

Wrangler and in the first class of the Classical Tripos in 1848. He took his M. A., B. D., and D. D. at his own University, and an honorary D. C. L. of Oxford, and an honorary D. D. of Edinburgh. He was ordained deacon and priest in 1851 by his old schoolmaster, the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Lee), and became an assistant master at Harrow under Dr. Vaughan. He was subsequently rector of Somersham-cum-Tidley and Colne, Huntingdonshire. In 1875 he was appointed one of the Queen's chaplains and in 1869 Mr. Gladstone nominated him to a stall at Peterborough, and in 1883 gave him one at Westminster. He is *Regius Professor of Divinity* at Cambridge, one of the chaplains to the Primate, and was formerly Fellow of King's College. At Cambridge he possesses an almost unique influence over the under-graduates, and has taken the place of his great friend, the late Bishop of Durham, whose chaplain he was and whose consecration and funeral sermons he preached in Westminster Abbey. He was an active member of the Company for the Revision of the New Testament, and one of the Royal Commissioners on Ecclesiastical Courts. He is not only an eminent scholar but a prolific author. His *Norristian Essay* was on the Elements of Gospel Harmony, and was quickly followed by his *History of the New Testament Canon*, which ran through five editions. His first out of many series of sermons before the University were on Characteristics of the Gospel Ministry, and among his other works may be named "The Bible in the Church," "The Gospel of the Resurrection," "History of the English Bible," "On the Religious Office of the University," "The Paragraph Psalter arranged for Choirs," "The Revelations of the Risen Lord," "Historic Faith," "Epistles of St. John," "Christus Consummator," and, in conjunction with Dr. Hort, "The New Testament in the Original Greek, with Introduction." His last work was on "Social Aspects of Christianity," and he has been a contributor to the "Dictionary of the Bible," "The Speaker's Commentary," and "The Dictionary of Christian Biography." For several years the late Bishop of Durham and his successor spent their holidays together in London and elsewhere.—*Church Review*.

THE CHIEF OBJECT OF CONFIRMATION.

What is Confirmation? What is that solemn rite that year by year the Bishop comes to the Church to administer? What is this ceremony that, not for a hundred years, but ever since the days of the Apostles, has been faithfully observed by the Church?

Each person to whom these questions are addressed will probably give a different answer. But three replies may be sufficient to give a clear idea of the subject. We will consider them in order:—

I. It is common to speak of Confirmation as the renewal of our Baptismal vows, or the taking of our vows upon ourselves. And this is a correct answer. The Prayer Book says that it is a convenient and proper thing for children, having learned what their god fathers and god mothers promised for them in Baptism, with their own mouth and consent to ratify and confirm the same.

It is indeed right and proper that children should be permitted to say: "We know the covenant our sponsors made for us; we know the obligations that they placed us under; and now we, having come to years of discretion, gladly assume these vows." Not that they would be released from those obligations, if they did not voluntarily undertake them. A child has to obey the laws of the community in which he lives. His parents have to see that he does so. For whatever damage he does

while a minor, the law holds his parents and guardians responsible. But when he attains to manhood he has to take upon himself all such obligations. He has to pay taxes, obey the laws, and do his duty as a citizen, whether he has the desire or not. The present Czar of Russia is the eldest son of the late ruler of the Russian Empire. Whether he likes it or not, his birth made him "heir apparent" to the throne. Immediately upon his father's sudden death, without promises or ceremony, he became Emperor and began to perform his duties, although he had not yet been formally crowned.

So it is with us. In Baptism we have been made citizens of a heavenly country. We have been made heirs of a heavenly throne. It is indeed a beautiful sight to behold those who appreciate their gifts, crowding to the chancel steps to say that they value what their parents did for them, and that they gladly confirm vows then made in their behalf. But whether they do this or not, they are under the same obligations. We must obey the law, we must do our duty to God, or we shall certainly suffer the consequences. While, then, it is convenient and proper that we renew the vows and promises of our sponsors, yet this is not the chief object of Confirmation.

II. Again, it is said that Confirmation is the confession of Christ before men. So it is. The young and the old who have not done so before, "with their own mouth," "openly before the Church," own their allegiance to Christ. For man or woman to break away from corrupt associates and careless or evil habits, and promise before the world to be faithful followers of Christ, is a brave and noble thing to do, always requiring courage and decision. Our Lord knew this, and therefore He said, that whoever would confess Him before this wicked and adulterous generation, He would confess before His father and the holy angels.

But coming to Confirmation is but one of many ways by which we confess Christ before men. Every time we refuse to laugh at some evil joke, or to mock at religion; every time we refuse to be dishonest in business, or irreverent in Church; every time we stand to sing a hymn, or kneel to say a prayer; every time we bow our heads at the Holy Name, acknowledging the power of the crucified—we by this means confess Christ before men. While, then, we do take a stand in Confirmation, and profess that we are Christ's soldiers, yet this is not the chief object in coming to this holy rite.

III. The great object of coming to Confirmation is to receive "the gift of the Holy Ghost." Eighteen hundred years ago and more, a young Deacon driven from Jerusalem by the fierceness of the first persecution went to a neighboring people for refuge. While among them, he preached the Gospel and baptized many converts. When the Apostles in Jerusalem heard this, they immediately sent two of their number down to these people, and after they had questioned them and prayed for them, "they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."

Ever since this event, recorded in Acts viii., baptized people have been coming to Confirmation, that they may receive the laying on of hands and be blessed with the special gift of the Holy Ghost. Ever since that day, as we read in Heb. vi., the laying on of hands—with repentance, and faith, and Baptism—has been reckoned among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ." Again, then, we assert that the great object in coming to Confirmation is to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

It is well to renew your vows; it is well to profess Christ openly before the Church; but it is a greater privilege to receive the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit! We might be ever so willing to do our duty, and yet fail for the want of strength.

In the olden times, when every freeman wore

a sword, it was the custom, when the Creed was recited, for every man to draw his weapon, in token of his willingness to fight for the faith that he professed. In this day, no hostile foes are seen around us, to war upon our Christianity. But we have unseen foes, that we must dread. There is a wicked host around us, seeking our destruction. In Confirmation we buckle on an unseen sword—to fight these battles. Yes! the sword of the Spirit shall then be ours; and if we have the will, and the perseverance, and the wisdom to use our weapons aright, we shall always have the power, and the majesty, and the victory, on our side to keep the enemy at bay through life, finally to beat him down under our feet, and at last to be "more than conquerors through Him that loved."—*The Church Standard*.

THE LAST RUBRIC IN THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION.

"And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

The design of the liberty here given was, that a person should not be denied the Holy Communion for want of Confirmation, in case of sickness or when from some cause there seemed no likelihood of opportunity for some time to come. The Rubric is taken from the English Common Prayer.

Wheatley comments, "This is exactly comfortable to the practice of the Primitive Church, which always ordered that Confirmation should precede the Eucharist, except there was extraordinary cause to the contrary, such as was the case of clinic baptism, of the absence of the Bishop, or the like; in which case the Eucharist is allowed before Confirmation. The like provision is made by our own Provisional Constitutions, as well as the Rubric which is now before us, which admit none to communicate, unless in danger of death, but such as are confirmed, or at least have a reasonable impediment for not being confirmed. And the glossary allows no impediment to be reasonable, but the want of a Bishop near the place." The Prayer Book Interleaved states, "The rule prescribed in the *Sarum Manual* was that no one should be admitted to communicate, save when dying, except he had been confirmed or had been reasonably hindered from receiving confirmation."

We cannot but think it a misunderstanding of the rubric, when Candidates are allowed to come to the Holy Communion, while their Confirmation is appointed for the same day, or in the near future. In this case, much of the meaning and solemnity of the Laying on of Hands is lost. The Sacrament precedes the Rite. The Candidate might be hindered from coming to Confirmation, and thus would be a Communicant but not confirmed.—*Church Helper*.

AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

It is a common saying and a perfectly true one that History is continually repeating itself. Just as in the natural world there is a Divine order and immutable law, by which the same cause produce the same effects, so also in the spiritual and moral world of human life. A most interesting and instructive comparison is often drawn by writers of Church History between the various epochs since the dawn of Christianity: all tending to prove that just in proportion to the vigorous life and activity of the Church, has always been the bitter hatred and opposition of an unbelieving world to her efforts for the good of mankind. Church History is in fact one of the strongest evidence