

century of the Christian era, was erected the first English temple of the Christian faith"—then we have the case of the lady-lodger. At least, so say our Anglicans; though we believe the Church of Rome has a trap for them, even on their own supposition. We care little about the matter: we say, You shall not have us, whether or no, *Septem Colles!* which is probably what the seamen have cut down into "Whether or no, Tom Collins!" Those who have no better defence against Rome than that Glastonbury was a church before Canterbury, are not worth arguing with: not a bit more than those who think more of descent from James the First than of the Act of Settlement when they describe Her Majesty's title to the Crown. If the Reformation were a reformation, no other answer is wanted: if not, no answer is possible.

8. 'The Comedy of Convocation' is a racy production, which seems to us both to hit and overshoot its mark. It is in two scenes. In the first, Convocation itself discusses the question "Would a clergyman, openly teaching that there is no God, be liable to suspension?" In the second, Dr. Easy's drawing-room is the theatre of a private discussion on the nature and validity of English Orders. The arguments are meant for satire on the latitude which the Privy Council has declared to be lawful. As applied to the maintainers of that liberty, the whole is a clever travesty. But as applied to ordinary modes of assailing these maintainers of liberty, the whole thing is clever and telling satire. For example, one of the main points is the renunciation, on the part of the English Church, of all claim to infallibility. Accordingly,—

"Where there is no infallibility, there can be nothing certain, as the Church of England wisely intimates, except, of course, the obligation of doubting. Consequently, it is one and the same thing to say that we ought to deny the Church's infallibility, and that we ought to doubt what the Church teaches. Now the Church of England teaches that there is a God. Therefore it is the duty of every Anglican to doubt the existence of a God."

If this had stood alone, we should have had no doubt that the satire was intended against the usual arguments of those who despise a fallible Church. But as we are satisfied, from the whole, that it is directed against those who adhere to a fallible Church, we stand amused at a writer who has so palpably aimed at the pigeon and killed the crow. Our readers will be interested, nevertheless, in the many sharp turns and some clear hits of this funny production.

9. The Sermons by the Archbishop of York are not theological, only Christian. There have been many attempts to set controversies fermenting in vessels of charity; but the new wine has almost always burst the old bottles. Of late years men high in the clerical order have given strange utterances of toleration, strange admissions about the meaning of Christianity. In the first sermon, on the Church, our Archbishop confesses that the "unity" does not exist: that there are different Churches: that the mirror is broken, and that it is absurd to frame one fragment, and call it the whole. The preacher here looks towards the pretensions of Rome: but in his heart he thinks of the fragments of our own fragment.

10. We are not so well pleased with Dr. Vaughan. We take the sermons on the Athanasian Creed and on the Burial Service: and we feel satisfied that when a person of Dr. Vaughan's position and intellect is driven to such subterfuges as swarm throughout them, a change is at hand. We give specimens. Speak-

ing of the damnatory clauses, "All men agree to understand these clauses in a modified and limited sense." What right have all men to repeat, before God, words which demand the addition, "Thou knowest, O God of truth! that we do not mean all we say"? If the matter had reference to an enunciation of dogma, between man and man, even then a voluntary misunderstanding of plain English would have been blameworthy; the phrases ought to be changed. But when the words are part of a creed to be solemnly repeated as part of *Divine Service*, it is quite a different thing. One of those gentlemen who couch their opinions muttered, on hearing a sentiment like Dr. Vaughan's *ὅτι ἰσχυρῶς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ*. Again, "We all agree that they must be applied only to wilful unbelief." *Wilful unbelief* can only mean belief accompanied by refusal of acknowledgment or by contrary profession; hypocrisy and falsehood. This is not the meaning of the clause. Once more: "That awful saying (Mark xvi. 6) shows us that there is an unbelief which is fatal to man's salvation: we presume not to fix its limits or to guide its application." So the Athanasian Creed does not fix limits or guide application! We have now sufficiently prepared our readers for Dr. Vaughan's view of the declaration of future happiness read over all alike at burial:—

"I question indeed whether any omission or modification of particular expressions in the Burial Service to adapt it to the individual character could convey a more awful lesson than that which is (!) involved in the promiscuous use of the Service as it stands, and the contrast in certain cases between the words employed and the circumstances which contradict (!!) them. There is, if I might venture so to express it, a sort of solemn protest in the hopes and the thanksgivings uttered over the grave of the sinner which is far more thrilling in its testimony against sin and for holiness than any (!!!) omission or any qualification that the ingenuity of man could have devised. *This is what ought to have been true of him: this is what ought to have been his life and his death....*"

Dr. Vaughan ought to propose placing a strong assurance of salvation, belief or no belief, at the head of the Athanasian Creed, as a thrilling testimony against unbelief. When an Archbishop would rather pay any penalty than read this service in certain cases, and a clergyman of intellectual note sees in what he admits to be words of falsehood—contradictory of circumstances, is his gentle phrase—a thrilling testimony against sin, we repeat that the change is at hand. In the meanwhile, Dr. Vaughan has opened a way of escape for conscience. When the buried corpse belonged to a notoriously wicked soul, let the clergyman read *ironically*.

11. The Rev. W. Smith is not the well-known editor of the Classical Dictionary; for he says, "In conclusion, I have to state that I submit this work to the judgment of the Holy See." The Pope will not trouble himself with the Hebrew, Sanscrit, and Hieroglyphics, which are scattered through this learned work. For ourselves, we looked at the attempt to prove, from the Book of Judges, that the Pentateuch must have been in existence, in its present form, in the time which that book describes. We found ourselves as unconvinced as ever: and we do not submit our judgment to the Holy See.

12. Mr. Goodsir is a resigned minister of the Church of Scotland. He has fought for more than ten years on the question whether the Scotch doctrine of justification can be reconciled with the Greek of the Testament. Unable to get the Scotch authorities to take up the matter, he "appeals from the tongue-tied tribunals of the Church to the tribunal of public opinion in his native land." We are not ap-

pealed to; and shall not give what the Scotch call ultroneous evidence.

13. Mr. Shipley comes before us for the third time. We called his first series mild half-and-half, his second heavy-wet. He reprints our descriptions, so we add that this third series is methylated spirit; strong, but distasteful. The essays are on Absolution, Purgatory, Seven Sacraments, Miracles and Prayer, Real Presence, Casuistry, Unction, Rule of Worship, Popular Rationalism. Mr. Shipley has betrayed himself. He says, speaking of the future state, "We [he and his] shall be perfected so as to be incapable of error; that is to say, we shall be omniscient and infallible." We thought they were all this here below, judging by the tone of their former statements. We know them better now. So we shall not receive it that the water of baptism is blood; nor that the Saviour was admitted into Hell by the Devil himself, who thought he had a new captive, and "outwitted himself." We were amused with the following:—

"It is right to be rational. To reason, and to be reasonable, is our bounden duty; and when we have to do with 'the record which God hath given of his Son,' more especially. The work of a certain philosopher remains to us under the title of 'The Reasonableness of Christianity.' Christianity is reasonable."

Probably the writer does not know that Locke's *Reasonableness* lies in the proposition that every man is a full Christian who believes that Jesus is the Messiah.

We have now done with our collection, which is as miscellaneous in matter, and varied in character, as the contents of a bookseller's shelf. We see what is coming up, and what is going down: and on the whole we are well satisfied.

A great many of our subjects are pointed towards the state and prospects of what is called the National Church. On this subject the age is one of prophecy. A recent article, of much learning, by "Presbyter Academicus," on the Athanasian Creed, ends as follows:—"But perhaps in the present temper of the clerical, and especially of the episcopal, mind, it is too much to expect any concessions to the claims of reason or charity. In a few years, probably, the time for concessions will be past, and, if it be still determined to reject any but the most violent and reactionary councils, there may be some even of our existing prelates who may live to see the State without a national religion and the Church a narrow sect." We should think so too, perhaps, if we were clerical and enlightened; but being only enlightened and not clerical, we hint that the laity will not suffer it to go quite so far. The clerical mind, episcopal included, will hear reason when it raises its voice a little. We think the Church will be saved; but we suspect that it will have to be saved by the laymen.

*Faraday as a Discoverer.* By John Tyndall, LL.D. F.R.S. (Longmans & Co.)

The day after Michael Faraday was buried the *Athenæum* said—"We trust there are among his compeers those who can fix and hand down the moral and social lineaments of his mind. They must not allow the name of Faraday to be nothing but a peg on which to hang discoveries." Feeling now, as then,—believing that there was a brightness and a beauty far removed from the common order in the life of Faraday,—it is with regret that we turn over the pages of Dr. Tyndall's little volume. The suggestion, from whomsoever it might have come, that "some image of Michael Faraday, as a scientific investigator and discoverer," should form the subject of a few lectures in