

"Andrews to the first, Hall to the second" this is evidently a misplacement of names.)

This statement has been very seriously and very justly criticized and disputed as to its truthfulness and justice. It might be shown (I have sufficient evidence to show) that Bishop Andrews is not so much a representative of the old historical High Church school, which His Grace has lately taken to patronize, as of the extreme High Church and Ritualist party. While Bishop Butler one may confidently affirm, would emphatically resent the impertinence of classing him with the Broad Church school, simply because, to combat the unbelief of his day, he met objectors to Christianity on the platform of reason and common observation, which is no uncommon thing now-a-days I believe, for high Church and low Church apologists to do.

But I wish to confine my attention to Bishop Hall, who is brought forward in this definite way, as the champion and representative of the Protestant or Low Church party. I thought that a few extracts from one of his books might be interesting and useful to readers of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN. I think they will be sufficient to show that if Hall is a Low Churchman, then he is uncommonly like a High Churchman. If he, as a Low Churchman, could hold the opinion exhibited in the following extract, Low Churchism must have been a very different thing then from what it is now-a-days. I have confined my extracts to one of the good Bishop's work viz., *Contemplations on the Old and New Testament*, as it is a book issued for popular use by the S. P. C. K. and may be had for the sum of six shillings, a marvellously cheap and useful book. Prefixed, is a life of the Bishop, by Bishop Charles Wordsworth, of St. Andrews. The book is thus spoken of by Mr. Spurgeon in his *Commenting and Commentaries*. "Need I commend Bishop Hall's *Contemplations* to your affectionate attention? What wit! What sound sense! What concealed learning! His style is as pithy and witty as that of Thomas Fuller, and it has a sacred unction about it to which Fuller has no pretension."

It is a little startling, on beginning our examination of the teaching of this good bishop—adduced as a representative of the Low Church school—to find that, in the troublous days of Charles the first, Archbishop Laud, one of the most zealous and uncompromising Prelates the High Churchmen have ever had, speaks in the most favourable terms of Bishop Hall. So great was Laud's confidence in his learning and orthodoxy that he specially requested him to write his "Episcopacy by Divine Right asserted," one of his most valuable works. Bishop Charles Wordsworth states that there "seems to have been no discordance," between them "in regard to fundamental principles." (p. xxii).

The following extracts touch upon well-nigh every question in dispute between the High Church and Low Church schools of thought: and in every case it will be seen that Hall's tendency is strongly towards the former rather than the latter.

To begin at the beginning, the question of the authority of the Church, upon which hinges the great mass of our controversies.

When the meaning of Scripture is uncertain or controverted, and when Scripture is silent, the Catholic party tell us we are to refer to the teaching and practice of the Primitive Church, as exhibited in the writings of the fathers, the creeds of the church, the decisions of several councils &c. The Low Church party say, we need not do this, but in the exercise of the right of "private judgment," may put our own interpretation upon the Bible, i. e., practically decide for ourselves what we are to believe, and what not. Now listen to Bishop Hall. "Surely who-soever willingly subscribes to the Word of God engraved in the everlasting monument of Scripture, to the ancient creeds, to the four several councils, to the common consent of the fathers for 600 years after Christ, which we of the Reformed Church religiously profess to do, if he may err in small points, yet he cannot be a heretic." His biographer calls our attention to the fact that Hall here agrees with Bishop Cosin, one of the greatest authorities in the Church of England, and an extreme High Churchman: indeed he outdoes him in respect for antiquity; for Cosin "limits

the consent of the fathers to the first five centuries." (p. xix).

Hall's testimony to the fact of the Church of England being essentially the same Church before and after the Reformation is explicit, and could hardly be accepted by any Low Churchman now-a-days. None but a High Churchman could really accept the following statement of Hall's on the relation of our Church to the unreformed Church of England. "We profess this Church of ours by God's grace reformed; reformed I say, not self-made, as some emulous spirits spitefully slander us. I am ready to sink through shame to the ground when I hear that hedge-row reproach, 'Where was your religion before Luther? where was your church?' Hear O ye ignorant, hear, O ye envious cavillers: we desired the reformation of an old religion, not the formation of a new. The church accordingly was reformed, not new wrought. It remains, therefore, the same church it was before, but only purged from some superstitious and pernicious additaments of error. Is it a new face that was lately washed? a new garment that is but mended? a new house that is repaired? Blush, if ye have any shame, who thus ignorantly and maliciously cast this in our teeth." (p. xx).

Hall evidently did not think the Reformers above criticism—or, as having been altogether so successful in their work as could be desired—and, as it appears, the complaint is made from a Catholic rather than the Protestant standpoint. Seemingly he charges the enemies of the Church with blame for holding aloof at the cleansing the church from its abuses. He says "They stiffly refused [to assist]; and by their forwardness and pertinacity caused this so weighty a task to be cast upon some few, and these weak, and feeble, and unequal to so great a charge. (Imbelles pusillosque ac tantæ provincie impares)." Bishop Wordsworth remarks justly enough. "The epithets are remarkable, if intended to include the English reformers" (p. xx).

On the reality of Sacramental Grace the Bishop speaks in several places, and there is little doubt his sentiments would be rejected as Popish by modern Low Churchmen. Speaking of our Lord's Baptism, he says: "The heavens are never shut while either of the sacraments is duly administered and received: neither do the heavens ever thus open without the descent of the 'Holy Ghost'" (p. 426. see also p. 417, 425).

The following passages are clear enough as regards the authority and dignity of the priesthood of the Christian Church. He remarks on the miracle of the loaves and fishes. "He gave it to the disciples." And why not rather by His own Hand to the multitude, that so the miracle and thanks might have been more immediate? Wherefore was this, O Saviour, but that thou mightest win respect to Thy disciples from the people? as great princes, when they would ingratiate a favourite, pass no suit but through his hands. What an honour was this to Thy servants! Thou wert Mediator between Thy Father and men, so Thou wouldst have them, in some beneficial occasion, mediate between men and Thee. How fit a type is this of Thy spiritual provision, that Thou, who wouldst have fed the world by Thine immediate word, wouldst, by the hands of Thy ministers, divide the Bread of Life to all hearers * * * Use of means derogates nothing from the efficacy of the principal agent, yea, adds to it. It is a strange weakness of our spiritual eyes, if we can look but to the next hand." (p. 485.)

So, again, commenting upon our Lord's command to the ten lepers, "Go, shew yourselves unto the priest," he has the following remark: "While I look to the persons of these priests, I see nothing but corruption, nothing but professed hostility of the true Messiah. All this cannot make Thee, O Saviour, to remit any point of the observance due to their places. Their function was sacred, whatever their persons were; though they have not the grace to give Thee Thy due, Thou wilt not fail to give them theirs. How justly dost Thou expect all due regard to Thine evangelical priesthood who gavest so curious respect to the legal. It were shame the synagogue should be above the Church, or that priesthood which Thou didst mean speedily to abrogate, should have more honour than that which Thou meantest to establish and perpetuate." (p. 505.)

Again, what can be plainer than the following

passage? It is exactly the teaching of the Society of the Holy Cross, that is to say, of the most extreme Ritualists and High Churchmen of the day. What Low Churchman now-a-days would accept this teaching? Still on the same subject he says: "Who but the successors of the legal priesthood are proper to judge of the uncleanness of the soul? Whether an act be sinful, or in what degree it is such, what grounds are sufficient for the comfortable assurance of repentance, of forgiveness, what courses are fittest to avoid the design of relapses, who is so like to know, so meet to judge, as our teachers? Would we in these cases consult oftener with our spiritual guides, and depend upon their faithful advices and well grounded absolutions, it were safer, it were happier for us. O, the dangerous extremity of our wisdom! Our hoodwinked progenitors would have no eyes but in the heads of their ghostly fathers; we think ourselves so quick-sighted that we pity the blindness of our able teachers; none but ourselves are fit to judge our own leprosy." (p. 504.)

So, elsewhere, he allows the lawfulness, to put it mildly, of auricular confession, and will it be believed, actually uses this much dreaded means itself? Commenting on our Lord's taking the deaf and dumb man aside, he remarks, "Is there a spiritual patient to be cured? aside with him; to undertake him before the multitude, is to wound not to heal him. Reproof and good counsel must be like our alms, in secret; so as if possible, one ear or hand might not be conscious to other; as in some cases, confession, so our reprehension must be auricular. The discrete chirurgion (surgeon) that would cure a modest patient, whose secret complaint hath in it more shame than pain shuts out all eyes save his own." Our limited and imperfect wisdom might teach us to apply private redress to private maladies, it is the best remedy that is least seen and most felt."

Last he boldly gives the Blessed Virgin Mary the old Catholic designation of the Mother of God. What modern Low Churchman would do so? In words almost identical with the well known words of the great Bishop Pearson, he exclaims: "How worthily is she honored of men whom the angel proclaimeth beloved of God." O Blessed Mary he cannot bless thee, he cannot honour thee, too much that deifies thee not." Surely a Roman Catholic would hardly go further, certainly no High Churchman, however extreme, would desire more than this. Bishop Hall is, we are told by the highest authority, a Low Churchman. Speaking of the Purification he remarks "she dutifully fulfils the law of That God whom she carried in her womb" (p. 416) So of the Annunciation; "How fit was her womb to conceive the flesh of the Son of God, by the power of the Spirit of God, whose breast had so soon, by the power of the same Spirit, conceived an assent to the will of God! and now of a handmaid of God, she is advanced to the Mother of God." (p. 410)

I might multiply quotations from the Bishop's other writings is other proof of the fact that the worthy Bishop held doctrines which are now regarded as essentially High Church and which alarm some good folks so much.

May I add in conclusion that I have abundant evidence stored away in my note books to show that opinions and practices which some people are wont to consider novel and High Church, Ritualism, Popish &c., have always had a place in the Church of England since the reformation, and indeed at times a prominent place; and have been held and taught and preached by Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and lay folk of the most unquestioned piety, learning, and loyalty to the Church of England: the names of many of whom are the glory and the boast of our Church?

A. C. W.

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

MR. EDITOR,—There are two ways of treating the bible by those who do not like its teaching. The one is to discard it altogether: this is rather out of date. The mere modern and "intellectual" way, is to make it subservient to the views of the class referred to. A plan which has the advantages that with all their want of reverence for the Book they themselves may be styled "Very Reverent," hold high position in handsome churches, be petted by royalty, and pocket large