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

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

are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 33). And "to Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts x.).

Precious and valuable as is the ministry of the Church, we are not *dependent* on it, or on any sermon, for access to God, or for the pardon of our sins, nor upon any set phrase of words whatever; for the way to the holiest of all has been made open for us by the blood of Jesus, and He invites us, even us sinners, to come to Himself, unless we read His words backwards, and are smitten with blindness, groping at noonday. It is Jesus who says, "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" it is Jesus who says, "Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out;" "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." The absolution of Jesus is not conditional; He can pronounce an absolution higher than a prayer and stronger than a declaration. He, the omniscient and heart-searching God, He who loveth us and hath loosed us from our sins by His blood, and He alone, can say, "Thy sins be forgiven thee! Go in peace!"

Beyond the clouds, within the veil,
Is the fit Priest for me;
He came from heaven to save my soul,
He died on Calvary!

Jesus, God's well-beloved Son,
Jesus is priest for me;
He speaks the gracious words I want—
"Ego absolvo te."

T. S. TREANOR.

ART. IV.—MR. CURZON ON MISSIONS IN CHINA.

I SOMETIMES wonder what would become of our newspapers if they treated their political, commercial, sporting, or theatrical columns with the treatment which they mete out to the fragments of space devoted to religious matters. Imagine the *Telegraph* or *Standard* sending a reporter to the Oval who did not know Mr. Grace from Mr. Stoddart, or understand the difference between a cut and a drive! For every department of life, except religion, it is deemed essential to employ an expert; but when anything has to be written upon a religious question—other than Church politics, such as Disestablishment and the like—it seems to be an accepted principle that an outsider is the best judge.

There is, indeed, a great improvement in the amount of religious information lately given, especially in the *Times* and the Radical organs, though certainly not in the two important newspapers named above; but if the May Meetings are alluded to in a leader or leaderette, is it not invariably from the point of view of a man of the world who looks at them from a distance, albeit, it may be, with a sort of patronizing kindness?

When we turn from the fleeting issues of the daily and weekly press to the grave and weighty volumes that essay to be standard works, we find a not dissimilar phenomenon. While a civilian would (with very few exceptions) be laughed at if he posed as an authority on military tactics, it is regarded as an almost indispensable qualification for the discussion of religious enterprises that one should have nothing to do with them, and so be able to give "impartial" judgment.

These thoughts have come to me with fresh force after reading Mr. George Curzon's pages on Missions in his recent valuable work, "Problems of the Far East." Mr. Curzon is one of our highest authorities on Asiatic questions. He knows Asia as few men know it. He is an accomplished traveller, and a cultured writer. And yet, on laying down his book, I have felt disposed to exclaim, "Well! if his comments on the political and social problems of China and Japan are of a piece with his remarks on Missions and Missionaries, then they are of little more account than the last smart article in an ephemeral society journal." Of course this conclusion would not be a fair one. The general value of Mr. Curzon's work is not to be gauged by his discussion of the missionary problem. But it is disappointing, very disappointing, to find a writer of his high calibre descending to repeat the stupid cavils about missionaries which one only smiles at if one chances to see them in a society paper. It is not that there are many misstatements, though there are a few. It is that the facts are twisted and travestied, and that the inferences drawn from them are entirely unworthy of a really able and thoughtful student of the subject.

If Mr. Curzon avowed himself a man of the world pure and simple, and a good hater of anything like devotion to the Christian religion, then we should take for granted his cheap sneers at "Exeter Hall," *et id genus omne*, which are the inevitable stock-in-trade of "smart" writers. But in his case they are accompanied with a profession of impartiality, and an occasional bit of mild praise thrown in regarding the "pious fortitude" and "excellent work" of missionaries, which may deceive the unwary reader. I myself cannot resist the conviction that Mr. Curzon is absolutely sincere in his desire and

purpose to be impartial, and in his good opinion, so far as it goes, of some missionaries; and his discussion of the subject only illustrates the impossibility of, say, a man who has never held a bat judging one of Mr. Grace's "centuries."

Let me take a very small and relatively unimportant instance of the blunders a clever writer may fall into when he wanders on to unfamiliar ground. Referring to the opposition which a preacher of the Gospel will meet with from the Chinese—which opposition, by the way, is denied by no one, and is indeed inevitable—Mr. Curzon asks what sort of reception a band of votaries of some new faith would meet with in England, if they began by "denouncing the Bible and crying Anathema *Maranatha* upon the Apostles' Creed." This is, to continue my former illustration, as if I were to say that Mr. Grace had placed an "on drive" into the hands of "slip." There are hundreds of servant-girls who could tell Mr. Curzon the meaning of "Maranatha"!

A much more serious matter than lack of acquaintance with St. Paul's use of a Hebrew word is Mr. Curzon's own attitude towards Christianity. On the very first page of his work, in an eloquent passage on the fascination of Asia, he observes that "five of the six greatest moral teachers that the world has seen" were "born of Asian parents, and lived upon Asian soil." Who are these five? They are thus enumerated: "Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, and Mohammed." Again, on another page Mr. Curzon refers incidentally to "the two best books that have ever been written upon the East—viz., the Old Testament and the "Arabian Nights." Is it possible for one who can write thus to understand Christian Missions? He may write about them: anybody may write about anything. I myself may write an essay on the status of peers' sons who are members of the House of Commons; but Mr. Curzon, who is interested in that subject, would hardly accept me as an authority upon it. Seriously, a writer on Missions, who desires to be impartial, should at least try to put himself in thought into the position of a missionary, or of a supporter of missionary enterprise, by seeking to grasp their principles and motives. He may entirely disagree with those principles and motives; he may notice them only to oppose them; but at least he should try to understand them. Mr. Curzon does profess to understand the position. He quotes St. Matthew xxviii. 19, as the missionary's avowed authority, and acknowledges that the missionary "conceives himself to be in China in obedience to a Divine summons, and to be pursuing the noblest of human callings." But he evidently imagines that this one verse in St. Matthew is an isolated passage. He says: "The selection of a single passage from the preaching of the founder of one

faith, as the sanction of a movement against all other faiths, is a dangerous experiment." Of the general tenor of Scripture, with its constant affirmation of the universality of the religion it reveals, its continual phrases "all men," "all nations," "the whole world," etc., Mr. Curzon gives no more sign of knowing than of knowing the meaning of "Maranatha." Like all writers of his type, he regards Missions as a more or less benevolent attempt to win men from their own "doxy" to our "doxy." The people who engage in such work may be good people in their way, but provokingly narrow-minded, and extremely troublesome. Now, if I do not believe that the Son of God came into the world to save mankind from sin, then I may fairly regard Missions as a "fad," and not always a harmless fad; but if I do believe such an overwhelming fact, then the duty is plain, obvious, indisputable, to make it known to those who have not yet heard it. *That* is the one fundamental principle of Missions; and the recognition of it—not necessarily the acceptance, but the recognition—is an essential qualification for any reasonable discussion of the subject. Mr. Curzon does not dispute this fundamental principle, he simply ignores it; for anything that appears, he never heard of it in his life. But then, what becomes of his claim to discuss Missions?

Let us, however, leave these preliminary considerations, and come to Mr. Curzon's actual remarks upon Missions as carried on in China. He begins by admitting that, "in endeavouring to arrive at an opinion upon so vexed a question, the risks, even after a careful study upon two separate occasions on the spot, are so great that it [is] perhaps the wisest to state the case *pro* and *con* with as much fulness as space will permit, leaving the reader to form his own conclusions." This is an excellent design: how is it carried out? The *pro* side occupies one page and six lines; the *con* occupies nearly thirty pages. So much for impartiality! At the close, our author observes that his only desire is to enable his readers, "first, to see that there are two sides to the Missionary question, and secondly, before making up their own minds upon it, to form some idea of what those sides are."

The *pro* side is given so briefly and in so condensed a form that I could only fairly state it by copying the whole. The devotion of many of the missionaries is mentioned; the influence of education and culture; the medical dispensaries, schools, etc.; the literary work done; and, we are glad to see —for in this one point Mr. Curzon does separate himself from the writers in *Truth*—"the occasional winning of genuine and noble-hearted converts." Moreover, the statement is expressly given as incomplete. "Much of the labour is necessarily devoid of immediate result, and is incapable of being scientifically

registered in a memorandum. They sow the seed; and if it does not fructify in their day or before our eyes, it may well be germinating for a future ear-time." This is excellent; but why, then, does Mr. Curzon, a few pages further on, dwell upon the utterly incommensurate results of "the prodigious outlay of money, self-sacrifice, and human power"?

But let us turn to the *con* side. Mr. Curzon divides the "objections and drawbacks" into three classes, (1) religious and doctrinal, (2) political, (3) practical. In dealing with these *seriatim*, we call attention to one feature of the discussion. The inherent and familiar difficulties of Missionary work in China are curiously mixed up with the imperfections of the missionaries and their methods, and both are used together as equally *cons* in the argument. It is as if, in discussing the conduct of the campaign for the relief of Chitral, the tremendous natural obstacles on the road were made a ground of attack on the military administration, along with any alleged failings in the commissariat arrangements. Both, no doubt, might have had to be taken account of in considering the possibilities of getting to Chitral at all; but if the plans and proceedings of General Low were the subject of discussion, the natural obstacles would be placed on the credit side of the account. Not so does Mr. Curzon reckon the immense obstacles to the Gospel in China when he estimates "results." Ancestral worship and missionary luxury both go to swell the total of *contra* items which are held to account for, if not to justify, the view of Missions taken in the club-houses of Shanghai. However, we take these "objections and drawbacks" as they stand in Mr. Curzon's pages.

1. Under the head of "religious objections and drawbacks" are included the following: Ancestral worship, the Term question, the variety of Protestant churches and sects, unrevised editions of the Scriptures, the preaching of dogma, and "irresponsible itinerancy." On ancestral worship, Mr. Curzon, like other critics, complains of the opposition of the missionaries to it, but he does not say what they ought to do with it. He will not commit himself to the opinion that men whose main purpose is to proclaim "the only true God" should somehow reconcile with this the worship of one's grandfather; but if he does not mean this, his remarks have no point at all. He suggests that a Chinaman visiting St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey might retort upon the missionary; but he does not get beyond the suggestion: he does not venture to say in plain words that putting up a monument to Wellington is parallel to burning incense at our ancestor's tomb, and definitely asking his spirit for protection. The annual garlanding of Lord Beaconsfield's statue is the most conspicuous instance in

England of honours paid to a dead man, but it would puzzle the smartest writer to compare it with ancestral worship. Of course the Chinese system is a tremendous obstacle to the progress of Christianity; but if the missionaries tolerated it in order to make converts more rapidly, Mr. Curzon would probably be the first to charge them with preferring success to truth.

The disagreement among the Missions regarding the right Chinese word for "God," and the variety of form under which the Christian religion is presented to the Chinaman, are fair subjects of criticism; though an "impartial" judge would probably express sympathy with the missionaries for what, after all, is their misfortune and not their fault. Protestant Christians have no Pope to settle internal controversies for them, and they have to bear the disadvantage, if disadvantage it be. But in reality the divisions of Christendom have no such effect upon the heathen mind as it is the fashion to suppose. If a Brahman Mission came to England, it would make no difference to us whether the preachers were votaries of Vishnu or of Siva; and to the average Chinaman all non-Roman Missionaries are much alike, whether they belong to the S.P.G. or the Plymouth Brethren. No doubt, within the Christian community, the difficulty is a real one; but it has no appreciable influence upon the heathen, and therefore none upon the number of baptisms. In the few cases of Chinamen sufficiently educated in Western ways to understand the position, however, it is very likely a convenient excuse for refusing the Gospel.

The lack of "impartial" fairness and candour in Mr. Curzon's remarks is conspicuous in his notice of "unrevised translations of the Scriptures." This is his own phrase; but when we go on to examine the particulars of the charge, we find that the word "unrevised" should be "unexpurgated." Mr. Curzon asks what an educated Chinaman is likely to think of Samuel hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord, or of "Solomon exchanging love-lyrics with the Shulamite woman." In what way these and similar episodes would drop out of a "revised" edition of the Chinese Bible we are not informed. What Mr. Curzon really objects to is the circulation of the Scriptures at all as they stand. Now, it may be freely conceded that the modern Chinaman is quite as likely to misuse the execution of the King of Amalek as some of our old English Puritans were. Nevertheless, it is the Christian's belief that if God gave man a revelation at all, He is quite able to protect it, and to make it a blessing and not a curse; and although such a consideration as this may be objected to in argument, I may at all events venture to remind Mr. Curzon of another, viz., that, as a

matter of fact, the nations that have an open Bible are the most flourishing nations of the world.

In this connection I may notice Mr. Curzon's objection to the "abstruse dogmas" taught by the missionaries. He is willing that the "ethical teachings of the Bible" should be offered to the peoples of the Far East. He thinks that "a simple statement of the teaching of Christ" might be to the Chinese "a glorious and welcome revelation." That is exactly what it has been to thousands of Chinese. But what is "the teaching of Christ"? In the very same paragraph Mr. Curzon says that "the bidding to forsake father and mother for the sake of Christ must to the Chinaman's eyes be the height of profanity." But who gave this "bidding"? Was it not actually a part of the very teaching of Christ Himself? The real fact is, that the revelation of Christ as the all-sufficient Saviour and the supreme Lord, and as One who *can* put His claims above even those of father and mother, does exercise over a Chinese heart, just as it does over an English or African or Indian heart, a power which no system of ethics, however lofty, ever does or can exercise.

> Talk they of morals? O Thou bleeding Lamb,
> The true morality is love of Thee.

There is one more item under the head of "Religious Objections and Drawbacks." This is called "Irresponsible Itinerancy." The reference is plainly to some of the China Inland missionaries, and, indeed, to one or two members of the famous "Cambridge Seven" in particular, for Mr. Curzon avows that he has some of his own schoolfellows in view, probably Mr. Studd and the Polhill-Turners. Their proceedings he regards as "magnificent, but not scientific warfare." Unfortunately, he nowhere gives us any inkling of what in his judgment really is "scientific warfare"; but it is curious that his warmest word of praise on another page is accorded to the "devotion and self-sacrifice" of "those particularly who in native dress visit or inhabit the far interior." The fact is that when in the clubhouses of Shanghai it is required to disparage the missionaries at the treaty ports with their European houses, Mr. Studd and his party can conveniently be used to point the contrast, while when the turn of the missionary pioneer in the far West comes for contemptuous allusion, "irresponsible itinerancy" is a good phrase to employ. Mr. Curzon hears first the one remark and then the other, and down they go into his pages without a thought of how far they are consistent with one another.

2. The pages on "Political Objections and Drawbacks" are chiefly occupied with a recital of the way in which the liberty

of missionaries to reside and build in the interior was secured by the duplicity of a French Roman Catholic missionary. Assuming the correctness of Mr. Curzon's narrative, we nevertheless fail to understand the point of it. According to his own statement, (1) the liberty exists, (2) no improper means were used by Englishmen to obtain it. Is it meant that English missionaries should refrain from exercising a right of residence which the Chinese law allows, and which the Chinese authorities have never contested? *More suo*, Mr. Curzon does not say so; but any stick will do to beat a dog with, and therefore he flourishes this one. Then comes in, of course, the "inevitable gunboat," for which, we are told, "many" missionaries clamour when they get into difficulties with the Mandarins. Mr. Curzon, however, acknowledges that there are "many honourable exceptions—men who carry their lives in their hands, and uncomplainingly submit to indignities which they have undertaken to endure in a higher cause than that of their nationality." "Exceptions"! Are not the exceptions the other way? Mr. Curzon mentions that in 1890 there were 1,300 Protestant missionaries in China. Can a dozen of these be named who have ever "clamoured for a gunboat," or asked for one at all with or without "clamour"? That the appeal has been made occasionally is true, but the men who have made it are rare "exceptions" indeed.

"Nevertheless," says Mr. Curzon, "the presence of missionary bodies in the country is a constant anxiety to the Legations, by whom, in the last resort, their interests, resting as they do upon treaties, must be defended." This we can well believe; and it is upon a subject of this kind that our author has a right to speak, and that we may fairly look to him for wise counsel. The position of a missionary in countries like the Turkish Empire and China, where possibly he might not be tolerated at all unless he could claim treaty rights as an Englishman, is peculiarly difficult. In New Zealand eighty years ago he had to live in daily and nightly peril of his life, with no consul to appeal to or gunboat to clamour for. In Uganda not ten years ago he could be cruelly murdered or ignominiously expelled without a murmur on the part of himself or his friends, still less with the thought of threatening the vengeance of British bayonets. But in Turkey and China the whole circumstances are different. The missionary there cannot divest himself of his English nationality, however sincerely he may desire to owe to it no special exemption from trial and danger. Mr. Curzon frankly faces these facts. "Whether it was wise or not," he says, "to introduce missionaries in the first place, China, having undertaken to protect their persons and to tolerate their faith, must

fulfil her pledge, and cannot be permitted to combine a mere lip respect for the engagement with secret connivance at its violation." And he goes on to advocate "firmness" on the part of European Governments in case of outrages as "the only policy for which the Chinese entertain any respect." He takes stronger ground, indeed, than most of the Missions would wish to see taken. So far from clamouring for gunboats, they would wish for as little consular interposition as possible consistent with the necessary maintenance of treaty rights, not from a missionary, but from a political point of view. But if the whole position is "an objection and a drawback" to Missions in China, then Mr. Curzon should put it on the other side of his balance-sheet. If the Chinese dislike missionaries because of their dependence upon alien powers, the disadvantage must make every successful advance the more creditable.

3. Next we come to the "practical charges brought against the work, arising partly from the missionaries' own conduct, partly from the gross superstitions of the people." Here, again, there is an obvious confusion in reckoning in the same category what may be open to criticism and what may well call for sympathy. Let the missionaries be criticised for their own imperfections and mistakes; but the superstitions of the people are not a "charge against the work," but a reason for appraising the work more highly. A good many of Mr. Curzon's *debit* entries ought to be on the opposite folio. Another flaw in the argument is this: Mr. Curzon begins by excluding Roman Catholic Missions from the discussion, and yet every now and then he is obliged to quote what he regards as their misdeeds to justify his strictures on Protestant Missions. Thus, under this head of "practical charges," he refers to the injudicious erection of high buildings and walls, so obnoxious to the Chinese doctrine of *fung-shui*. "It is strange," he says, "that missionaries of all sects and creeds seem to be quite unable to resist these easily surmounted temptations." But the only examples he adduces are the towers of the French cathedral at Canton, another French cathedral at Peking, and a cathedral of the Russo-Greek Church, not in China at all, but in Japan. Perhaps he is not aware of the anxious care of some at least of the Protestant Missions not to offend in this respect; but we may be sure that if he had known of any conspicuous case to the contrary he would have cited it.

Among the "sources of friction between the missionaries and the Chinese" which are enumerated are the refusal of native converts to contribute to heathen festivals, and the popular notions about the missionary's "witchcraft" and the

like. These are indeed frequent "obstacles and drawbacks"; but how they come to be included among the "practical charges brought against the work" we fail to understand. It is another case of "any stick."

Once more, sure enough, we come upon the inevitable sneer at the missionaries' "comfortable manner of living," their "domestic engrossments and large families," "encouraged, strange to say, by a liberal subsidy from the parent society for each new arrival in the missionary nursery." Here, again, we seem to have descended from the level of reasonable statesmanship, which Mr. Curzon in some of his comments succeeds in maintaining, to that of the commonest society paper. Did it occur to Mr. Curzon to make a simple inquiry into the actual amounts paid as stipends or allowances to missionaries, and a comparison between them and the incomes of all other Europeans in China? Did he take the trouble to ask if the "parent society" had any real reason for "subsidizing the nursery"? Did he ever attend, out of curiosity, a meeting of the governing body of the "parent society," and observe its jealous reluctance to allow its missionaries a dollar more than is proved to be necessary? Has he ever heard of the Church Missionary Society's principle of "no salaries, but allowances for maintenance according to need"? If a total of (say) £200 or £250 is found necessary for a married man with a couple of children, would he give the same amount to a young bachelor, in order to avoid the after "subsidies to the nursery"? The whole case is a perfectly clear one, and it is —shall we so express it?—unscientific to ignore all the facts and indulge in the cheapest and unworthiest of sneers.

But our author is equally hard upon the attempts to cheapen missionary labour. He refers to some society which had "committed the outrage" of allowing a party of twenty Swedish girls "£27 10s. a year each for board, lodging, and clothing," so that they were "destitute of the smallest comforts of life." Now, (1) we simply do not believe that this sum was to cover "lodging," for all Missions find *that* for their agents, independently of personal allowances. (2) These "Swedish girls" were evidently of the number of those elsewhere praised for their "devotion in wearing the native dress in the far interior," and, we may add, living native-wise in other ways; and if so, a little inquiry would have shown that some who are thus living find it actually hard to manage to spend much more than this. (3) The more so, when a large party live together. No doubt, £27 10s. would not keep one "Swedish girl," but perhaps £550 might keep twenty, if they are of the type praised by Mr. Curzon for "devotion and self-sacrifice." We must not ask our author what sum he him-

self, were he a missionary director, would fix upon as the *juste milieu*, certainly not for "Swedish girls," for he strongly objects to unmarried women being sent at all, whether Swedish or of any other nationality. In order to emphasize this point, he draws a picture of steamer after steamer coming from America, each with "a bevy of young girls, fresh from the schoolroom, with the impulsive innocence of youth," etc.; and adds that a "scarcely inferior stream of female recruitment flows in from the United Kingdom and the Colonies." Were this picture a true one, the statistical footnote on the same page would surely have to report more than 316 unmarried women, all told. This figure, however, belongs to 1890. Perhaps the "bevies" have come since.

Now, the conditions and methods of women's work in China are fair subjects of discussion; and all will allow that every possible precaution should be taken against causing needless offence to national customs and even prejudices. But there is a limit to this obligation. Would Mr. Curzon compel the English ladies in official and mercantile circles in Shanghai to wear loose garments, because a close-fitting dress is scandalous in Chinese eyes? Or would he insist on the ladies in Cook's Nile parties veiling their faces because they are in a Mohammedan country? If Christian women are willing to undergo privations and annoyances for the sake of winning their Chinese sisters to a knowledge of the Saviour whose teachings have elevated women wherever they have been accepted, they are not likely to be turned from their purpose by the supercilious smiles of Shanghai smoking-rooms, any more than the holy women who, years ago, went down into the London slums, pioneers of the great army that have followed them, were turned from their purpose by the fear of Mrs. Grundy.

Such are the "obstacles and drawbacks" which make up Mr. Curzon's *con* side. It will be seen that if the *pro* and *con* calculation is concerned with the character of the missionaries and the methods of their work, some of the most important points must be ruled out as "not evidence." But if the *pros* and *cons* are counted with a view to an estimate of results, attained or to be expected, then we may admit a good deal of this excluded evidence.

The true heading for the list of *cons*, however, would be this: "Reasons why the Traders of Shanghai dislike Missionaries." Only, if this heading were adopted, two or three of the *pros* might be transferred to the *cons*; for one cause of unpopularity of missionaries among their countrymen in the East is undoubtedly their high Christian profession and practice. No doubt there are high-minded and honourable

men, many of them, among both the official and the mercantile residents in treaty ports. But it is not to be denied that decided personal religion is no better liked there than it is in "the world" at home. To some it is utterly hateful; to others, a rebuke to conscience. No "impartial" observer could leave this consideration out of his reckoning.

But no doubt Mr. Curzon would say that the question of the results of Missions is at least one of those upon which he has endeavoured to throw light. To the evidence on this subject, however, he devotes just half a page; and in the brief form in which he gives it, it is entirely misleading. After a passing hint that the statements in missionary publications must be received with caution, as "of course" they convey an impression more favourable than is apparent to "many," Mr. Curzon does adduce the official returns of the Societies, or rather, the totals gathered from them. But observe the way in which this is done. The number of "converts" is given as 37,300 in 1890, and this is affirmed to be "a proportion of only one in every 10,000 of the Chinese population." But a moment's examination would have shown Mr. Curzon that 37,300 is only the number of the inner circle of communicants. The Missionary Societies, in their anxiety not to overstate results, put forward this figure as fairly representing the spiritual fruits of their labours. But in any comparison with the aggregate population of China, the whole number of adherents must be reckoned, including both baptized persons who are not communicants and *bonâ fide* candidates for baptism. Moreover, "population" includes, of course, a large proportion of children; therefore the children of adherents, whether baptized, as in most Missions, or unbaptized, as in Baptist Missions, must likewise be included in the statistical return of "Christian population." Five minutes' inquiry of any experienced missionary would have shown Mr. Curzon that, for the purpose of his calculation, the 37,300 must be multiplied by at least three, perhaps by four. Then again, the number of Protestant missionaries is given as 1,300 in 1890, and the "37,300 converts" are credited to them as "the harvest of half a century's labour." But this omits all the converts who have died. These, on a modest estimate, would add half as many again to the number. Therefore, instead of "each shepherd having a fold of less than thirty," as Mr. Curzon expresses it, each would have (say) three times thirty, and half as many again, or 105. But even this estimate of "harvest" assumes that there have been 1,300 missionaries at work for half a century, and that all of them have been "shepherds." The figure, however, includes missionaries' wives; and nearly two-thirds of the 1,300 of 1890 were the

increase of the preceding decade. At every point, therefore, Mr. Curzon's statistical argument is incorrect and misleading. What would be thought of a consul who reported on exports and imports after this fashion?

We wonder whether Mr. Curzon was ever present in an assembly of Chinese Christians. To mention only one Mission in the smaller half of one province, Fuh-Kien: Did he chance to attend the annual conference of 300 Chinese delegates from congregations in more than a hundred towns and villages—picked men, many of them sufferers for Christ's sake, many voluntary and unpaid evangelists, and several educated and ordained clergymen? Perhaps an hour or two spent in listening to their prayers, praises, accounts of work, and practical business discussions, would have given him a view of the "results" of Missions which no statistics can ever convey.

I must not close without just referring to another part of Mr. Curzon's volume, where he devotes two pages to the consideration of the prospects of Christianity in Japan. There is here a curious illustration of the way our author collects his "evidence" and draws his inferences. He mentions the "combination of circumstances" which "has led many to suppose" that "here [in Japan] at least, the Church of Christ is sure of a magnificent spoil, and that Japan is trembling on the brink of a mighty regeneration." This is put rather rhetorically; but it is true that, a few years ago, there was a widespread impression, largely derived from the anticipations of the Japanese newspapers themselves, that a national adoption of some form of Christianity might possibly be imminent. But in a footnote to the words "on the brink of a mighty regeneration," Mr. Curzon says, "Such appears to be the view of the Church Missionary Society. . . ." (I will finish the quotation directly). Had Mr. Curzon really desired to know the view of the Church Missionary Society, he could easily have ascertained it, for it has been stated several times, and a postcard to the office would have obtained for him correct evidence by return of post. The Society has, particularly at the time that the general impression alluded to was prevalent, mentioned the fact, but mentioned it both doubtfully and deprecatingly. In the first place, its leaders did not share the extremely sanguine expectations expressed in some quarters; and in the second place, they earnestly hoped, and avowed that they hoped, that no premature adoption of an outward form of Christianity would occur, and that the superficial adhesion of a nation of 40,000,000 of people still heathen at heart would be very doubtful gain to the cause of true Christianity. But let me now finish Mr. Curzon's footnote. The evidence that

the Church Missionary Society regards Japan as "trembling on the brink of a mighty regeneration" is that "it has recently created two new bishoprics in Japan"! Might it not have occurred to Mr. Curzon that other reasons for this step were possible? When is it that two additional generals are despatched to the seat of war? Is it when victory is just complete? Or is it not rather when the campaign looks like being prolonged and arduous? The simple fact is that the plans for the new bishoprics had no connection whatever with the questionable anticipations of five or six years ago. Yet there stands that conspicuous footnote in an important and widely-read book by one of our leading authorities on Asiatic affairs! Really, there is nothing more left to be said.

EUGENE STOCK.

ART. V.—DR. KARL HIRSCHE AND THE "IMITATIO CHRISTI."

DR. KARL HIRSCHE, after spending over thirty years of his life in trying to establish the claims of Thomas à Kempis to the authorship of the "Imitatio Christi," died in July, 1892, without having been able to complete his labours, although we hope he has written enough to establish the truth of his thesis to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced reader. The results are now before us in three octavo volumes, the first of which was published in 1875, the second in 1883, while the third has only just been issued.[1]

In the first two volumes he printed a chrestomathy of the undisputed works of Thomas, with a criticism thereon in order to show the similarity to the "Imitatio," both in thought and arrangement of sentences as well as in style. He also laid great stress on a discovery which he made in the little MS. volume written by Thomas himself, a volume which is in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. This discovery was a system of punctuation and of accentuation of considerable intricacy, which brings out a rhythm, and occasionally rhymes of a great value to the reader. Dr. Hirsche did not wish to assert that such punctuation does not exist in other works of the middle ages, but that in this volume it is of such an intricate nature as is rare in MSS., and could only have been done by one who read over the works with the greatest care; and the fact of its only existing in such MSS. as are contemporaneous with Thomas,

[1] Hirsche (Karl), "Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe d. Imitatio Christi nach dem Autograph des Thomas von Kempen," Bd. iii., 8vo. Berlin, C. Habel, 1894.