, is working for them, too, and slumbers not nor sleeps in His ceaseless, unremitting care for their souls and bodies. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets." So said our Master. But since He said those words we can add yet a stronger reason, for this is why He who said them died upon the cross!

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

## ART. III.—“THE FULNESS OF THE GENTILES.”

THAT expression, “the fulness of the Gentiles” (Rom. xi. 25), is one of the first importance, for many things depend upon it. First, the period of Israel’s national blindness and rejection of her Messiah; second, the time allotted by God to missionary work amongst the heathen; and, third (we may also believe), the day of our Lord’s return—centre upon the hour when that epoch shall have arrived.

It is needful at the threshold of our subject to analyze the word translated “fulness,” both in the Authorized and Revised Versions. Now, the late Bishop Lightfoot has left us in his “Commentary upon the Colossians” a long and careful essay upon the use of the word *πλήρωμα* in the New Testament, and two or three of the leading thoughts in that essay may here be given. The verb *πληροῦν*, from which *πλήρωμα* comes, occurs about *one hundred* times in the New Testament. It has two meanings, viz., “to fill” and “to fulfil,” and it is translated with the latter meaning quite four times more frequently than with the former. The substantive which occurs in the text with which I began means, according to Lightfoot, “that which is completed,” i.e., “the complement,” “the full tale,” so that when a certain number is in view (as the number of the elect known by God), a time will arrive when that exact number is reached, and then the *πλήρωμα* is accomplished.

We should be mistaken, then, if we were to explain “the fulness of the Gentiles” by such an expression as “the whole” or “all” of the Gentiles. It seems, on the contrary, according to Lightfoot, that *πλήρωμα* is not used by the Apostles St. Paul and St. John as a word connected with the meaning to *fill*, but with the meaning to *fulfil*, and that it therefore does not mean the whole of the Gentiles, but *that which is completed* of the Gentiles; the full tale of a certain number laid down and foreseen by God. When this number is complete, when the *πλήρωμα* has been called forth (the full complement or number of those who *out of* the Gentiles believe God and the testimony He has given concerning the Son of His love), then, as I believe, the fourth chapter of the Thessalonians shall be accomplished, and the Church of the firstborn, formed of true believers, of Jews and Gentiles, a temple of living stones, shall be removed from earth to the presence of the Lord—the marriage supper of the Lamb. This view, if I understand it aright, is in direct antagonism to the idea (held still, I imagine, by many) that the Gentile, or heathen, world is to be converted before the coming of Christ.

If any of my readers hold that view, I merely ask that they will read their Bibles again *without that idea* just for an experiment, and see what the result will be to their judgment.

Let us briefly consider that aspect of the question : *The heathen world is to be converted before Christ comes.*

There are *three* solid reasons to be brought forward against that view : (1) The Lord left behind Him the promise of His return at any moment to be the cheer and comfort of His Church ; and it is only the *lothful* servant who saith, "My Lord delayeth His coming until the heathen world is converted." Is it likely that the Lord would have left an expectation behind Him so deadening to the spirit as this ? (2) A remarkable little book came before the world a few years ago called "*A Century of Missions.*" One of the startling things which it revealed, based upon apparently unimpeachable returns, was that the heathen population of the world is rapidly and enormously *increasing*—not from the failure of missionary work, nothing of the kind, but from the humane legislation of Christian governments over great heathen populations (such as ours over India), by which barbarous practices to young and old, the traffic in slaves, human sacrifices, and internecine wars are repressed. Our small missionary efforts are steadily bringing in a few everywhere to God, but they are almost as nothing to the great increase of the heathen themselves under our sway. This fact does not look like the conversion of the world before our Lord's return. (3) This idea seems to many of us to be contrary to the whole tenor of many of our Lord's words—to such a chapter as 2 Tim. iii., and to such an expression as this, "*Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.*"

Very different from this view, and yet not quite Scriptural, as I imagine, is the other, held by many, that the Gospel must be "*preached as a witness*" in all nations before the return of our Lord. He Himself has said that it must so be preached before the end of *this dispensation*; but that is not the same thing. Many students of prophecy hold that this is to be the work of the godly Jewish remnant, after the Church has been taken up, and that a considerable period intervenes between the coming of our Lord for His Church and the *end* of the dispensation. It is, I suppose, pretty clear that "*the great tribulation*" lies between those two events, and perhaps many other things; and it is a delaying of His return to say that it cannot be till the preaching of the Gospel, even as a *witness* in all nations, has first taken place.

The view suggested by the text is, I believe, as follows : The certain number foreseen by God as coming in from the Gentile

world is now being made up, and may be made up at any time, quite independent of the end of the age. When it is completed, then 1 Thess. iv. tells us what shall follow. *After that* many, both Jews and Gentiles, though not part of the bride or "Church of the Firstborn," shall be saved, when God's judgments are in all the world, by the preaching of "the gospel of the kingdom," through Jewish agency, to which probably St. Paul refers (Rom. xi. 12-15). *After that, again*, but not in this dispensation, "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the *glory* of the Lord"; at that time, viz., in the millennial reign, the Old Testament prophecies of Isaiah ii. and Micah iv., and multitudes of passages of the same kind in the Psalms, etc., about the Gentiles flocking into the temple of the Lord and the Messiah reigning over them gloriously, shall be fulfilled. This is all very different from the teaching that bids us wait for the conversion of the world *before* our Lord's return. We wait for the Lord as those that watch for the morning; but we have, as faithful watchmen, to proclaim, "*The morning cometh and also the night.*" The Church's hope loses its heartiness, power, and practical efficacy under the weary shadow of waiting for the world's conversion.

To repeat in a different form what I have already advanced. The former, or Abrahamic, age, till Christ's first advent, was the dispensation of Israel — afterwards, when Christ was rejected by His own, the blindness or hardening in part happened unto Israel as a nation, until, the Gospel being preached to the Gentiles, the full tale of them (even the Gentiles who have a share in Christ's *glory*) should be received into His Church, the Bride; that is the season in which we now live. This is the period when the spiritual Church is being built and the Bride is being made ready. But when the complement from the Gentiles is made up, then the Gentile history of *grace* and the Church period shall cease, Christ will come *for* His Church, and His Bride shall be caught up to meet Him. *After this* shall be, we believe, the days of trouble, of which the sorrows of Jerusalem were a miniature and foreshadowing. *After that again*, when trouble is at its height (as He came to the disciples in the boat on Galilee), Christ shall visibly appear not *for* His Church, but *with* it, as the Jews' once-rejected Messiah, now their Deliverer—not to take them to heaven, but to destroy their enemies and to turn away ungodliness from Jacob in the place of His power on the earth. Then the evil powers of rebellious heathenism shall be cut off, with the professing Laodicean Church and Popery, and such-like superstitions, and then we 'believe that Israel shall be delivered from its

blindness, and being saved nationally (which, of course, cannot take place while the *Church period* is going on, where there is neither Jew nor Greek), shall turn to the Messiah, who will reign over the house of Jacob for ever. Thus converted, Israel shall have a different position from the Church of the Firstborn—into it (the latter) now, and in the past, both Jew and Gentile are admitted as individuals, as living stones, and this shall have been completed before Elijah the prophet comes to fulfil his mission to Israel and to prepare them for the Lord.

Viewed in this light, what a new importance is imparted to missionary work! and what intense reality! We are not engaged in operations which in the days of our children or grandchildren may pave the way for our Master's coming and rear gradually in the course of generations a temple for our God—we should work like those who listen every moment for the sound of the chariot-wheels—we ourselves may be—yes, I will venture further—we may *expect* to be among the workers who shall see the headstone brought out with shoutings. This view of the meaning of the words “the fulness of the Gentiles” brings the end of our work very near—“known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world”—we know not how soon this work shall be accomplished and the exact number of those among the Gentiles brought into His Church. How this should stimulate us to burning enthusiasm in our Master's cause! Perhaps an earnest prayer offered by one who reads these words may bring down a blessing upon some worker in the Mission Field, and so be the means of bringing in the last one to complete the πλήρωμα; and then, what remains to hinder the coming of our Lord!

J. H. TOWNSEND.

---

ART. IV.—CHAUCER'S RELIGIOUS SYMPATHIES.

IT is clear, from the “Canterbury Tales,” that Chaucer had a very low opinion of the established religion of his time. Again and again we find him attacking clerical abuses, and pouring scorn upon the pride, worldliness, and venality of the Churchmen of his day. Professor Reed, in his excellent work on English literature, says: “The writings of Chaucer have an interest in connection with ecclesiastical history; for, abounding as they do in keen and earnest satire of clerical and monastic abuses, they have truly been reckoned among the means by which popular sentiment was animated and prepared

for the great change of the Reformation." Nor was Chaucer alone in his keen and earnest satire of clerical and monastic vices. In the same age we find men of a like spirit who lashed ecclesiastical abuses with an unsparing hand, such as Gower, Longlande, the author of "The Vision of Piers Ploughman," Froissart, Grossteste, Bradwardine, Wycliffe; and Chaucer would hardly have run the risk of attacking the corruptions of the all-powerful Church and clergy if he had not sympathized in some measure with the views and feelings of these men. How keenly he attacks them! With what ridicule and contempt he covers them! This acute observer of life describes them as licentious, profligate, and avaricious, "full of dalliance and fair language," "easy to give penance," knowing well "the taverns in every town," begging at the beds of sick men, and asking of the housewives "mele and cheese or ellis corne," swindling even the poorest widow out of her mite.

The poor man's money gone to fat the friar,  
as Tennyson puts it in his "Sir John Oldcastle," and all the while, amid the farrago of old stories with which they pleased their gaping audience, taking up the hypocritical cry, "Radix malorum est cupiditas." Some writers assert that Chaucer greeted Wycliffe's reforming work with joy, and that it is his character he delineates in his poem of "The Good Parson."

A true good man there was of religion,  
Pious and poor, the parson of a town,  
But rich he was in holy thought and work,  
And thereto a right learned man, a clerk  
That Christ's pure gospel would sincerely preach,  
And his parishioners devoutly teach.  
Benign he was, and wondrous diligent,  
And in adversity full patient,  
As proven oft, to all who lack'd a friend.  
Loth for his tithes to ban or to contend,  
At every need much rather was he found  
Unto his poor parishioners around  
Of his own substance and his dues to give,  
Content on little, for himself, to live.

He waited not on pomp or reverence,  
Nor made himself a spiced conscience,  
The love of Christ and His apostles twelve  
He taught; but first he followed it himself.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A German writer contends that Chaucer and Wycliffe were friends. Warton and others claim him as an Oxford man; and if he studied there it is more than probable that he sat at the feet of Wycliffe, who lectured as Professor of Divinity, and imbibed the doctrines of the great Reformer. His remarkable familiarity with the Bible, and the knowledge he displays of divinity, would afford some ground for this view, or at all events might be adduced as an argument in favour of the hypothesis that he was at least acquainted with Wycliffe, then labouring at the great work which he gave to the world a few years later, the translation of the Bible into English.

The students of Oxford in that day were, as we learn from his pictured page, as strongly marked out into reading men and fast men as they are in our own day. Among the motley company that rode out of the Tabard hostelry, bound for the shrine of St. Thomas à Becket at Canterbury, there was "a clerk of Oxenforde," lean and logical, who would rather have had twenty red or black bound books at his bed's head than wear the richest robes or revel in the sweetest joys of music; and in contrast to this enthusiastic bookworm and scholar, the Miller in his tale gives a full-length portrait of the dissolute "parish clerk Absolon," who, clad in lisen red and light-blue kirtle, with a snowy surplice flowing around his dainty limbs, and the windows of St. Paul's carved upon his shoes, minced through the service of the parish church. And there can be no doubt as to which of them has the sympathies of the poet. It may be said that it was his object to present a picture of society as it existed in his day, and that in doing this he was obliged to paint the monks and other ecclesiastics as he found them, and to give voice to the popular sentiment concerning them. But this would not account for the heartiness with which he performs that duty, nor for his evident liking for the poor parson. It would not make it necessary for him to bite so sharply and deal such heavy blows as he does. He evidently likes his work. There is a manifest pleasure in the castigation which he administers. He knows they deserve it, and he has no mercy.

They were stirring and eventful times in which Chaucer lived. Edward III. and the Black Prince had won the splendid victories of Cressy and Poictiers, and the banner of St. George had been borne in triumph beyond the waters of the Ebro and to the very walls of Florence. And while our arms triumphed abroad, the arts of peace were cultivated at home. The people tilled the soil, adorned and enriched their towns, and gave themselves to the extension of commerce. And the revival of commerce was followed by the revival of learning. The English mind was waking up from the slumber of ages. Colleges were founded in connection with the two Universities, and many students might be heard within them in high and sometimes fierce debate on the merits of Nominalism and Realism, the great subjects of disputation all over Western Europe in that age. At this period was formed the language which we speak —a language which in strength, richness, and aptitude for all the highest purposes of the poet, the philosopher, and the rhetorician is excelled by the copious and forcible tongue of Greece alone. And with the formation of our language our literature arose. It was an age of show and splendour. Great lords kept princely state in the country, and when they went

abroad they were attended with a great retinue of servants. Religion was picturesque, and appealed emphatically to the senses, with bishops and abbots and cathedrals, and sweet-smelling incense and gorgeous processions and pilgrimages on a large scale, with their usual attendants of bells, bagpipes, and buffoons, to the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury, or that of Our Lady at Walsingham. The yeoman kept open house ; the city merchant feasted kings ; the outlaw robbed jolly abbots, or transfixed deer in the noble's park ; ladies and fine gentlemen, with hawks on their wrists, rode forth in brilliant array for a day's sport. It was a shallow, unreal, artificial, conventional age. Pleasure ruled in the hearts of men, and religion was a thing of outward show and pretence, a bowing of the knee and a smiting of the breast, while the inner life of the soul grovelled in the slavish degradation of its original state. Fiction, romance, legends of saints, cloistered seclusion, and systems of formalities—these were the food of the human mind. For six hundred years the Romish Church had been riveting chains of slavery upon the necks of men, and every day the yoke was becoming more galling. But a change is at hand. Amid all this brilliant life and pageantry and pleasure there is a restlessness which augurs good for the time to come. The spirit of inquiry begins to manifest itself. The incipient glow of the coming day is faintly seen gilding "the misty mountain-tops" of the east, and it hardly needs the prophetic gift to declare : " Lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, and the time of the singing of birds is come." Now appeared the "Canterbury Tales." And there can be no doubt that a man like Chaucer would enter heartily into the great questions of the day ; and a movement like Wycliffe's, which stirred the community from end to end, would interest him immensely. Both of them attacked the vices of the friars, but each in doing so followed the bent of his own genius. Chaucer, it has been remarked, aimed at the fraternity the shafts of his wit, while Wycliffe planted against them the artillery of reason and Scripture. Every third man one met in the street, we are told, was a Lollard. Poor and rich, nobles and commons, were excited on this particular question raised by the last great Schoolman, and shall we suppose that the poet, the keenest observer and the sharpest critic of all England, was unmoved ? If the "Canterbury Tales" were written to expose the absurdities of pilgrimages, and to show that the piety they assumed was a sham and a pretence, it is not strange that Chaucer should paint in the brightest colours the character of one who was not a sham, but a real man. A glance at the poor parson's character shows that its traits are just those which Wycliffe looked for in the

poor priests who preached the new doctrines on the highways and in the hamlets of England. The parson was a good man, "holy of thought and werk," and

Christ's pure Gospel would sincerely preach.

The pilgrims recognised him as a Lollard, when he rebuked the host for profanity. The host said he smelt a Lollard in the wind, and expected a "predication," or sermon. The Shipman hastened to tell his tale, saying :

Here shall he not preche,  
He shall no Gospel glosen here ne teche.  
We leuen all in the great God, quod he,  
He wolde sownen some difficultee,  
Or springen cockle in our clene corne.

This episode shows clearly that the poor parson was one of Wycliffe's priests, for any other man would have hastened to deny the imputation put upon him by the host and the sailor.

At last the parson is called upon for a tale. He has heard the "fables" of the other pilgrims, and tells them candidly that they need expect no such things from him :

Thow getist fable noon i-told for me,  
For Poul, that writeth unto Timothe,  
Reproveth him that weyyveth sothfastnesse,  
And tellen fables, and such wrecchednesse.

The references seem to be to those words of the Apostle, "Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying, which is in faith." "Now the spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. . . . But refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness." "Preach the word, be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (1 Tim. i. 4; iv. 1-7; 2 Tim. iv. 2-4). In these passages St. Paul reproves the circulation of fables or false doctrines, argues against celibacy and abstinence from meats, and exhorts to the faithful discharge of ministerial

duties. They are just the passages that the Roman clergy would at that time have ignored and avoided. The parson says :

If that you list to here  
 Moralitee and vertuous matere,  
 And then that ye wol geve me audience  
 I wold ful fain at Cristes reverence  
 Don you plesance leful, as I can.

There is nothing here to remind one of the other men of religion, nor is there when the good man continues, and prays "Jesu for His grace" to send him wit to point out to his fellow-travellers the way

Of thilke parfit, glorious pilgrimage,  
 That hight Jerusalem celestial.

And then, when he learns from those who are present that they will gladly hear him, he gives them an address on penitence which, though containing many sentiments at variance with those held by the great Reformer, is, on the whole, in keeping with his Wycliffian character. He discourses on sin in general, the seven deadly sins in particular, and on penance, confession, and kindred themes. It has been held by many writers on Chaucerian literature that much of "the Person's Tale," as it is called, is apocryphal and the work of the monks, who thus sought to identify the great poet with their beliefs and teachings. The opinion now generally held by the best judges is that, after omitting large portions of the tale, which are incongruous, the brief sermon on penitence—not penance—which remains is Chaucerian in diction and symmetrical in form, and is entirely at one with the doctrines and views held and promulgated by him whom we must always think of as the other great literary light of the period. It seems reasonable, then, to conclude that if not by profession and before the world, in his heart at least Chaucer was a Wycliffite.

There are, no doubt, many admirers of Chaucer who are not admirers of Wycliffe, and who have no sympathy with the great work which he accomplished. He did not, indeed, come up to the present standards of Protestantism, but he prepared the way for the reformers who came after. He cut down the briars and thorns, and cleared away the rubbish, that impeded men's progress in their movements towards a higher life; he filled up the valleys, levelled the hills, removed obstructions, and let light in upon the foulness and quagmires and pitfalls that lay about everywhere, and in which so many had perished without remedy. Like John the Baptist, Wycliffe was the pioneer in a great work, but he still retained some of the errors against which protest was afterwards so emphatically made by men who had more light and saw deeper into the

truth. To a great extent he was under bondage to his times. And what is true of Wycliffe is, in a larger degree, true of Chaucer. Neither of them must be judged in the light of the Reformation, much less in the light, so full and glorious, of the present day. It would be unfair to judge of Chaucer by the standard which we apply to Shakespeare, and still more by that which we apply to Wordsworth or Tennyson. It is safe, however, to say that his sympathies were with reform, and it is by no means improbable that he accepted the doctrines of his great contemporary, the master spirit in the assault upon the dominant Church, the first translator of the whole Bible into the English tongue, the creator, with Chaucer himself, of the English language and literature, the man who has been well called "the Morning Star of the Reformation."

WILLIAM COWAN.

---

#### ART. V.—THE LINCOLN JUDGMENT.

ON the second of last month the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council pronounced their decision upon the appeal brought to them against so much of the Archbishop of Canterbury's judgment delivered on November 21, 1890, in the suit of Read and Others *v.* the Bishop of Lincoln, as was in favour of the accused Prelate. The one-sided hearing of the appeal — for it will be remembered that the Bishop declined to appear—took place in June and July of last year, so that the Judicial Committee spent more than twelve months in making up their minds. In an article contributed to this Magazine by the present writer in January, 1891, the appeal (which had not then been lodged) was alluded to as inevitable, but the hope was expressed that it would fail all along the line. This is what has actually occurred; and the vast majority of Churchmen will agree that the result is to be hailed with thankfulness and satisfaction, as conducive not only to the peace, but also to the well-being of the Church.

The points on appeal to the Judicial Committee were five in number. The Archbishop had adjudged Bishop King to have been guilty of no ecclesiastical offence in having been a party to the following ceremonies: (1) The administration of a mixed chalice of wine and water; (2) the ablution of the paten and chalice after the service; (3) the singing of the *Agnus Dei* after the consecration of the elements; (4) the adoption of the eastward position before the Prayer of Consecration; and (5) the use of lighted candles on the Communion Table in daylight.

On the second of these points, the ablution of the paten and chalice after the service, there had been no previous legal adjudication; but the third, the singing of the *Agnus*, had been twice condemned by Sir Robert Phillimore as Judge of the Arches Court of Canterbury, without any attempt having been made on either occasion to upset his decision on appeal; and the other three practices had been condemned by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in previous ecclesiastical suits. The adoption of the eastward position at the beginning of the Communion service had also been independently condemned by Sir Robert Phillimore. The Church Association, therefore, in carrying up their appeal to the Judicial Committee, had good hope of success on most, if not all, of the points on which they sought to reverse the Archbishop's judgment. Let us see the grounds upon which their hope has been frustrated.

1. With reference to the administration of the mixed chalice, the Judicial Committee have distinctly dissented from, and decided counter to, the judgment of their predecessors in the suit of *Hebbert v. Purchas* (reported in Law Reports, Privy Council Cases, vol. iii., p. 605). In that case, as in the recent proceedings, the defendant did not appear or submit any arguments to the Committee. But they decided against him, in his absence, that the rubric in our present Prayer-Book does not allow wine mixed with water to be administered to the communicants, whether the water be mingled with wine before or during the Communion service. The question of mingling the two as a ceremonial part of the service was not before the Judicial Committee on the recent occasion, since it had been pronounced illegal by the Archbishop. But they have now reversed the earlier decision with respect to the previous addition of water to the wine, and have decided that so long as the quantity added is not so great as to cause the wine to lose its distinctive character as wine, there is no illegality in making the addition before the chalice is placed upon the Holy Table. It is unnecessary to repeat the reasons which were submitted in the former article in favour of this being recognised as the law of our Church. The Judicial Committee point out that in the first Prayer-Book of King Edward VI. the word "wine" is applied to the mixture of wine and water which is enjoined in that book. They might have added that the word "wine" is similarly used in the Act 1 Edw. VI. c. 1 (against such as unreverently speak against the Sacrament, and for the receiving thereof in both kinds), which was passed in the year before that Prayer-Book was authorised. In the narratives of the institution of the Lord's Supper the word used is "cup" (*ποτήριον*), and not

wine. But even if *οἶνος* had been distinctly mentioned, it would have implied a mixed beverage of wine and water, according to the statement of Plutarch that the people of his time gave the name of wine to such a mixture, even though the water predominated in quantity (*τὸ κράμα καίτοι ὕδατος μέτεχον πλείστους οἴνον καλοῦμεν*).

2. The Committee had no difficulty in acquitting the Bishop on the second charge of rinsing the paten and chalice after the service. It was in no sense a ceremony, nor a part of the service. The Bishop explained it as having been done with the intention of complying with the rubric, which directs the reverent consumption of what is left of the consecrated elements. Assuming that he had shown excessive care and scruple in the method of performing the prescribed duty, this certainly could not constitute an ecclesiastical offence.

3. The sanction by the Bishop of the singing of the *Agnus Dei* in English by the choir after the consecration of the elements was the next point under consideration. As already stated, the practice had previously been condemned by Sir Robert Phillimore in the cases of Elphinstone *v.* Purchas and Martin *v.* Mackonochie (suit No. 2) (Law Reports, Admiralty and Ecclesiastical Cases, vol. iii., p. 66; vol. iv., p. 279). The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had, however, never before been called upon to adjudicate upon it. They have now overruled Sir Robert Phillimore, and have upheld the decision of the Archbishop, who had pronounced in favour of its legality. It was admitted, they said, that it was not illegal to introduce a hymn or anthem at some points during the service at which there is no order or permission in the Prayer-Book for their insertion. The usage in the matter is too universal to be called in question, and it is immaterial whether or not it is founded on the sixth section of the first Act of Uniformity (2 & 3 Edw. VI., c. 1), which enacts that "it shall be lawful for all men as well in churches, chapels oratories or other places to use openly any psalm or prayer taken out of the Bible at any due time, not letting or omitting thereby the service or any part thereof mentioned in the said book" (*i.e.*, the Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church after the use of the Church of England). The Committee referred to the fact that in Wither's "*Hymns and Songs of the Church*," licensed by James I. and Charles I., a custom is mentioned as then existing of a psalm or hymn being sung during the administration of the Sacrament, in order to keep the thoughts of the communicants from wandering. The *Agnus* complained of was a combination of two passages of Scripture, and was found in more than one place in the

Prayer-Book. They declined, therefore, to condemn its use as sanctioned by the Bishop.

4. The fourth subject of appeal, the adoption of the eastward position during the Communion before the Prayer of Consecration, occupies a larger portion of the judgment of the committee than any of the other points. It had been condemned by their predecessors in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*, already referred to. It had also been independently condemned by Sir Robert Phillimore in the same suit (*Elphinstone v. Purchas*, cited above). The words of the rubric at the commencement of the Communion service, directing the priest to stand at the north side of the table, appear in themselves clear and unmistakable. But the history of the rubric, and the fact of the situation of the table having been changed, so that instead of its longer sides facing north and south, as was the case when the rubric was first framed, they now face east and west, have introduced an element of uncertainty into the matter. We all remember the conclusion to which the Archbishop came after a lengthy review of the whole subject. He considered that while long custom had undoubtedly made the position at the north end of the table, looking southwards, a lawful use in our church, yet the change in the situation of the table, by which what had once been the north side had become the west side, warranted the adoption of the eastward position by the officiating clergyman throughout the Communion service. The Committee have practically adopted this view, and reversed the former decisions on the point. "Their lordships," they say, "are not to be understood as indicating an opinion that it would be contrary to the law to occupy a position at the north end of the table while saying the opening prayers. All that they determine is that it is not an ecclesiastical offence to stand at the northern part of the side which faces eastwards." As has been pointed out in letters to the newspapers, the west side is evidently meant in this last sentence. It is to be observed that the decision of the Judicial Committee does not entirely cover that of the Archbishop. The accused Bishop had stood at the northern part of the west side of the table, and all that the committee had to decide was as to the legality or otherwise of this. The Archbishop went further, and, while not condemning the Bishop for his exact position, held that the middle of the west side was the more correct place to stand. It was not necessary for the Judicial Committee to endorse this view, and they have abstained from doing so. Their judgment has, however, established the legality throughout the service of the eastward position, which had previously been held by the Judicial Committee to be legal only during, and perhaps after,

the Prayer of Consecration. In so doing they have decided the kernel of the matter against the Church Association; and the question at what precise part of the west side of the table the officiating clergyman may or may not stand is one of comparatively little moment.

5. The last point before the Committee was the use of lighted candles on the table during the Communion service when not required for the purpose of giving light. On this subject the Judicial Committee, in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie* (Law Reports, Privy Council Cases, vol. ii., p. 365), had condemned as unlawful the ceremonial lighting and burning of candles on the Holy Table when not required for light, and had also declared that the lighted candles, under such circumstances, were unlawful ornaments. The Bishop of Lincoln was accused of having used and permitted to be used lighted candles under similar circumstances as a matter of ceremony; and the Committee pointed out that the words, "as a matter of ceremony," were an essential part of the charge against him. It was not pretended that he had himself placed the candles on the table or lit them. They might be illegal ornaments, but he was not responsible for their being there. He could only have been guilty of an illegal act in connection with them, by having used them or permitted them to be used as a matter of ceremony; and the sole evidence of his having done this was that they had remained there lighted during the whole of the service without any objection on his part. The Committee do not consider that this omission to take objection constituted an ecclesiastical offence. Nor, they add, "are they prepared to hold that a clergyman who takes any part in the celebration of Divine service in a church in which unlawful ornaments are present necessarily uses them as a matter of ceremony." They have, therefore, acquitted the Bishop on this head without impugning the decision of their predecessors on the subject, in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie* already mentioned. They have consequently not endorsed all the historical research and reasoning with which the Archbishop's judgment is replete on the subject of what are popularly called "altar-lights"; and, as far as the authority of the Final Court of Appeal is concerned, the question of their intrinsic legality or illegality remains where it was before the recent judgment. All that has been decided is that a clergyman, not responsible for their having been placed on the table or lighted, does not commit an offence in conducting or taking part in the service while they remain there.

Such are, in brief, the decisions of the Committee on the different points under appeal. But there are two general

features of the judgment which call for special notice. In the first place, the line adopted by the Archbishop of referring back to primitive and pre-Reformation usage and to contemporaneous histories and other documents for the purpose of elucidating the meaning and force of the rubrics in the Prayer-Book is distinctly approved. It had been objected to on the part of the promoters of the suit, though their counsel, Sir Horace Davey, in his argument before the Judicial Committee, said that he did not deny, and he thought no lawyer or any other person who understood the history of his country would deny, the legal continuity of the Church of England (*Times*, June 12, 1891, p. 3). But the Judicial Committee declared that the Archbishop had been right in the investigations in which he had engaged, and of which he embodied the results in his judgment. To a certain extent they themselves adopted the same line of reasoning, although, from the view which they took of some of the charges, it was unnecessary for them to follow the Primate throughout the whole of his researches. In the next place, the Committee were as careful as the Archbishop had been to point out the entire absence of any doctrinal significance in the various practices, of which the legality was impugned in the proceedings before them. In reference to the eastward position, the words of the judgment upon the point are so weighty that it is well to transcribe them in full :

Before discussing the matter in its relation to the express words of the rubric, their lordships cannot forbear from observing that it is impossible to assign to the directions in the rubric any meaning, either positively or negatively, which touches matters of doctrine. Whatever the position of the priest may be, it is the same whether there is or is not a celebration of the Lord's Supper ; and the rubric, immediately before the Prayer for the Church Militant, shows that what is described as the Communion service may be used—at least, that the part of it down to the end of that prayer may be used—without the celebration of the Lord's Supper at all. This is also plain from the first rubric at the end of the entire service. The question is, therefore, by the form of the charge, whether the position of the respondent, on the occasion to which the charge relates, constituted an ecclesiastical offence. It is difficult to understand the importance which has been attached by the appellants to the position of the priest during the early part of the Communion service. It appears to be suggested that the eastward position at the Holy Table is significant of the act of the priest being a sacrificial one. The Archbishop has pointed out that, in his opinion, this view is erroneous ; but, quite apart from this, if there be any such significance in the position of the officiating priest, and if the intention of those who framed the rubrics now in force was to prohibit a position which could be interpreted as indicating a sacrificial act, it is obvious that the prohibition would have been specially aimed at the position during the consecration of the elements. Yet it has been decided by this Committee, and the appellants did not seek to impeach the decision, that the celebrant may at that time stand at the middle of the table facing eastwards. If this be lawful, of what importance can it

be to insist that he shall during the two prayers with which the service commences place himself at that part of the table which faces towards the north? And this is all that is now in controversy. The point at issue has been sometimes stated to be whether the eastward position is lawful, but this is scarcely accurate. Even if the contention that the priest must stand at that part of the table which faces northward were well founded, there is nothing to make his saying the Lord's Prayer and the opening collect with his face eastward unlawful; the only question is whether he can lawfully do so when occupying a position near the north corner of the west side of the table. Of what moment is it, or can it ever have been, to insist that he should, during the two prayers with which the service commences, place himself at that part of the table which faces towards the north, if it be lawful to stand at the middle of the table facing eastward during the Prayer of Consecration? The very necessity of occupying the position which it is contended is alone legal during the early part of the service would serve to emphasize the subsequent change of position, and to render the position assumed at the time the elements are consecrated the more significant. (*Times*, Aug. 3 1892, p. 5.)

May we venture to hope that, after the emphatic pronouncements both of the Archbishop and the Judicial Committee, we shall hear no more of any doctrinal importance being attached to the matters which have now been decided to be beyond question lawful. Whatever may have been the case in the past, it is henceforth permissible to us—nay, more, it is our duty—to regard them as mere matters of taste.

At the annual meeting of the Church Association in May, the chairman said that they were still anxiously waiting for a decision, the most momentous, he believed, which had been delivered by a Supreme Court for the past three centuries; for upon it depended very much more than was generally supposed—the fate of the Church of England and the liberties of the country. Without looking on the recent judgment from the same point of view as Captain Cobham, we may agree with him as to its importance, and as to its influence on the fate of the Church and on the liberties, if not of the whole country, at any rate of all Churchmen. *Interest ecclesiae*—no less than *reipublicæ*—*ut sit finis litium*. For half a century, and particularly during the last thirty years, litigation on matters of ritual has been going on in our midst. The prosecution of a bishop was rightly regarded as the culminating effort of this litigation; though we were plainly told that if it were successful, proceedings against other prelates would follow. That scandal, happily, has now been rendered impossible, and it is to be hoped that after the judgment which has just been delivered we shall have heard the last of litigation on ritual for many years to come. But the mere cessation of agitation would have been a doubtful benefit if it had left the Church cramped and confined in the way in which the promoters of the ritual prosecutions desired. The

principle on which the universal Church, and every national branch of it, should be organized is expressed by the Latin formula, *In necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in omnibus caritas.* It is further to be remembered that in putting this formula into practice it is an offence against charity to include among essentials things which are not essential. The Archbishop's judgment, and the judgment of the Judicial Committee, have declared, what was already plain to common-sense without the assistance of a judicial decision, that there is no inherent doctrinal significance in any of the five practices which formed the subject of the recent appeal. They are consequently non-essentials, and, as in the case of other non-essentials, there ought to be liberty in respect of them. If it is objected that this reasoning would lead to the toleration in the Church of England of a multitude of other aberrations from the standard of ritual as laid down by the Book of Common Prayer and the Act of Uniformity, the reply is that it is precisely on that account to be considered valuable. On no other ground is it possible to justify the deviations in ritual perpetrated by members of the so-called Evangelical section of the Church, many of which, however, are not only harmless, but positively expedient. For instance, nothing can be more clearly unrubrical than the recital of the words of administration to several communicants at once, instead of to each one singly. Yet the practice can be defended on many grounds both sentimental and practical, and, in the opinion of the present writer, is far preferable to the rule prescribed by the Prayer-Book. It is highly desirable that both this and other departures from the letter of the rubric in matters of mere convenience or taste should be purged from the suspicion of being ecclesiastical offences. But the tendency both of the Archbishop's judgment and of the recent decision in the direction of latitude of ritual opens up a yet further vista of far-reaching consequences.

It is becoming every day more evident that it will be impossible for the Church of England to maintain the position which she has occupied since we became a nation, of being our National Church, unless she succeeds in re-attracting into her fold the bulk of the Dissenters who now stand aloof from her. It is not clear that this result can be achieved on any terms to which it would be possible for Churchmen to assent; but it is quite certain that, whatever else may be requisite, two conditions are indispensable for its attainment.

First, there must be a substantial relaxation of the Act of Uniformity of 1662, which led to the permanent schism of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists. And secondly, there

must be a considerable modification of the parochial system, which at present gives the incumbent exclusive control over the church ministrations in his parish, and which led to the Wesleyan Methodist schism. The issue of the recent proceedings can scarcely fail to give us a lift forward in both of these directions. The prosecutors of the Bishop of Lincoln desired to stamp uniformity of ritual on the Church, and relied on the Act of Uniformity for effecting their purpose. Both the Archbishop and the Judicial Committee have decided that, in spite of that Act and of the rubrics in the Prayer-Book, to which it gives the force of law, a divergence of ritual is permissible in points to which some Churchmen attach great importance. This, so far as it goes, is a forward step. If we admit, as we can scarcely help doing, that all real Christians ought to be united together in one ecclesiastical organization, and that this organization ought not to impose greater restrictions upon their public worship than are absolutely necessary, we cannot do otherwise than welcome any progress in the direction of making our law of ritual more elastic. On this ground we may hail the decisions in the Bishop of Lincoln's case as a substantial advance in themselves, and as an earnest of a further advance in the future in the way, not of a higher ritual, but of greater variety of ritual.

The bearing of the decisions on the other requirement of our day which has been mentioned—namely, a modification of the parochial system, is not so direct or obvious. But satisfaction with the result of the recent proceedings is entirely compatible with keen sympathy for those to whom the ritual now pronounced legal is a distasteful innovation. Their endeavour, however, should be, not to suppress the tastes of others, but to obtain for themselves liberty to worship God as they desire, without forfeiting their status as Churchmen. This liberty can only be fully obtained by dethroning the incumbent of a parish from his present position as sole arbiter of the Church services to be conducted within it. In common worship there must, of course, always be of necessity a certain amount of give and take, and of surrender of one's own predilections to those of others. But, subject to this, the right of Churchmen, within certain wholesome but not too restricted limits, to engage in forms of public worship which are in harmony with their feelings and conscience, ought to be placed on an unquestionable footing, and the Church Association, if it survives its recent defeat, would do well to bend its energies towards the accomplishment of this object. When this is achieved, the way will have been prepared for the present dissenting chapels being admitted as chapels of ease to the parish church. The central edifice will retain the standard

of ritual prescribed by the Prayer-Book, but in the other places of worship different forms of prayer and extempore prayers without any form at all will be permissible. It may, indeed, be that the fate of the Church of England and the liberties of the country will prove to have depended on the recent judgment to an extent not generally realized. The proceedings against the Bishop of Lincoln, when they were first taken, were regarded by most Churchmen with regret, and by some even with dismay. But there are substantial grounds for hoping that in their result, against the will of those who promoted them, they will have been overruled for good. It will be something if they lead to peace. It will be still better if they clear the way for the toleration of a wide diversity of ritual, and for the return to the Church of those whose dissent has been due to the rigidity in her forms of public worship, which has prevailed to an extravagant degree in past generations, and of which there is still legitimate reason to complain.

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.



## ART. VI.—THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH OF HOLLAND.

### A Visit to Utrecht.

THE recent death of Dr. Heykamp, the old Catholic Archbishop of Utrecht, and the election and consecration of his successor in that see, the Rev. G. Gul, formerly pastor of the parish of St. Vitus, Hilversum, has directed special attention to the ancient Church, commonly called "The Jansenist Church of Holland," a title, however, which its members repudiate as a sobriquet imposed by their adversaries the Jesuits, the official designation of their Church being "The Church of the Old Episcopal Clergy of Holland" ("Kerk der Oud-bisschoppelijke Klerezij te Holland"), a title distinguishing them from both the Roman Catholics and from the various denominations of Presbyterian Protestants. Theirs is the only one national Latin Church which stands, and for generations has stood, independent of the Papacy. It has borne many persecutions and endured much opposition, and whilst not formally severing itself from all connection with Rome, has yet cast off many Romish errors, and refused to accept the modern dogmas of that corrupt Church, e.g., Papal infallibility, and the universal episcopate or ecclesiastical omnipotence of the

Roman Pope, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, compulsory confession, and the like. It rejects acts of reverence to, or worship of, pictures or images of saints; and, above all, it puts the Bible in the hands of the clergy and people, encouraging all to read and study it. One of its own pastors, Herr Van Santen, parish priest of Dordrecht, Holland, said at a Conference at Farnham Castle, August 3rd, 1888, the following being present: the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne), Archbishop of Dublin, Bishops of Western New York and of Guiana, Bishop Herzog (Switzerland), Mar Gregorius (Syria), Count Henry de Campello (Italy), Canon Meyrick, and about three hundred clergy and laity: "I am very thankful to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury that he has invited me to come and visit England, to be a witness to the life of your Church. And now I see that there are many points of agreement between us, and these points are the most important. Both our Churches venerate the Bible as the Holy Word of God that is spoken, not to the clergy alone, but to all mankind. Our creeds are the same creeds of the old undivided Christian Church. Our Prayer-Books are not corrupted by legends and superstition. We do not adore images and the relics of the saints, who were only the humble servants of our Lord. We know that we ought not only to celebrate Divine service in the church, but also to gather our families and servants to prayer in our houses, and to serve God in our daily life."

A little time before the assembling of the last Pan-Anglican Conference at Lambeth, two of our English Bishops (the Bishops of Salisbury and Newcastle), bearing a letter of introduction from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of Utrecht and to the Bishops of Haarlem and Deventer, visited the Church of Holland. In an interesting account of the visit the Bishop of Salisbury states that the community is a small one, numbering about thirty priests and seven thousand adherents; but it really represents the Old National Church of Holland, which has been wrongly stigmatized as heretical, and, as far as possible, superseded by a new Roman hierarchy introduced by the Jesuits. The Roman Catholics in Holland number, it would seem, about one million, and the Protestants about three millions. This Old Catholic Church conveyed the episcopal succession to the Old Catholic Church of Germany. "I met Archbp. Van Loos, of Utrecht," says the Bishop, "at the Old Catholic Congress at Cologne, in 1872. He died on June 4th, 1873, before he could consecrate Bishop Reinkins. The latter was, however, consecrated in St. Lawrence Church, Rotterdam, August 11th, 1873, by Bishop Hermann Heykamp, of Deventer." The Bishop goes on to say:

Our conference with the Archbishop of Utrecht, held at his house, was begun by him with an extempore prayer, in French, of great beauty. We discussed various questions. We found, as we expected, that they entirely reject the name Jansenist. They say : "We are no more Jansenists than we are Bossuetists or Quesnelists. We do not hold by any means all the opinions of Jansenius, who, for instance, believed in the infallibility of the Pope, which we entirely reject ; but we say that Jansenius' teaching on the doctrine of grace was wrongly condemned by the Court of Rome, which attributed to him statements which he did not really hold." In regard to the rule of faith, we found that the Church of Holland accepts the dogmatic definitions of the Council of Trent, though not of its canons of discipline. This, of course, is a serious difference between us and them. We were glad to find, however, that their priests are not required to sign the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which is a great stumbling-block in the way of intercommunion between the Churches. The Roman Liturgy is used for the Holy Eucharist ; but the Breviary, containing the daily offices read by the clergy, is the Parisian, with a few additional offices for local saints' days.

The catechisms in use are also chiefly adapted from French sources by writers of the school of Port Royal. Mass is said on Sundays, and once or twice during the week. The Communion is administered to them only in one kind, but after it a chalice of unconsecrated wine is generally administered to the communicants. The teaching of the Church is full of references to Holy Scripture. The clergy receive about £100 to £150 a year, with a comfortable house rent-free. The greater part of this income comes from old endowments belonging to the parishes, but the Government contributes annually about £25 to each.

How this Church, variously called "The Old Catholic Church of Holland," "The Church of Utrecht," "The Jansenist Church of Holland," and by its own members, as we have seen, "The Church of the Old Episcopal Clergy of Holland," is regarded by the Bishops of our communion may be gathered from the following allusions to it and directions concerning it :

At the Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion held at Lambeth Palace in July, 1888, and attended by 145 bishops from all parts of the world, (1) an Encyclical Letter was drawn up addressed "To the faithful in Christ Jesus," (2) certain resolutions were formally adopted by the Conference, and (3) reports of various committees were received.

The Encyclical Letter contains the following words : "To Old Catholics and others" :

... Nor, again, is it possible for members of the Anglican Communion to withhold their sympathies from those Continental movements towards reformation which, under the greatest difficulties, have proceeded on the same lines as our own, retaining episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance. Though we believe that the time has not come for any direct alliance with any of these, and though we deprecate any precipitancy of action which would transgress primitive and established principles of jurisdiction, we believe that advances may be made without sacrifices of these ; and we entertain the hope that the time may come when a more formal alliance with some at least of these bodies will be possible.

2. Resolution 15a (carried by the Conference *nemine contradicente*) was as follows :

That this Conference recognises with thankfulness the dignified and independent position of the Old Catholic Church of Holland, and looks to more frequent brotherly intercourse to remove many of the barriers which at present separate us.

3. And in the report of the Committee of the Conference, consisting of one Archbishop and fourteen Bishops, presided over by the late Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne), appointed to consider questions respecting the Scandinavian Church, Old Catholics, etc., are the following words :

By the name Old Catholics we understand, in general terms, those members of foreign churches who have been excommunicated on account of their refusal, for conscience' sake, to accept the novel doctrines promulgated by the authority of the Church of Rome, and who yet desire to maintain in its integrity the Catholic faith, and to remain in full communion with the Catholic Church. . . . First of all, it is due to the ancient Church of Holland, which in practice accepts the title of Old Catholic, to recognise the fact that it has uttered energetic protests against the novel dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Universal Bishopric and Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome. It is to this Church that the community usually termed Old Catholic in the German Empire owes, in the providence of God, the episcopal succession. We recognise with thankfulness the dignified and independent position which the Church of Holland maintained for many years in almost absolute isolation. It has now broken through this isolation as regards its neighbours on the Continent. As regards ourselves, the Church of Holland is found on inquiry to be in agreement with our Church in many points; and we believe that, with more frequent brotherly intercourse, many of the barriers which at present separate us might be removed.

The Old Catholic community in Germany differs from the Church of Holland in this respect, amongst others, that it does not retain possession of the ancient sees.

It was fondly hoped and believed by the cruel adversaries of the Jansenists in France that the destruction of Port Royal, the death of the Arnaulds, and the scattering of the nuns and recluses would cause Jansenism to perish out of the world, and leave themselves—the Jesuits and their upholders—uncontrolled masters of the situation, the guides of kings and nations and councils, and even steersmen of the bark of St. Peter.

But this was not to be the case. It is interesting, in passing, to notice that as there were many reformers before the great Reformation, so there are almost always pioneers of mighty movements. There were such in England, in France, in Germany, in Switzerland. Such were the Jansenists. Many of the doctrines of Jansenism are those held by Protestant nations. The struggles of those who bore the name of the famous Bishop of Ypres against the Ultramontane views of

the Church of Rome; their faithful protests against the accretions in modern days, additions to "the faith once delivered unto the saints" made by valiant men who from time to time have worked and lived and died within the Romish Church—in it, but to a certain extent not *of* it—not accepting dogmas opposed alike to Holy Scripture and to the views held in earlier and better days at Jerusalem and Alexandria, at Antioch and Constantinople, at Hippo and Rome itself—all make a study of the past deeply interesting, and show how the men and the movements referred to prepared the way for the reception of greater light, and wider spiritual knowledge, and a purer faith. And the remarkable movements in our own day in Mexico, in France, in Spain, and in Germany (notably that to which the term "Old Catholic" is applied, and with which the honoured names of Döllinger, Reinkins, and Herzog are associated) are the natural outcome, and to some extent the counterpart and the result, of the work of the Jansenists of the seventeenth century. When France expelled and persecuted the Jansenists, a Protestant country, Holland, gave them shelter and protection; just as England gladly received the Huguenots in earlier days when cast out of their own land.

There were many Roman Catholics in Holland in the seventeenth century, and amongst them Jansenist, or, more properly, Augustinian, opinions were widely spread. They numbered about 330,000. When the Jesuits and their abettors could not in a Protestant land persecute the Jansenists or those who, belonging to the Romish Church, sympathized with the teachings of the refugees whom they protected and welcomed from France, they (the Jesuits) adopted a plan worthy of the cunning of the astute and unscrupulous Order of Loyola. They determined to have the Roman Catholics of Holland placed under the direction of Ultramontane prelates, feeling sure that thus Jansenism and sympathy with Jansenists would by degrees expire.

Holland formerly belonged to the see of Utrecht, a see founded by the English missionary St. Willibrord in A.D. 696. Utrecht became a centre from whence English missionaries carried the Gospel to a great part of heathen Germany. The Bishop of Utrecht in after days was a suffragan of the Archbishop of Cologne; but Pope Pius IV. (in whose day our Queen Mary carried on persecutions in England), separated Holland from the province of Cologne, and made Utrecht an archbishopric with five suffragans—Haarlem, Deventer, Leeuwarden, Gröningen, and Middelburg.

The limits of this article do not permit the details of the long-continued struggles of the Church of Holland to be

given at any length; suffice it to say that reviewing the history of this Church we find that almost from its origin in the seventh century it had to resist the encroachments of popes and princes. Not until A.D. 1448 did the Pope (Nicholas V.) recognise the right of the Dutch Church to elect its own bishop. In 1583, during the archbishopric of Sasbold, the conflict of the Church of Utrecht with enemies from within first began. Rome regarded Holland as a mission land, and Jesuits and Franciscans poured into it, utterly disregarding the rightful hierarchy existing in the country. Sasbold thus complained of the Jesuits in his report to Cardinal Milano: "They make religion a matter of politics; they make the Church more political than pious."

The Jesuits intrigued against Sasbold and his successor, Rovenius. In 1624 the Dutch University of Louvain sent Jansenius to Madrid to obtain a prohibition against the intrusions of Jesuits into their pulpits, and to induce the successor of Charles V. in the imperial office to confirm Rovenius in his Archbpisopric. This errand was the only occasion on which Jansenius came into direct communication with the Church of Utrecht.

Cardinal Colonna said of the Church of Utrecht at this period, that "it was the most flourishing part of the whole Catholic Church." After Rovenius came De La Torre, then Neerkassel, under whom the Dutch Church reached its prime. Neerkassel, in a report to the Propaganda, represented the Jesuits as "audacious, barefaced liars." They retorted by charging him in 1669 with Jansenism. A feeling in favour of reform was springing up in many lands: those anxious for improvement in morals and in doctrine urged greater strictness in the administration of the sacraments, in the bestowal of Church patronage, in the restoration of the doctrines of faith according to the contents of Holy Scriptures and the witness of Christian antiquity, and in the better instruction of the young. Some of those who desired and toiled for reforms, e.g., Charles Borromeo, Francis de Sales, Jeanne de Chantal, were canonized; others, labouring in a like way and for similar ends, e.g., St. Cyran, Jansenius, Arnauld, Neerkassel, Pavillon, were branded as heretics. Whilst almost universal corruption was found in the Churches of France and Germany, the Dutch Church presented an example of piety, learning, and fidelity. Comparing those who held the episcopal office, the striking saying was borne out, "When the vessels of the Church are made of wood, the bishops are made of gold." Whilst Archbishop Neerkassel was opposing error in doctrine and defending the truth by word and by his devout and simple life, the German princes were accepting bishopric after bishopric, receiving the

revenues, but careless as to the duties. The Archbishop of Cologne, Max Henry (1650-1688), held simultaneously five other bishoprics. Among the twenty-four German bishops there was not one who preached in person or was competent to take his place in a Synod with becoming dignity. Hunting-seats, gardens, public works, feasts, occupied their time and thought. The worship of the Virgin and the saints increased. "Had the five foolish virgins," said a preacher at that time, "instead of calling 'Lord, Lord!' had called 'Our Lady, open to us!' the doors would not have remained closed against them."

Neerkassel went from place to place preaching the Gospel. Writing to decline the revenues of a French abbey that were offered to him, he said: "Riches are more of a hindrance than a help to a man who should have but one care, that of spreading the Gospel tidings. They are like thorns in his path, hindering him from being light and nimble, as he should be." When the Port Royalists were persecuted, and the printing of their books in France forbidden, the good Archbishop Neerkassel brought about the publication of their works in Amsterdam, and invited the persecuted ones to take refuge in Holland. In 1679 Arnauld came; in 1682 Gerberon; and in 1685 Quesnel, whose "*Reflexions Morales*" were the alleged cause of the notorious Bull "*Unigenitus*." "We are in the Fortunate Isles," wrote Arnauld to his friends who had stayed behind in France.

The success that attended the efforts of the Jesuits at the Papal Court after Neerkassel's death to regard Holland as a mission-land, and thus suppress an ancient National Church and bishopric, is severely commented on even by zealous advocates of the Church of Rome, as Renardi and Canon Hyacinth de Archangelis, who pronounced the proceedings of Rome at the time of Archbishop Codde, Neerkassel's successor, against an ancient National Church to be invalid and unlawful, "a perpetual blot on the honour of the Papal Chair."

The Papal Nuncio told the Dutch people that the ancient clergy of the land were "rebels, hirelings, and blind guides." When the parish priests were old or ill, the Nuncio placed a young priest in the neighbourhood that he might take possession of the altar and pulpit immediately on the death of the former occupant, and in every way the authority and influence of the Church of Holland was undermined and set at nought by the emissaries from Rome led by the Papal Nuncio.

By reason of this opposition the numbers forming the Dutch Church greatly declined, and the ancient order of clergy almost died out. Within twenty years the number of adherents, 400,000 in Neerkassel's day, dwindled down to 6,000 or 7,000,

and these chiefly peasants, and belonging to the lower middle classes, who had little to lose from a worldly point of view. Whilst Codde (Neerkassel's successor) was in Rome—appealing in vain to the Papal Court for confirmation in his episcopal rights—at the request of the Chapter of Utrecht, the Irish Bishop Fagan (afterwards Archbishop of Dublin) repeatedly ordained priests for the Dutch Church, as did also some French bishops.

In 1763 the Provincial Council of Utrecht met, and their record, bearing unanswerable testimony to the orthodoxy of the Dutch Church, made a deep impression on the whole Roman Catholic world. Many bishops of Italy, Germany, France, and Spain, theologians and heads of Orders, sent letters of the most cordial kind.

In 1773 Pope Clement XIV. abolished the Order of Jesuits, and the next year was to bring about the reconciliation of the Pope with the Dutch Church. The latter sent Dupac de Bellegarde to Rome as their representative. A day was fixed for an interview with the Pope. Clement, however, was taken ill and died, not without grave suspicion of having been poisoned.

After King Louis Buonaparte abdicated, and Holland was free from Napoleon's usurpation, Willibrord Van Os was consecrated Archbishop, in 1814. A month after this the Society of Jesuits was revived under Pius VII., and, as might have been expected, the persecution of the Dutch Church awoke afresh. The Curia demanded the abolition of the ancient order of episcopacy and the acknowledgment of the paramount authority of the Pope, and failing to reduce the sturdy Dutch prelates and priests to subjection, Rome resorted to extreme measures. In 1853 the Bull "Ex qua die" appeared, by which a new episcopacy was set up in opposition to the ancient episcopacy of Holland. Loos (afterwards Archbishop of Utrecht), the Secretary of the Utrecht Chapter, wrote indignantly, "It is true, then, that Rome is about to accomplish the arbitrary and unjust work of usurpation which it began 150 years ago. . . . As it has long since set up altar against altar, so it is now going to establish episcopacy against episcopacy." "Rome, insolent and insatiable Rome, stuck its claws into the breast of the Dutch Church. Rome knew no other freedom than that of yielding to her will, and trembling and cringing before her signals."

The Pope in 1854, having exalted the opinion of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin to a doctrine of faith, and in 1870 proclaimed the Infallibility of the Pope to be a dogma of the Church, the schism between Utrecht and Rome became final, and the victory of might over right complete.

The entire isolation of the ancient Dutch Church is evidence of the success that has attended the efforts of Rome to crush her. The alliance of the Church of Holland with that of France which existed in early days is now extinct. “*Tous nos amis sont allés à Dieu,*” sadly wrote Karsten, President of the Theological College at Amersfoort, in answer to enquiry on this head.

As a specimen of Rome’s mode of working I may cite the late Dr. Tregelles, who, in his book on the Jansenists, gives a very interesting account of a visit paid by him in 1850 to Archbishop Van Santen at Utrecht. He found the Archbishop a kind, courteous gentleman, seventy-eight years of age. The Archbishop told him that twenty-three years before, a Papal Nuncio, Cappucini, came to the Netherlands from Rome with full authority to regulate everything for the consolidation of the Roman Catholic Church. The Nuncio had two conferences with the Archbishop, and at the second urged him to sign the “Formulary,” saying, “It is but a *form*; all that is asked is that you write your name on a slip of paper, and then all will be right.” Van Santen indignantly replied, “A *form* has a meaning, and I cannot subscribe a document and confirm it by the solemn obligation of an oath unless I am certain in my conscience before God of the *truth* of that to which I put my name.” The Nuncio replied, “As his holiness assures you of the truth of the formulary, that is sufficient to remove every scruple. . . . You have the full authority of the Church both to *instruct* you that the formulary states what is true, and to *require* you to acknowledge this undoubted fact.” Van Santen answered, “I have read the ‘Augustinus’ of Jansenius more than once through; I know that the five propositions, as condemned, are not contained in that book, how can I, then, as an honest man and a Christian, subscribe a declaration as true which denies a simple fact?”

For a time the Chapter of Utrecht elected the Archbishop, as we have before seen, and the Pope confirmed the election; but all this was changed through the malign influence of the Jesuits, who persuaded the Pope to set at nought the wishes of chapters and national churches. The sturdy Dutch refused to sacrifice their independence or to accept a nominee of Rome as archbishop, and for many generations the following state of things obtained. When the see was vacant a new archbishop was elected, and was consecrated by the suffragan bishops in Holland, application being always made to the Pope to confirm the election. The reply from Rome was always the same—condemnation and excommunication. But as Ingoldsby wittily put the matter in reference to the Cardinal, so with the Pope:

Never was heard such a terrible curse ;  
But what gave rise  
To no little surprise,  
Nobody seemed one penny the worse.

It was my happy fortune a little time since to visit the centre and home of the remnant of the Church of Utrecht, accompanied by a friend deeply interested in foreign Churches, and especially in those Churches where movements for reform and struggles for spiritual light and liberty have been and are being made. After spending a most interesting Sunday in the ancient city of Worms, where, perhaps, the most impressive and important scene in modern history was enacted, where Luther, "the solitary monk that shook the world," confronted the power of Rome and the might of his Imperial Majesty Charles V., I visited Utrecht, and sought the church and parsonage, palace and library, belonging to the modern representatives of the faithful and heroic band whose history it has been the object of this paper to trace.

With some difficulty we found what we were in search of. Even when we had discovered the quiet square we had inquired for in the calm, respectable and somewhat dull old Dutch city, a square called "Hoek van Sint Marie," wandering about the square and examining courts and passages in vain, a woman spied us, and suspecting the object of our search, directed us up a narrow covered way which led to the parsonage and church we sought. Entering the church, a small but very neat building, marked by Dutch cleanliness, free from the tawdry decorations so common in ordinary Romish churches, and containing no confessional-boxes, we noticed a gallery on three sides, and under the floor of the galleries (seen from below) pictures of martyrs, and there was the Archbishop's throne. Whilst engaged in examining the church, the priest joined us. We found him kind, polite, communicative and intelligent. Neither his French nor ours was of the purest and best, and as he could not speak English nor we Dutch—High or Low—our conversation was, at any rate, deliberate. Passing through a light vestibule containing a magnificent carved bench, and possessing a white marble floor, we entered a hall fitted up with old pictures, and thence up some narrow, steep stairs to a room containing a very interesting series of portraits of former archbishops and of the present parish priest of Utrecht. The stirring times in which these men lived gave intense interest to the portraits of the Archbishops Sasbold, Neerkassel, Rovenius, Van Os, etc. A portrait of Jansenius also adorned the walls of that room.

As we walked about the room and passages, the memory of past days and faithful services, secret gatherings for conferences

and for worship in time of persecution, and chapter meetings of the Church of Utrecht, to elect bishops and archbishops, held in this very building in age after age, crowded in our thoughts.

Heroes [God's heroes] have trod this spot :  
'Tis on their dust ye tread.

Ascending one of the staircases—the house seemed made to play at hide-and-seek in—we come to the priest's chamber, the walls covered with books, and the bed at one end of the apartment in an alcove, or sort of cupboard. In the library, a long, narrow room, is a collection of theological works of the seventeenth century, nowhere else to be found except in the great library at Paris. Amongst other books in the various rooms I noticed the works of Jansenius, Pearson on the Creed, Augustine, Ambrose, Gregory, Josephus, Thomas à Kempis, 1453, a Concordance, 1600. Amongst the archives in this calm, secluded, out-of-the-world corner of the "Hoek van Sint Marie," are the correspondence of the Archbishops of Utrecht with Romish cardinals, and with bishops and theologians of Germany, France, Spain and Italy. Letters from Port Royalists in neat characters, from Bossuet in his large handwriting, from the Landgrave of Hesse and other famous men are there. The history of the struggles of the Church of Utrecht during the past three hundred years, with its trials and reverses and triumphs, are here portrayed. The well-known French critic St. Beuve, who spent many days in this library, searching the records and enjoying the peaceful retreat, says: "There is an odour of Port Royal here, and the very spirit of Port Royal has found refuge in this little corner of the world." Engravings on the walls represent the Mere Angelique, the Mere Agnes, the Mere Angelique de St. Jean, abbesses of Port Royal, Arnauld and other famous Port Royalists, and Port Royal itself. Our obliging guide took down from the top of some shelves a box containing a beautiful altar covering or frontal, done by the sisters of Port Royal, with figures of the evangelists at the corners, and representations of the Annunciation and Salutation worked in colours. He seemed much pleased to show us a long and faded parchment roll containing the genealogy of the Kings of England, and our interview ended with a pressing invitation to us to go with him to see the Archbishop of Utrecht, an invitation which we with much reluctance were forced to decline for lack of time, and because the train to Rotterdam would not await our convenience.

No country in Europe is more interesting to an Englishman

than Holland, both on account of its noble history, its links with our own land in the days of our great Queen Elizabeth, and after, its struggles in the cause of freedom, its gift of William III. to us, its endurance of persecutions for the faith, its glorious list of heroes on land and water, the energy of its sons evidenced by the rescuing of the whole country from the sea, and as Macaulay has so graphically described in his "History of England," making its capital, Amsterdam, the great centre in Europe for a time of learning, wealth and commerce. The contrast now with its heroic past is somewhat painful and depressing. May we not hope that the ancient Church of that remarkable country will have a bright and useful future, that it will be a more powerful influence for good and witness for its Lord than in any former period of its history, that further illuminated by the Divine Spirit and instructed by the inspired Word it may be blessed and a blessing. The Church of Scotland has, as its expressive and beautiful emblem, "The Burning Bush," in the fire (of persecution) often but never consumed. We may hope that the arms of one of the United Provinces, a lion swimming, with the motto, "Luctor, et emero" ("I strive and keep my head above water"), to some extent true of the old Catholic Church of Holland, may be more fully realized as the ages go on, and that this Church may advance in its Master's name and endued with His strength, "Conquering and to conquer."

I may, I think, fittingly conclude this paper by quoting the words of a writer on the subject that has engaged our attention, in the *Foreign Church Chronicle*: "If one did not still meet with traces of a noble past in the churches of Holland, the town halls, the museums, the libraries, and in fact everywhere, one would hardly believe one's self to be in the land of warriors, statesmen, scholars and artists, who once ranked among the first in Europe. The portraits of such men as Ruyter, de Witt, William of Orange, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Hugo Grotius, Rubens, Rembrandt, Neerkassel, etc., look down from their frames as strangers on the dull, lifeless present, almost exclusively devoted to gain and domestic comfort. When one looks back on the conflicts of the Church, considering the present constitution of the Church as their final result, and when one reviews the scenes of the stormy past, Port Royal and Utrecht seem to stand out amongst the superabundance of objects as those which are most perfect and most at unity. It seems doubtful which fate was the most tragical, the rapid and violent destruction of Port Royal, after a short but highly prosperous existence, or the tenacious, persistent and hopeless struggle of Utrecht against the oppression of a superior power. With respect to the future of the ancient

Dutch Church, its frame of mind is expressed by its members in the biblical words, ‘Lord, abide with us, for it is toward evening and the day is far spent.’”

THOMAS WHITBY.

---

## Notes on Bible Words.

---

### No. XXIII.—“DO . . . DO” (WORK).

**I**N how many sermons and addresses on St. Paul’s exhortation, Coloss. iii. 23, is the fact brought out that the second “do” is a different verb?—ὅτι ἐὰν ποιήσῃς, εἰς ἡγεῖσθε. (Vulg., “facitis . . . operamini.”)

ἡγεῖσθε, trans. *work, execute, carry out*. See e.g., 2 John 8; “wrought.” 2 Thess. iii. ii. 1 Cor. xvi. 10: “he worketh the work of the Lord;” gives his strength to the work which the Lord wishes to have done.

“Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily” is the A.V. The R.V. has: “Whatsoever ye do, work heartily” (Marg., “as from the soul”).

Alford’s N.T., pub. in 1869, has: “Whatsoever ye do, work at it heartily.” Davidson’s, in 1875, gave the same. Meyer renders: “in your service, *labour*.”

Bp. Lightfoot’s paraphrase has: “And in everything that ye do, work faithfully and with all your soul.”

---

## Short Notices.

---

**A**LTOGETHER excellent, and so far as we know standing quite by itself, is Mr. Moule’s new book, *To my Younger Brethren*, or “Chapters on Pastoral Life and Work” (Hodder and Stoughton). The chapters on Study of the Scriptures, Parish Work, Preaching, the Prayer-Book, and Curates, like those on the spiritual life, are of high value. Common sense is a special note all through. Our pencil marks on the margin are frequent, but we are unable to quote as we would the sentences which we have enjoyed. Principal Moule refers, we observe, to Mr. Glover’s article on “Old Sermons” in a recent CHURCHMAN.

Whoever has read Mr. Augustine Birrell’s delightful essays, *Obiter Dicta*, first and second series, will be glad to make acquaintance with his *Res Judicatae*, just published (Elliot Stock). Mr. Birrell is an essayist of singular gifts, and when we are not able to agree with him, we nevertheless admire his style. He is suggestive and scholarly, and, as a rule, both witty and wise. In the papers on Mathew Arnold and Newman, and elsewhere in *Res Judicatae*, a phrase or two somewhat jars upon us. We should add that the volume is dainty as to type, cover, etc.

*Some Recent Teachings Concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice* is a masterly essay, reprinted with additions from this Magazine, mainly dealing with the visitation addresses of the Bishop of Salisbury. This pamphlet of 31 pages is full of closely-reasoned argument and telling quotations (Elliot Stock). We quote a few lines from the passage on "do this":

Dr. A. Edersheim concluded his Review of Bishop Ellicott's "Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians" in THE CHURCHMAN of August, 1888 (in which he had spoken of the Rabbinic usage of *asdh*), by saying—and they are words of weight from such an authority—"The rendering 'sacrifice this,' which is advocated as 'in accordance with Hebraistic use,' absolutely fails on Jewish grounds of interpretation. . . . It is perfectly certain that no Jewish writer would in this connection have so expressed himself if he had intended to indicate a sacrificial act" (see also Malan's "Sacrament to the Lord's Supper," p. 68).

It may be added that the modern Greek Church does not take the words of her own tongue in the sense of "make" or "offer," but in that of "do" (see Malan's "Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," p. 72).

We have received from Messrs. Longman and Co. a new edition of Dr. Mason's *The Faith of the Gospel*.

*The Gospel of the Future*, by a Parish Priest, containing several well-known chapters on unfulfilled prophecy, has a preface by the Bishop of Coventry (Griffith, Farran, and Co.).

*Blackwood* contains, as usual, much that is interesting. Mr. Fielden's excellent paper on the Lancashire Cotton Industry is very welcome.

### THE MONTH.

ON the 11th, after three days' debate, the No Confidence amendment was carried, in a very full House, by a majority of 40.<sup>1</sup> The resignation of Lord Salisbury two days later was accepted by the Queen, says the *Court Circular*, "with much regret." Mr. Gladstone has formed his Cabinet. Lord Rosebery, we gladly note, is Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of "Read v. the Bishop of Lincoln" has at last been given. It confirms the Archbishop's judgment, and the appeal upon every point is dismissed. For ourselves, at present, we will only echo the wish expressed in different quarters by so many representative Churchmen, "May it truly make for peace."

<sup>1</sup> In the Lords the Address was voted without opposition and with little criticism. On "the conspiracy of silence," the Premier said: "I would express some little surprise at the reticence which noble Lords have thought it right to practise. Before such a tribunal I should have thought noble Lords would have wished to vindicate their opinions. They do not do so. I do not see that this is an occasion on which they can be made, by any process of pressure or torture known to Parliament, to express their opinions; but we are now met in this building in order that the House of Commons may exercise a prerogative which is exclusively its own. The House of Commons has an exclusive determination with respect to men. When the men have been selected, afterwards will come the measures. I hope the men will be found who can agree upon the measures. But when the measures are adopted, then the exclusive position of the House of Commons ceases; and, with respect to all matters not financial, *the share which your Lordships must bear in legislation is as large as that of the House of Commons.*"

Comment upon the judgment by our valued contributor, Mr. Philip Vernon Smith, appears elsewhere. An article by a clerical pen, too late for our present impression, will appear in the October *CHURCHMAN*.

The *Record*, in the course of a very able article, said :

We regard with grave regret the legal establishment (so far as it is accomplished) of the use of lighted candles and the singing of the "Agnus Dei." We regard both as alien to the spirit of simple worship which our Church seeks to encourage, and as tending to superstition. The Eastward position before the Consecration Prayer has always seemed to us unimportant, since the Ridsdale Case legalized the Eastward position during the consecration itself. The use of the Mixed Chalice is a very early practice to which no serious objection has ever been taken except on the ground of its illegality, and that is now removed. But the aspect of the matter which seems to us of much greater consequence than the actual points under discussion is the fact of the agreement of the Spiritual and Crown Courts. It is an unmixed good that Church and State should thus, as it were, be once more brought into line. The anxiety with which we have viewed the Lincoln prosecution from the start had its source in the risk which it offered of a conflict between the Archbishop and the Privy Council, the final result of which it was difficult to speculate upon without alarm.

In the *Guardian* of the 10th appears the following :

We reprint with very great pleasure the comments of the *Record* on the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the Lincoln case. It is easy to be wise and statesmanlike when things have gone as you wished them to go. Our contemporary, if we may be allowed to say so, has maintained this attitude in face of a decision with which it cannot be expected to feel any sympathy. It is eminently true that "the larger interests of the Church demand, and especially at this juncture, that constitutional obstacles in the way of the harmonious working of Church and State should be as few as possible"; that "the Lincoln case might easily have created the most formidable of such obstacles"; that "it is an unmixed good that Church and State should thus be once more brought into line"; and it is a striking testimony to the lessening acrimony of party divisions in the Church of England that these facts should be insisted on by the recognised representative of the evangelical clergy. We hope, too, that no injudicious or hasty action on our own side will mar the effect—in the long run, we believe, the very great effect—of this confirmation of the Archbishop's judgment.

The *Times* (of the 3rd) said :

In theory perhaps the Privy Council might again consider, in the light of new evidence, the questions determined yesterday, even as it has reviewed matters supposed to be settled in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, *Hebbert v. Purchas*, *Ridsdale v. Clifton*, and other well-known cases. The time has come for finality and a truce, if such are possible in regard to deep-seated differences. In every line of the decision which we report to-day may be traced a desire to bring about peace; and perhaps, in the praiseworthy anxiety to put an end to strife, the substance of points in dispute has been more than once slurred over. . . . Forgetting what is past and irretrievable, we look to the future, and are not without hope that the decision of the Privy Council may prove the beginning of a much-needed truce, if only Dr. King's friends do not abuse their victory.

In a letter to the *Record*, the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, Headmaster of Harrow, said :

The judgment leaves Evangelical Churchmen exactly in the position in which they were before it was pronounced. They are not called upon to do anything which they have not done, or to abstain from anything which they have done. There is no question as to their loyalty in spirit or in practice to the Prayer-Book. They are at liberty to go on conducting Divine worship and specially celebrating the Holy Communion upon the lines which have approved themselves and do still approve themselves to their conscience. The only denial put upon them is that they cannot impose the precise ritual which they think best upon other Churchmen who prefer a ritual of another kind. . . . The Evangelicals may still fight the battle of truth with the armour of reasoning, sanctity, and prayer.

## I N D E X.

---

PAGE	PAGE		
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Jewish Historics, by Canon Girdlestone . . . . .	113	Marringe Customs in British India, by Dr. Cust . . . . .	600
"Apology" of Aristides, The, by Rev. Morris Fuller, B.D. . . . .	57	Modern Criticism of the Old Testa- ment, by Rev. J. J. Lias, 281, 337, 393, 448	
Archbishop Tait, by Very Rev. the Dean of Salisbury . . . . .	5	New Pentateuchal Theory, The, by Canon Hayman, D.D. . . . .	354
Bishop Wordsworth's "Annals," by Dean Boyle . . . . .	138	Notes and Comments on St. John xx., by Principal Moule, 101, 196, 302, 363, 413, 467, 530	
Chaucer's Religious Sympathies, by Rev. W. Cowan . . . . .	639	Old Catholic Church of Holland, by Canon Whitby . . . . .	654
Church Reform, by P. V. Smith, Esq., M.A., LL.M. . . . .	474	Old Testament Criticism, by Dr. Leathes . . . . .	617
Church, The, and Socialism, by Rev. W. H. Daubney . . . . .	121	Professor Cheyne's "Origin of the Psalter," by Canon Meyrick . . . . .	93
Clerical Life in Ireland, by Rural Dean . . . . .	572	Recent Criticism on Deuteronomy, by Rev. Alfred Kennion . . . . .	523
Dean Burgon, by Dean Boyle . . . . .	407	Richard Baxter, by Rev. J. Vaughan .	423
Didon's "Life of Christ" . . . . .	148	Roman Catholic Congress at Malines, The, by Dr. Cust . . . . .	226
Discipline Bill, The, by Chancellor Dibdin, D.C.L. . . . .	373	Sacrifice and Covenant, by Rev. A. H. Wratislaw . . . . .	18
Early History of Israel, The, by Rev. W. E. Barnes, B.D. . . . .	429	St. Mark xiii, 32, by Preb. Bassett .	591
Extreme Criticism and its Conse- quences, by Preb. Leathes, D.D. . . . .	1	Seventy Weeks of Daniel, The, by Rev. W. T. Hobson . . . . .	72
Fulness of the Gentiles, The, by Rev. J. H. Townsend, D.D. . . . .	636	Some Curiosities of Patristic and Medieval Literature, by Rev. N. Dimock . . . . .	128
General Election, The, by G. F. Chambers, Esq. . . . .	538	Some Proverbs of Solomon, by Ven. Archdeacon Perowne, B.D. . . . .	464
Goodman's "Life of Bishop Perry," by the Bishop of Ballarat . . . . .	545	The Lincoln Judgment, by Philip Vernon Smith, Esq. . . . .	645
Holy Coat of Trèves, The, by Robert Cust, Esq., LL.D. . . . .	314	The Church and Social Questions, by G. F. Chambers, Esq. . . . .	180
Impressions of Buddhism, by Canon Tristram, D.D. . . . .	294	The Church of Ireland, by Ven. Arch- deacon Wynne, D.D. . . . .	512
"Indemonstrable Principle," The, by Canon Jenkins . . . . .	260	The New Criticism, by Principal Wace, D.D. . . . .	561
Knowledge of Christ, The, by Preb. Bassett . . . . .	160	Theological Terms, by Rev. Alfred Pearson . . . . .	22
Law in the Prophets, The, by Rev. W. E. Barnes, B.D. . . . .	383	The Servant of Christ, by Ven. Arch- deacon Sinclair, D.D. 208, 237, 314, 346, 402, 481, 505, 582	
Lengthening the Cords, by Canon Bardsley . . . . .	288	The Spanish Church, by Rev. G. Yeates . . . . .	499
Milton Manuscript, The, by Rev. Robert Sinker, D.D. . . . .	12		
Mediator, The, by Rev. E. K. Kendall, D.C.L. . . . .	36		

	PAGE
The Tragedy of Sir T. Overbury, by Canon Perry . . . . .	257
The Valley of the Nap, by Rev. W. Cowan . . . . .	31
The "Aurum Pietas" Argument, by Canon Jenkins . . . . .	607
Use of the Old Testament in the New, The, by Prof. Leathes . . . . .	187, 243
William Wordsworth, by E. H. Blakeney, Esq., B.A. . . . .	80
NOTES ON BIBLE WORDS: 44, 105, 154, 215, 265, 334, 387, 438, 497, 613, 666.	
NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS: 46, 106, 155, 216, 334, 389, 445, 500, 559, 614, 666.	
THE MONTH: 55, 112, 163, 223, 280, 336, 392, 504, 560, 616, 667.	
POETRY: Principal Moule, 439.	
CORRESPONDENCE: Bishop of Liverpool, 333; Rev. S. C. Malan, D.D., 389.	
REVIEWS: Bishop of Salisbury's "Visitation Addresses," 266; "The Church and her Doctrine," 440; "A Cyclopædia of Nature Teachings," 442; "Charles Simeon," 498.	