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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1880.

ART. I.—A LAY DIACONATE.

THE proposal to establish a lay diaconate as an integral element of our Church organisation, has now for many years been put forward as one of the necessities of the time, and yet, for some reason or other, those in authority appear never to have given the subject any serious attention, or even to have paid it the respect of a thoughtful discussion. It seems, indeed, to have been regarded thus far as one of the crotchets which are brought out to be aired from time to time by unpractical enthusiasts, and are then laid aside to be reproduced for inspection on some future occasion. Some twenty-five years ago, or more, when vice-principal of Lampeter College, the present Bishop of Winchester issued a pamphlet on the subject, now, we understand, out of print, but though his lordship's episcopal position and experience have given him special facilities for an attempt to realise his earlier proposals, we are unaware of his having made it. The permanent diaconate in connection with lay-work in the Church was one of the topics before the Church Congress at Swansea last autumn, and some excellent papers were read, and equally pertinent speeches made by clergymen and laymen well qualified to deal with the subject; but there, apparently, the matter has ended. So far as our own knowledge extends, the clergy in their ruri-decanal gatherings have never been asked to give their opinion upon it, nor has it engaged the attention of the Diocesan Synods. Convocation has busied itself with a host of questions of far less practical importance, which have now passed away, and in all probability will never be heard of again; but no motion has been made or committee appointed to bring to the test of a candid and careful consideration a suggestion which, if it were carried out, many

Churchmen believe would be of incalculable advantage to the Church.

Taking a wide outlook over the field of ecclesiastical politics, and having regard to the probable eventualities of the next twenty years, we are satisfied that the Church of England will only be able to hold her own as the Church of the nation, and to occupy the new ground ever opening before her in consequence of the constant increase of population, by the adoption of vigorous measures for economising her resources, for utilising the strength which is now wasted in the exceedingly small rural parishes which form so great a proportion of the benefices, especially in the southern province, and for largely recruiting the ranks of the ministry. Whether our bishops care to face it or not, the fact is too palpably real to the incumbents of large and poor parishes to be evaded or ignored, that the Church is undermanned. The work she professes to have at heart, and for the doing of which she is primarily responsible so long as she claims to be the National Church of the land, is but half done, for the simple reason that she has not the staff for doing it, and if she could command the men, she has not the means to pay them.

Proposals to reduce the expenses of University education, and the institution of diocesan bursaries for this purpose, useful as they are in their way, do not really touch the question before us. For that question is not at all as to the qualifications which shall be insisted on by the bishops for holy orders, and whether or not a university education and degree shall continue to be regarded as essential or desirable in candidates for the ministry. The question is as to the payment of curates *when* they are ordained, and the admitted impossibility of doing this in many parishes where, nevertheless, further assistance in public as well as pastoral duties is absolutely required for heavily tasked and infirm incumbents. We do not forget what large assistance is given by the Church Pastoral Aid and Curates' Aid Societies. But (1) The grants which come from these sources now only suffice for half, or, at the most, two-thirds of the curate's salary, and the balance has to be provided out of local resources by the incumbent. (2) The aid afforded by these grants often meets but a part of the need, owing to the size of the parish. (3) The societies have always before them a large number of deserving and urgently necessitous cases, which they are entirely unable to take up. (4) A considerable proportion of the grants are as a rule unoccupied, owing to the difficulty experienced by incumbents in getting suitable curates; a difficulty sometimes arising from the scarcity of men, and sometimes from the unprepossessing character of the locality, and of the work to be done in it. The question, therefore, which has to be confronted is not only how to increase the number of candidates for the full

ministry, but whether some means are not feasible for enlisting in a more formal and authoritative way than is now done the spare strength and time, especially on Sunday, of godly laymen in directly ministerial work.

By a "lay" or "permanent diaconate" is usually understood a distinct order of persons, who should be ordained by the bishop, and be licensed and authorised to discharge specified public functions as assistant ministers, while still permitted to continue in their ordinary secular occupations. It is earnestly contended on behalf of such an order, that the strain involved in the efficient maintenance of services on the Lord's Day in churches and licensed mission rooms would be materially lessened at little or no extra cost to the incumbent. We have, it is true, a diaconate actually in existence, as an essential part of our ecclesiastical organisation, but the members of it are exclusively dedicated to the ministry; they are prohibited from following any so-called secular occupation, though, in common with presbyters, they may be authors, editors, librarians, secretaries, school teachers or lecturers, and receive payment for service in these capacities, the canons of the Church notwithstanding. The diaconate, as it now exists, is, moreover, only a preliminary and preparatory step to full orders, the instances being very rare indeed in which a deacon does not go on in due course to the higher grade. But the difference between the deacon and the priest or presbyter, however great it may be in theory, is really very slight in practice. With the exception of two or three things in the public services of the Church, the deacon discharges precisely the same functions as his senior. In truth, there is an odd mixture of strictness and laxity in our rubrical customs. The deacon is supposed to be prohibited from reading the Absolution at the commencement of the Church service, by the rubric "to be pronounced by the priest alone," as if it were to be read "by *a* priest alone," and as if the "alone" referred to one order of the ministry as distinguished from the other, and not, as is really the case, to the officiating minister as distinguished from the people, who are called upon to join him in the preceding Confession and the following Lord's Prayer. The late Archbishop of Canterbury was not likely to take a lax view of the matter; but yet, in reply to a question on the subject, he frankly admitted, in presence of other analogous rubrics, where "priest" is found, that the only reason for a deacon not reading this Absolution was custom. Other parts of the service are permitted to a deacon, which, as Dr. Hook, another High Church authority, states in his "Church Dictionary," must be reserved to the priest, if the rubrics were strictly adhered to—*e.g.*, the versicles before the Psalms, and after the Lord's Prayer which follows the Creed, the latter part of the Litany beginning

at the Lord's Prayer, the whole of the Communion office, including the Creed and Confession. The permission to a deacon to baptize is only available in the absence of the priest. The services for the Solemnization of Matrimony, the Burial of the Dead, the Churching of Women, and for Ash-Wednesday, are all outside the diaconal function, if the rubrics be observed. Yet we doubt if, among the extremest of sacerdotalists, these rubrics are ever adhered to. In practice, the only thing in which the deacon is distinguished from the presbyter is in the customary abstention from reading "the Absolution," and from one or two functions in the administration of the Lord's Supper, such as the consecration of the elements and the distribution of the bread. As regards the care of souls, teaching, preaching, and pastoral visitation, there is no real practical difference whatever.

Nor is this all. For while the arrangements in our ecclesiastical organization are so sacredly stereotyped that not a few among us would consider any attempt to modify or change them as savouring of revolution or sacrilege, agencies have been called into existence within the Church, to which have been entrusted without scruple, and with the cognizance and concurrence of our highest authorities, the most solemn duties a man can undertake. Thus the custom has grown up, without let or hindrance, for laymen to conduct services in Church mission rooms which differ but little from the ordinary services of the Church. These laymen offer prayers, they read the Word of God, they expound it, and preach it—in truth, they do well nigh all that the clergy are doing in the parish church at the same hour, except administer the sacraments. It will scarcely, moreover, be questioned that of all the functions which a Christian teacher can discharge, there is none more difficult or delicate, none which requires more Christian experience, a deeper knowledge of God and His word, or a more earnest piety, than that of dealing privately and singly with individual souls. Yet this is a function which is widely discharged every day by men who have never had bishop's hands laid on them even in ordination to the diaconate. Thousands of souls pass into the unseen world every year from the dense masses of our metropolitan and urban population—many of them born again of the Holy Ghost and heirs of eternal life—with no other personal and private training for heaven than that of a scripture reader, a City missionary, or other evangelist. Here, therefore, except in the actual clerical office, and the power to minister in the congregation, the only distinction perceptible between the ordained deacon and the unordained evangelist is that the latter may be a man of years and of matured Christian experience, while the former has possibly emerged but three or four years ago from

his teens, and has yet to learn the very alphabet of ministerial duty. Outside the church walls we have busily at work a lay-diaconate in everything but the name, and the formal authority of ordination.

Having regard to these indisputable facts, it becomes an important question whether the Church cannot yet further strengthen her cords and lengthen her stakes, by the establishment of a new order of duly-qualified ministers, who, while still, as we have said, engaged in their private secular calling, should give their services to the Church, and have authority, under due restrictions, even to assist in the public ministrations of the sanctuary. How many a clergyman now working single-handed in his parish, would welcome, in such a capacity, the aid of a godly parishioner, as affording him the opportunity of adding to his Church services. We have called the proposed permanent diaconate a new order, because, so far as we are aware, the advocates of the change deprecate any interference with the existing organization, and only suggest the addition to it. As Canon Garbett stated in his paper at the Swansea Congress: "The existing diaconate, as a transition office, most useful, wise, and healthy, should continue as it is. No one wishes to touch it. Nor would a subordinate branch of the diaconate do otherwise than increase its dignity and usefulness."[1]

The Right Hon. H. C. Raikes, late M.P. for Chester, put the matter distinctly in his address at Swansea:—

> Such a diaconate would, of course, be placed under the control of the Bishop and the Archdeacons. Such an agency is absolutely necessary in London, Liverpool, Leeds, and Birmingham, and other places where the populations are large, and no where is it more needed than in the Principality of Wales. We have heard a great deal of the difficulties which beset the Church in Wales. We have heard a great deal of the immense area of her parishes, and the poverty of her endowments and the bilingual difficulty. See what the Nonconformists have done; and where can we find a better field for a perpetual diaconate than Wales? Who are the men that find their way into the remote districts? Why not recruit them for this work? Why not employ them in places where we can utilize their knowledge of the habits and language of the Welsh people? Why should we not in every extensive parish have mission-rooms, with services conducted by evangelists of this class? The Church of Wales has its special difficulties, it has much to right in the past, and the future looks stormy and full of doubt; but she has yet in her reach the opportunity of putting in force this experiment of the perpetual diaconate. We are told we want educated clergy, and men who are masters of both languages. We are told we are to have great

[1] Report of Church Congress at Swansea, 1879, p. 487.

reforms; but time is required and the material has to be found. But there are in the country men scattered broadcast, who may be made into a body of Welsh Evangelists, to carry the Gospel into every corner of the land, and that without any great endowments.—*Report of Church Congress*, 1879, p. 494.

What, then, are the hindrances and objections? We know of none that present any insuperable obstacle to the adoption of the proposal. There is nothing intrinsically incongruous in the combination of daily labour in a secular pursuit, professional or otherwise, with direct ministerial functions. There are, no doubt, ample reasons why clergymen, the incumbents and curates of parishes, should not be occupied with engagements of a commercial, or otherwise purely secular character; but these reasons have no real foundation in the nature of things, or in anything essential in the ministerial office. They operate not as of necessary consequence, but from considerations of policy and the highest expediency. But we search in vain for any enactment or custom in the Apostolic and Primitive Church which can be construed in disfavour of this lower diaconate. As a matter of fact, we do know that even St. Paul, when circumstances called for it, betook himself to secular labour. It is true that we have exhortations to Christian congregations to give due support to the ministry; but these exhortations are not founded on any essential inconsistency and inherent sinfulness in the combination of secular work and ministerial functions, but solely on the reasonableness of the claim that they whose lives were spent in preaching the gospel should be spared the necessity of toiling for their maintenance, and share the worldly blessings of those among whom they ministered in the Lord. Neander states it to be probable that at first those who held offices in the Church continued to exercise their former trades and occupations for the support of themselves and their families. We find, too, in the history of the Church of the first three or four centuries, that, while there is a good deal of information scattered up and down its pages as to the position of deacons relative to the other orders of the ministry, the duties they were called to discharge, both in their extent and limitations, and even the vestments they were authorised to wear in the public services of the Church, there is nothing to indicate the existence of any absolute rule or law forbidding them to be occupied in secular work. It is also a fact that many persons filled the inferior office of deacon for their lifetime without ever passing into the ranks of the priesthood.

While on the subject of Primitive Church custom, in regard to Church orders and practice, we may observe, as not irrelevant to the matter in hand, that though the office of teaching in the congregation was more and more confined to the bishops

and presbyters, yet even in the middle of the third century, Origen, though still a layman, was permitted to preach; and when the bishops who were responsible for it were reproved by the High Church Bishop of Alexandria for the so-called irregularity, they appealed in their defence to the practice of many bishops in the East. Even in the spurious Apostolical constitutions themselves, tinged as they are with the hierarchical spirit, there is an ordinance assigned to St. Paul, allowing any man, though a layman, who is of reputable life and skilful in expounding doctrines, to teach (Neander's "Ch. Hist.," i. § 2).

Irrespective, however, of considerations and inferences arising from primitive custom, we hold to it that every Church, and therefore the Church of England, has an inherent power for its own internal organization, and the right either to create or modify its ecclesiastical constitution, and the arrangements for carrying on and extending its operations, so long as nothing is done inconsistent with the plain teaching of God's Word. And here the action of the Apostles, as described in Acts vi., is of great worth. For that history teaches nothing if not this, that when emergencies arise in the Church which demand, as the condition of greater efficiency and wider usefulness, the creation of new agencies, it is the bounden duty of the authorities to inaugurate them. John Wesley was wise in his generation when he established an order of local preachers as a vital part of his Church system, who, under careful supervision and restriction, should aid in ministerial work, and that without any charge to the Society. But for this the Wesleyans would find it utterly impossible to maintain their position as the largest of the Nonconforming denominations.

Turning, however, to our own Church, the sole obstacles to the establishment of the proposed diaconate are, so far as we are aware, the 76th Canon, and Sections 28—31 of the 1 and 2 Vict. cap. 106. The canon ordains that "no man being admitted a deacon or minister shall from henceforth voluntarily relinquish the same, nor afterwards use himself in the course of his life as a layman, upon pain of excommunication." The Act of Parliament in like manner prohibits, except as provided, any spiritual person who holds preferment or curacy, or is licensed to *perform the duties of any ecclesiastical office whatever*, from engaging in trade, or buying and selling again for profit or gain. These enactments are, of course, conclusive, so long as they stand unrepealed. But here, as in so many other things, the power that made can unmake, and if it be considered, as would probably be the case, that these canonical and legal restrictions really cover such a subordinate order in our ecclesiastical *régime* as is implied in the permanent diaconate, there is no reason to doubt that Parliament would readily modify them, if

the Church demanded it, as a necessary and desirable thing. Anyhow, the subject is worth more attention from our bishops than they have yet given to it, and certainly any dealing with the Pluralities Acts such as was reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN for March, must fail in its primary intention of setting free the now wasted clerical strength, unless it be accompanied by some measures for enlisting the services of educated laymen as a permanent diaconate. To quote again Canon Garbett: "It may be acknowledged that adaptations were more easily made when the Church was young, and not hampered by traditions, than in an historical Church, which has hardened with age into one shape. But are we prepared to admit that the Church has grown stiff with years, and sunk into the decrepitude of old age? A living Church must have powers of self-adaptation, or she ceases to live."

R. ALLEN.

ART. II.—CHRISTIANITY IN JAPAN.

THREE hundred and thirty years ago, a Japanese of high rank, named Anjiro, who was condemned to death, escaped in a Portuguese vessel to Goa. There he met Francis Xavier, and presently embraced the new religion which the great Jesuit missionary had come to India to preach. Xavier asked him what prospects Christianity would have in Japan, and thus records his reply:—"His people, he said, would not immediately assent to what might be said to them, but they would investigate my religion by a multitude of questions, and above all, by observing whether my conduct agreed with my words. This done, the Daimios, the nobility, and the people would flock to Christ, being a nation which always follows reason as a guide."

How far have the Japanese justified the character thus given of them? Their inquisitiveness in religious matters is testified to by every missionary. In India, the difficulty is to induce the Brahmins and the Mohammedans to listen to the preacher of the Gospel at all. In China, he will have a crowd round him, but the Chinese as a nation are "of the earth, earthy," and religion is the last thing they will readily talk about. But in Japan, even if it be allowed—and it scarcely can be allowed—that conversions are not rapid, certainly "inquirers" are numerous. Speculative their questions are, no doubt. Few can be described as "asking the way to Zion with their faces thitherward." But interest of a kind, there manifestly is. Anjiro's prediction that "they would investigate the new religion with a multitude of questions," is true to-day.

So also is his second prediction, that they would judge Christianity by the conduct of Christians. "It is in vain," writes a young Japanese (quoted by an American writer), "that some really good Christians try to persuade the natives that Christianity is the true religion of God, while they are beset on all sides by these splendid specimens of nominal Christians. The conduct of foreigners, excepting some of the better class of missionaries and a few laymen, is a very shame to the name of Christianity and civilization." It is to be feared that the writer of these melancholy words was not speaking without book, when we hear of a merchant at a treaty-port having ten Japanese girls in his harem, and of the form of agreement required to be signed by English or American gentlemen engaged by the Japanese Government containing an undertaking that they would not get drunk. "I met scores of white men from Old and New England," says Mr. Griffis, the accomplished author of "The Mikado's Empire," "who had long since forgotten the difference between right and wrong." On the other hand, the influence of Christian men, mostly Americans, who, though not missionaries, have *lived the Gospel* in the official positions their scientific acquirements have gained them, has been remarkable. To the spread, by their instrumentality, among the governing and literary class, of correct views, at least, of the high character of the Christian religion, is unquestionably due the toleration that now prevails. Nor have more direct results been wanting. To give but one instance: Mr. Dening, one of the C. M. S. missionaries, visiting a Government Agricultural College in the interior of Yezo, in 1878, found that half the students—educated men, likely to occupy important positions—were earnest Christians, brought to the knowledge and confession of Christianity through the quiet influence and holy example of an American gentleman, who was Principal for only twelve months. "From the time of his arrival to the day of his departure, his daily life and conversation seem to have shown forth the praises of Him who had called him out of darkness into His marvellous light." Another, a Professor at the Imperial College at Tokio, held three Bible classes for students every Sunday, at his own house. "I confess," he wrote, "that when the feeling floods upon me, that *these* are souls for whom Christ died, and *mine* is the privilege to make the fact known to them, it breaks through all bounds of mere expediency, and forces me to speak the truth at all risks." No results would astonish us from such a spirit as this.

But if the Japanese are indeed so candid and reasonable a people, the question naturally arises: How is it that more than three centuries have elapsed since the first of them to make a profession of Christianity gave utterance to the sanguine expectation quoted above, and yet the work of evangelisation has

but just begun? A question this, to be well pondered by some who never tire of singing the praises of Roman Catholic missionaries, and of casting in our teeth not only their unquestioned zeal, but also their "brilliant successes."

The Jesuits had Japan to themselves as a mission field for three quarters of a century. They laboured there under every posssible advantage. They came with all the prestige of royal and official countenance from the then most powerful and enterprising nations of Europe. For half the period, they were openly favoured by the Shogûn and some of the leading Daimios. They had no need to rely on the intrinsic and unaided power of the Gospel message—even supposing they had delivered it. The secular arm was at their disposal. Some of the clans were ordered to embrace Christianity or go into exile. Let the Jesuit Charlevoix himself supply one illustration: "In 1577, the lord of the island of Amakusa issued his proclamation, requiring his subjects to turn Christians or to leave the country the very next day. They almost all submitted, and received baptism, so that in a short time there were more than twenty churches in that kingdom." "God," adds the narrator, "wrought miracles to confirm the faithful in their belief." Nor was banishment the worst penalty incurred by resistance. Numbers of Buddhist priests were tortured and put to death, and their monasteries burnt to the ground. After all, the "converts" had little to change in their religious customs and worship. Buddhism in Japan is no "pure atheistic humanitarianism," with its lofty moral code, and its melancholy view of life as a delusion, and of *nirvana* as the only goal of existence. It is emphaticaliy a popular and sensuous ritualism, with monks and nuns, shrines and relics, images and altars, vestments and candles, fastings and indulgences, pilgrimages and hermits, incense and holy water, rosaries and bells; and the transfer of all this paraphernalia from Buddhism to Romanism was as easy as the turning of a captured gun or a captured ship against the enemy. The images of Buddha, with a slight application of the chisel, served for images of Christ. Each Buddhist saint found his counterpart in Romish hagiology; and the roadside shrines of Kuanon, the goddess of mercy, became centres of Mariolatry.

And what was the result of this triumphant campaign? It cannot be better expressed than in the blasphemous edict which for two hundred and thirty years appeared on the public notice-boards, along with prohibitions against crimes and breaches of the law, at every roadside, at every city gate, in every village, throughout the empire:—

So long as the sun shall warm the earth, let no Christian be so bold as to come to Japan; and let all know that the King of Spain himself,

or the Christian's God, or the Great God of all, if he violate this command, shall pay for it with his head.

Rome in Japan had taken the sword—and perished with the sword. The story has often been told, and need not now detain us. Let one fact only be recalled—that for the whole history of those ninety years, our authorities are Romish writers, confirmed by the Japanese historians themselves. No one can suggest that the narrative has been coloured by Protestant partisanship.

To Xavier himself, let all honour be given for his untiring and self-sacrificing labours—though, indeed, Japan had but a small share of them. With a generosity we can all appreciate, the present Bishop of Ossory, in his interesting little book lately published, "Heroes of the Mission Field," has included the great Jesuit in his roll of mighty men, and justly observes that "there is something heroic in the simple story of his privations and difficulties."[1] Nor can an equal meed of praise be refused to some of his less famous successors. But the edifice they reared had *both* of the fatal flaws against which St. Paul, and a greater than St. Paul, have warned us. Its materials were wood, hay, and stubble; and its foundation was the sand. The fires of persecution soon tried their work, of what sort it was; the floods of outraged and indignant patriotism beat upon it, and it fell, and great was the fall of it.

A melancholy commentary on its history is furnished by incidents that occurred long afterwards. The vessel which Charles II. sent to Japan, in hopes of re-opening the door which the reaction against priestly intrigue had then kept fast closed for forty years, was refused leave to trade, because the Japanese authorities had been informed by the Dutch that Charles had married a daughter of the Romanist King of Portugal. In 1695, a Chinese junk was sent away from Nagasaki, because a Chinese book on board was found to contain a description of the Roman Catholic Cathedral at Peking. The envoy sent by Colbert with a similar purpose (but who never reached Japan) was instructed to explain that France had two religions—one the same as Spain, and the other the same as Holland—and that Le Grand Monarque, recognising the prejudice against one of them entertained in Japan, would command such of his subjects as might wish to trade thither to profess only the Dutch form. What opinion, by the way, the Japanese had of "the Dutch form" it is not easy to say, considering the utter absence of all religion in the little Dutch settlement of Deshima, the one wicket-gate

[1] The story of his work in Japan is well told in Henry Venn's admirable "Life of Xavier," a book to which attention may well be called just now, in connexion with the publication of its author's own Memoir.

through which, for two centuries and more, Europe could alone communicate with Japan. It is almost superfluous to recall the well-known story of the trader who, being taxed with his belief, pleaded that he was "not a Christian, but a Dutchman."

The memory of the Jesuit plots in Japan was like the memory of the Gunpowder Treason in England. But the search for gunpowder under the Houses of Parliament, made year after year till it became nothing but an amusing old ceremony, was paralleled in Japan by a scrutiny that never failed in its seriousness. In the districts where the Jesuits had gathered most adherents, annual reports were made to the police by the Buddhist priests; high rewards were offered to informers; suspected persons were compelled to trample on pictures or images of Christ; sometimes the whole population of a town would be subjected to this test. As late as 1829, six men and an old woman are said to have been crucified at Osaka on the mere suspicion of their being Christians. And when, only ten years ago, Sir Harry Parkes remonstrated with the authorities for deporting some obscure villagers in Kiushiu who were claimed by Romanist missionaries (admitted under the *ægis* of modern treaties) as a remnant of the Jesuit flock, the official reply justified the action on the ground of "the memory of the deplorable events connected with the introduction of Christianity some centuries ago." "Public opinion," it was significantly added, "even now demands that the same seeds of discord should be removed, which at that period so nearly succeeded in overthrowing the Government, and endangering the independence of the country."

Thus, when, through the clever diplomacy of Commodore Perry, on behalf of the United States, in 1854, and of Lord Elgin, on behalf of Great Britain, in 1858, Japan once more became a possible mission-field, it presented no *tabula rasa* for the Christian evangelist to write his message on. The remark has been made that one article in the average Englishman's creed consists of two words—"*No Popery.*" The Japanese creed had a similar article directed against the same system; only, in innocent unconsciousness of any flaw in the identification, it was thus expressed—"*No Christianity.*" Protestant missionaries found the ancient proclamation still on the notice-boards; and even after the Revolution of 1868, which abolished the Shogûnate and brought the Mikado forth from a seclusion in which his predecessors had reigned without ruling for seven centuries, the new Government, comprising enlightened men who had visited Europe and America, put forth a new edict, and published it throughout the empire—

The evil sect called Christian is strictly prohibited. Suspicious persons should be reported to the proper officers, and rewards will be given.

These notices were withdrawn in 1873; but others against "murder, arson, and robbery," were withdrawn at the same time, and officers were told off to warn the people that in neither case were the laws altered—only the methods of promulgating them. Gradually, however, a Gallio-like indifference (it is not more than this) has grown up, and toleration is now, in practice, virtually complete.

It is worth noting that among those who have reaped the advantage of this toleration is a strong French Roman Catholic Mission (Lazarists), consisting of three bishops, thirty priests, and a goodly contingent of nuns. It is not their fault, however, that reactionary tendencies have not, after all, won the day. Four years ago Sunday was adopted as an official seventh-day holiday, in lieu of the old *ichi-roku*, or fifth-day holiday. But this change, so helpful in many ways to missionary progress, was to have been made three years before, and the good intentions of the Government were only spoiled by a French priest, who spoke so imprudently to one of the ministers, that an alarm was raised, the measure was withdrawn, and not only so, but Christian scientific text-books were abolished from the schools, and the foreign instructors were ordered to teach on Sundays. To this the few French professors agreed, but the Americans and English refused; and though one, prominent for his Christian steadfastness, was dismissed, their firmness prevailed, and this was almost the last attempt at overt and official opposition to Christianity.

Under the peculiar circumstances which have thus been briefly summarized, it would have been no marvel if Protestant missionary enterprise had failed altogether in so short a time to make good its footing in Japan. That, notwithstanding such formidable obstacles, native Christian communities have risen within a dozen years in all the treaty ports and some other of the large cities, comprising (on the lowest estimate) 2,500 professed believers in Christ, and double that number of virtual adherents, is due, under God, to the singular wisdom with which the missionaries, American and English, acted from the first under conditions of great difficulty. And these converts, it should be remembered, have not been caught, as it were, with the large drag-net (*σαγήνη*) of our Lord's parable, "gathering of every kind," as lately in Tinnevelly. It may almost be said that for each individual has been cast the hand-net (Andrew and Peter's *ἀμφίβλησστρον*) of personal watching for souls. Moreover, although Mr. Fleming Stevenson, in the graphic account of his recent visit to Japan, published in *Good Words* last year, somewhat overstates the case when he speaks of "an educated Native Church, with only slight admixture of the unlearned, and with little grip as yet upon the lowlier ranks of the people,"

the proportion of educated men of good social standing who have embraced the Gospel in Japan is without doubt unusually large.

A brief retrospect of the work which has already produced these results may not be without interest. Under Commodore Perry's treaty the residence of Americans was only permitted at two small ports under vexatious restrictions. Lord Elgin's more comprehensive treaty, in 1858, first opened the door (though not avowedly) for the Gospel. The very next year, three American societies were in the field, the Protestant Episcopal Church leading the way, its missionaries, the Rev. C. M. (now Bishop) Williams and Mr. Liggins being the first Protestant preachers of the Gospel to enter Japan. The Presbyterian Board and the "Dutch Reformed" Church followed immediately, and the Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions (Congregationalist) and other Societies of other denominations a little later. In the following year, Bishop Smith, of Victoria (Hong Kong), visited the country, and published his impressions in his very interesting book, "Ten Weeks in Japan." He found Mr. Williams, his host at Nagasaki, on excellent terms with the people of that city; but this hardly foreshadowed the circumstances under which the missionaries generally had to work for the next twelve years. Neither public preaching nor any other open evangelistic effort was possible; and the missionaries, partly to perfect themselves in the language, and partly in hopes of quietly gaining influence over individuals, engaged in secular teaching. "God led our men," said Dr. Ferris, of the "Dutch Reformed" Church, at the Mildmay Missionary Conference of 1878, "into the schools; and through the schools the Kingdom of Christ entered Japan."

In 1866, an address from "a little band of believers of various nationalities" residing at Yokohama, was issued "to God's people throughout the world." This address was duly received by the Church Missionary Society, and was published in its *Intelligencer* (June, 1866). A spirit of prayer was evoked by it in C.M.S. circles; and within twelve months one answer to the supplications offered came in the shape of an anonymous donation of £4,000 for Japan. In yet another twelve months the man also was given; and in the very year of the great Revolution, 1868, the Rev. George Ensor, B.A., of Queen's College, Cambridge, was designated as the first missionary from Christian England to the newly opened empire. Mr. Ensor landed at Nagasaki, January 23rd, 1869, eighteen days after the young Mikado gave his first State reception at Tokio to the ministers of foreign nations. A few months later, Mr. Russell, of Ningpo (afterwards Bishop of North China, whose recent death so many are now deploring), made a journey of inquiry to Japan, and found Mr. Ensor's Japanese visitors "speaking with

much reserve till they ascertained he was not a Romanist, and then prosecuting religious conversation without hesitation." Nevertheless, no public work could be undertaken. The ten or twelve converts of the next three or four years were baptized secretly; and one of them was thrown into prison and kept there two years and a half.

In 1873, when the edicts against Christianity were removed from the notice boards, the Church Missionary Society took measures to enlarge its operations, and in the next two years four treaty ports besides Nagasaki were occupied—viz., Tokio (the capital), Osaka (the Venice of Japan), and Niigata, in the main island; and Hakodate in the remote northern island of Yezo. Nine men are now engaged in the work. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel followed, stationing two men at Tokio, and two at a sixth treaty port, Kobe. No other English society (we think) has established itself in Japan; but the Scottish United Presbyterians are represented, and the Edinburgh Medical Mission.

The C.M.S. Missions, especially at Nagasaki and Osaka, show sound and solid results, and hopeful prospects. At the first-named place, or in connection with it, there are more than 100 converts; twelve men are already under training for Missionary service; and the work has branched out into other parts of Kiushiu, the southern island, the population of which is peculiarly manly and independent. At one of its chief ports, Kagoshima, the place where Xavier landed in 1549, and the head quarters of the recent formidable Satsuma rebellion, thirty-seven persons have lately been baptized by Mr. Maundrell, the fruits entirely of evangelistic effort by native Christians. From Osaka, Mr. Warren's accounts of patient and persistent teaching, "precept upon precept, line upon line," have been deeply interesting. Here, too, the first converts themselves have been the most successful evangelists; and a Native Church Committee has already undertaken the management of local church affairs. Hakodate was occupied with especial view to the Aino aborigines, the remnant of whom are found scattered over the wild mountain country of Yezo. Mr. Dening has made long journeys on horseback to visit their villages, and believes them, like other uncivilized races in so many quarters of the globe, peculiarily open to the influences of Christian teaching.[1]

The S.P.G. Mission is likewise well worked by men to whose zeal and faithfulness the reports of the C.M.S. missionaries bear hearty testimony. Although the work of the Church of England

[1] I may be permitted to refer to a little book just published by the Church Missionary Society, "Japan and the Japan Mission," which contains full details of the C.M.S. Mission, and some account of other Missions, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, together with a brief notice of Japanese history and of the recent changes.—E. S.

is even now on a comparatively small scale, episcopal supervision, closer than can be exercised by Bishop Burdon from Hong Kong, is already desired; and a wise selection of the first Bishop, with a judicious scheme for the direction and limits of his work, might be of the greatest advantage to the English Missions. But the work of our own Church is almost thrown into the shade by the extensive organization of the various American Societies. Of sixty or seventy ordained missionaries in Japan, three-fourths are from the United States, and these are accompanied by ten or twelve medical missionaries and other lay agents, and some forty ladies (not including the wives). Very able men, too, there are among them. The names of Dr. Hepburn, of the Presbyterian Board, and Mr. Verbeck, of the "Dutch Reformed" Mission (and it is almost invidious to mention these when there are so many others), would be an honour to the roll of any Society. Dr. Hepburn's Japanese-English and English-Japanese Dictionary is the standard work on the language. To him and his brethren is mainly due the progress already made in the translation of the Bible. The New Testament has just been completed, and more than a hundred thousand copies of portions are in circulation; and at a conference of the representatives of eleven societies held at Tokio in 1878, arrangements were made for proceeding with the Old Testament without delay. Whatever may be the political and religious future of Japan, *that* work cannot die. If all the Protestant missionaries were expelled to-morrow, they would leave behind, as one fruit of twenty years' use of opportunities, the most essential parts of the written Word of God. Had the Jesuits so used their four times twenty years, the history of Christianity in Japan might have been very different. Another Madagascar might afterwards have been revealed to the astonished gaze of Christendom.

Nor is Japanese Christian literature confined to the Bible. A translation of the Prayer Book was finished last year, and has been accepted by the Episcopal Missions. Editions of a "Life of Christ," a translation of the "Peep of Day," and numerous other books and tracts, mostly by the American missionaries, are sold by thousands; and a Christian newspaper circulates widely throughout Japan. Some of the educated and influential adherents of the American Missions take an active part in these and other agencies for making known the Gospel. One in particular, the well known Joseph Niisima, who, sixteen years ago left Japan at the peril of his life (for the old laws were in force then), and went to America to "find God," is now the head of a Training College at Kioto, the old sacred capital, preparing a hundred Japanese Christians to labour among their countrymen.

While rejoicing, however, in these manifold evidences of

progress, we must not shut our eyes to the arduous character of the work before the Church of Christ. The two religions of Japan are not foes to be despised. Shintoism, indeed, though the Revolution was in one aspect a victory of its votaries over the Buddhists, and though for a time the official patronage it enjoyed gave it great power, will scarcely hold its own now that it, like its rival, is "disestablished and disendowed." A religion without a moral code—for its great modern revivalist, Motoöri, taught that "Japan needed no system of morals like immoral China, as every Japanese acted right if he only consulted his own heart"—without images or idols—and practically consisting in the worship of a Mikado who now wears a French military coat and travels by rail—cannot influence the people. But Buddhism, notwithstanding the secularisation of many of its temples, is a power still. The Shin-shiuists especially, the most active of its sects, who teach the doctrines of Buddha on their purest and most practical side, have been showing remarkable signs of vigour of late, building a great College for six hundred students at Kioto, and even contemplating a proselytizing mission to Europe and America. Western science and civilization indeed, are dealing deadly blows at these ancient faiths; but what is taking their place? The real danger to Japan, now, is from Socialism, Nihilism, and Atheism. "The aged, time-worn religions of old Japan," said a native Christian, Mr. F. T. Yamasaki, in an address lately delivered by him at the Kioto Training School, "are tottering to their fall, and their priests and believers are everywhere despised. The people are unsettled and dissatisfied. They are ready to reject every belief, however reasonable, if it be only old, and to embrace every doctrine, however absurd, if it be only new. The scepticism of Japan, though now confined to the educated few, is yet an undeveloped giant, and must either be crushed while young, or else it will crush us."

Everything Western, *except* Christianity, is being rapidly transplanted by the enthusiasm of Young Japan. Railways, though covering but short distances as yet, carry millions of passengers in a year; manufactories, with machinery from Manchester and Birmingham, are at work everywhere; lighthouses stand on all the promontories; the telegraph runs from end to end of the empire; Industrial Exhibitions are organized even within the sacred precincts of Kioto; in 1877, twenty-two millions of letters, six millions of post-cards, and seven millions of newspapers, passed through the 3,700 post-offices of the empire, and Japan being now in the Postal Union, a post-card can be sent thither for *2d.* The Education Department has established schools all over the country under Government inspection, and two millions of children are at school. But from

the English Bible, and from the God of the Bible, Japan still withholds her allegiance; and one of her acutest and most learned scholars, Nakamura, the translator of Mill's "Liberty" and Smiles's "Self Help," has the shrewdness to perceive, and the courage to affirm, that "without the religion of Christ, the Japanese are plucking only the showy leaves, while they neglect the root of the civilization of Christendom."

Nor is it merely neglect. With many it is deliberate rejection. An influential Japanese newspaper, the *Hochi Shimbun*, in a remarkable article some time ago, appealed to Christian foreigners to waste no more time and trouble in improving Japanese morality, which was as good as their own, but to devote the same time and trouble to imparting to Japan some of their undoubtedly superior intellectual power. At the same time, the writer made no attack upon Christianity itself. "We have no wish to obey it," he said, "nor have we any fear of being troubled by it. As we can enjoy sufficient happiness without any religion whatever, the question as to the merits or demerits of the different forms never enters our head. In fact, religion is nothing to us."

But the *Hochi Shimbun*, in this same article, did not deny the progress that Christianity was actually making in Japan. Its eyes were more open than those foreign merchants and others, who, like some Englishmen in India, doubt the very existence of Missions in the country, although they may be living literally next door to the mission churches and schools.

> The Christian religion [it confessed], seems to be extending by degrees throughout the country. At present, not only in the large cities and at the open ports, but even in small and distant villages, the believers seem to increase day by day. *If it should progress in the future as it does now, it is certain that the Christian religion will prevail all over our country.*

"A new sun," says Mr. Griffis, "is rising upon Japan. Gently, but resistlessly, Christianity is leavening the nation." "God's hand," says Dr. Ferris, "has been in the work day by day, is plainly in it now, and it may be that in the Land of the Rising Sun we may live to see a nation born in a day." Can words express the tremendous responsibility lying upon us Christians to lose not a moment while the opportunity is given us, and to support to the utmost of our power, and by our unceasing prayers, the agencies for revealing to Japan the Light of the World?

EUGENE STOCK.

Art. III.—PREACHING.

WHEN we find an association formed for the avowed purpose of promoting improvement in the art of preaching, the public Press repeatedly, both by comments, suggestions, and communications from correspondents, recurring to the subject, and a distinguished Member of Parliament making it the subject of a well-considered lecture, we cannot be wrong in concluding that it is one in which a large section of the public takes an interest. It is therefore not unsuitable that a magazine such as this, devoted to the service of the Church, should make it the grounds of a few pages of reflection. And in truth, observations on preaching, whether considered in reference to its importance, its objects, its history, or its management, can never in such a Church as the Church of England be held to be out of place. Let us observe, however, that it is not our object so much to show how sermons should be made, as to demonstrate their necessity, and to determine why they should be delivered at all.

As to the importance of preaching, no one with the pages of the New Testament, of Apostolic effort and of Church history before him, can be supposed to question that preaching or addresses on religious topics has the highest of all sanctions, the act of our Lord Himself. When He would make full proof of His Ministry He systematically adopted it. His very first public appearance as a minister was in the attitude of a preacher. The Book of the Law was placed in His hands, in the Synagogue of Capernaum, and He searched out the page He wanted, delivered His text and entered upon His first sermon. It would, of course, have been a precious privilege to us to be in possession of our Lord's inaugural address, more especially as we may observe from the fragment of it which has been preserved that it contained the exposition of the whole of His mission. But we are dealing not with the way in which He unfolded His text, but with the fact that He opened His ministry by preaching. And in truth what other way was there of His doing so? His object was to reach the hearts, the intelligence, and the conscience of the people, and He approached them through the ear. He did not establish, as the great philosophers did, schools of theology, but He simply did what we must do, threw Himself on congregational attention, and taking a section of Scripture as a basis, went on to "open it" and to apply it. And that primary act of His ministry was but the example of it afterwards throughout His entire course. "He went through the villages teaching." "Seeing the multitudes He went up into a mountain" and "He opened His mouth and taught." Whether by lengthened

discourse or by incidental comment, or by the illustrative agency of parables, He was ever bringing himself by speech addressed to the ear, the emotions, the convictions, the ignorance, or the intelligence of the people of his day, in contact with them. And all this was preaching, without which there remained nothing but the force of example and the exhibition of miracles as instruments for the declaration of his mission. Wanting our Lord's addresses of every kind, His religion as far as we can see would have advanced but slowly. In fact, the three years of His ministerial life was principally made up of preaching.

And, that implement sanctioned by Himself he deliberately placed in the hands of His disciples. Sent out by Him on their defined limited commission, He delivered to them the means by which they were to fulfil it when He said, "As ye go preach." It is true that He armed them with miraculous power, which they were freely to exercise for the trials of the suffering many. But even those gifts were auxiliary to the principal effort of their mission, the recommendation and confirmation of the Word. As with their Master, so with them. They had no other way of getting at the minds of the people. The key of knowledge had been taken away by the priests and Pharisees, and the door outside of which lay masses of ignorance and superstition was closed, until forced open by hard outspoken truth. In duplicate arrangement these early homilists went through the villages and towns of Judea, and took their stand, it may be in the market-place, the broad street, the house which received them, and began to speak to the listeners. Of their sermons we know nothing, but may rest assured that they were not disobedient to the command under which they went forth to preach. And although all that they reported was "that devils were subject to Christ's word," yet doubtless had they told the whole tale, we should have had in it simply exhibitions of early Apostolic preaching.

It is in perfect consonance with all this that we find our Lord, when departing from this world He dropped his mantle on His disciples, declaring His reliance for the spread of His Gospel to rest on the agency of preaching. Apostles were sent forth; under Imperial decree they were to go "into all nations and teach." If our Lord's first ministerial act sanctioned, nay, consecrated the instrument of the pulpit, that was doubly consecrated by His last. Commencing with an open Bible in his hands, He laid down His earthly ministry by enjoining His followers to preach the Gospel to every creature. It was His essential mandate, almost His only direction. Whatever climes they visited, whatever veins or sections of mankind they came in contact with, that was the power on

which they were to rely, the function they were to fulfil. Whatever else the Apostles were, and whatever else they did, this they were by Divine command to do, to become preachers of the Word.

With the volume of the Acts of the Apostles before us we are not to question now how that command was obeyed. As if by instinctive impulse of fidelity, the opportunity afforded by the Feast of Pentecost to collect a miscellaneous congregation was eagerly embraced, and the once fishermen of Galilee stood forward as preachers. Preachers, too, in the accurate sense, for we cannot read the address of Peter and John without tracing in it all the elements of a duly constituted sermon. We have the introduction, the thesis laid down, the proofs in support of it, and direct and scriptural quotations brought forward in elucidation of the points made. And so throughout the whole of that eventful history. It is the history of the demand of truth to an ignorant and depraved world to accept God's message recommended by the eloquence of human preaching. Whether to individuals, as when Philip preached Jesus to the Ethiopian, or in courts, as when Paul pleaded before Festus and the Sanhedrim, or to congregations, as when the men of Athens were rebuked for superstition, or to households, as when Peter reasoned with the family of Cornelius, or to men already converted but wanting stimulus and encouragement, as when the Apostle of the Gentiles continued his speech till midnight, or to Imperial despots, as when he made his first answer to Nero, or to fastidious, philosophical Greeks, as when his "speech and preaching" reached the ears and hearts of luxurious Corinthians—it was all preaching, the thunder of the pulpit sounding forth in the ears of sinners that God was waiting on a guilty world with the proffer of reconciliation in His hand.

It would carry us beyond our just limits to extend these proofs of the importance of this ordinance. But we cannot but glance at the fact of which the pages of Christian literature are the proofs, that beyond the Apostolic age the Church felt that the same implement was her chief weapon of defence and aggression. The tomes of the fathers of the early centuries still exist, ponderous and voluminous, but consisting in a large degree of sermons and expositions. Through their pages Chrysostom and Augustin still speak; the latter the acute rhetorician, the man of close argumentative power; the other the "golden mouthed," the master of that Christian eloquence which fascinated Constantinople, and made the Roman Empire of the East acquainted with the treasures of revelation. These men and their contemporaries wrought no miracles in support of their propositions, but they enforced them by the force of their sermons. The ground won by the Apostles was maintained by

the pulpit; the triumph of the first age sustained and consolidated by succeeding ones. No doubt there were schools of catechumens in which the young were indoctrinated, and untaught inquirers built up in the elements of Christian theology. But where would youthful Christianity have stood either for her defence or for her increase but for the ordinance of preaching? Sacraments and ceremonies might have done much to sustain and invigorate Christian life, but they could hardly displace the old recognised process, "that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." It is surely open to us to add to this historical review as to the importance of this ordinance the consideration that time, though it has made many changes in the mental condition of the world, has not removed the ignorance and apathy of the masses of men. Education may have done much, but no one acquainted with the lower strata of society can be unconscious that they are still submerged in the deepest and most lamentable ignorance. And no one acquainted with the upper stratum will be prepared to deny that a deep indifference as to spiritual things largely overspreads it. The nominally educated man is very often an unimpressed man, immersed in business, pleasure, and professional care, seldom throughout the week coming in contact with religious thought, and never caring to open a religious book. The agricultural labourer, the hardworking mechanic, the anxious tradesman, if catechised, would find it difficult to give a reason for the hope (if any) that is in them. How are such classes and such masses to be dealt with? What is to be done by way of dropping if but a single grain of truth on minds untaught and souls unrenewed? It is true that they may read and think, but will they do either? Is it not something that on one day of the seven the "inevitable sermon" should thrust truth on their minds, insinuate an anxiety, suggest an inquiry, implant a dogma? The individual minister would be probably repelled if he attempted personal remonstrances, but the Pulpit has a sort of privilege of presenting to men of all kinds even unwelcome truths; and if it be a matter of importance to make men think any how, then surely to other arguments we may add this in demonstrating the importance of preaching.

We pass from this to another aspect of the subject, that is the uses which preaching subserves. And there can be little doubt that one of these is to make men understand better the foundation of all preaching—the Word of God. Confessedly a difficult book and abounding with things hard to be understood, it is no doubt the minister's duty to attempt to make it plainer. In other words preaching is exposition—the result of that study by which the preacher masters the difficulties and unties the obscurities of the Scriptures. To do

that is something, for it prevents the Bible from being a "sealed book," and if it goes no deeper than the discharge of this critical and intellectual lesson, the Pulpit has done something to give the Word of God an intelligent place in the minds of hearers. But such an intellectual exercise falls far below the real intention, and that which ought to be the aim and effort of the preacher. It is something to enlighten minds, but it is more to rouse conscience, to excite the affections and confirm resolutions. The Pulpit may, if it stops short of these, be an excellent adjunct to the lecture room, dealing with men as a scientific professor might with his subject; but it does not fulfil its destiny, for it does not aim at the conversion of souls. That minister will have but a painful recollection of life on his deathbed who has not striven by all means "to save some." That was the very genius and object of our Lord's mission. "He came to seek and save that which was lost." A sermon which does not aim at hastening reluctant Lot and forcing him out of Sodom, which does not seek to pluck sinners as brands out of the burning, which does not meet in some shape the inquiry, "What must I do to be saved?" whatever else it may be—learned, elegant, critical—has not risen to the point burning in the heart of Christ when he told Apostles to "preach the Gospel." It is that ministry of reconciliation, the proffer of amity on the part of God, and the seeking of trust and submission on the part of man, which has given in all ages to Christianity her persuasive and commanding power.

Times there are when the Pulpit is called upon to fulfil a function distinct from this, for not only should truth be preached, but error combatted. The Epistles of the New Testament, while elevating, spiritual, devotional, are at times eminently controversial. Those to the Hebrews and Galatians are clear instances of this. For truth may be implanted, and yet error may overgrow it. Wheat may be in the field, and tares may be choking it, and therefore are our ministers under the necessity of guarding, as well as enforcing, truth. There have been seasons in our Church's history where she could not well have done without this office of the Pulpit. At the Reformation, Protestant and Papal creeds could not have been separated from each other, but by the keen definitions of controversy. The saintly Taylor felt himself compelled to write his "Dissuasive," and the devout Hall his "No Peace with Rome;" the bulky volumes of Gibbon's "Preservative" retail some of the most masterly discourses in the English language, by dignitaries of the Church, who, moved by the dangers of their times, buckled on their armour and stepped down into the arena of conflict against the inroads which Popery was making on the faith. The spread of Arian and Socinian opinions, the revival

of heresies which menaced the atonement and reinculcated Pelagianism, the bold assaults of infidelity, as at the end of the last century, were all occasions which compelled the Pulpit to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered. We say not that it is desirable that the minds of sinners should be, even by those provocations, drawn away from the great point of personal salvation; but if Paul made Timothy a controversialist, and even passionately declared himself one, it is surely requisite on grave occasions that the trumpet of the Pulpit should utter its sound.

There are also occasions on which the Scriptural simplicity which should distinguish ordinary sermons (and which become a necessity from the fact that congregations are of all classes, whether social or mental) may well be departed from. For there are congregations of highly intellectual and scholastic character to whom the handling of abstruse subjects is applicable, and who perhaps would nauseate truth if presented to them in a simple and elementary form. To them truth must be not simply stated, but elaborately and comprehensively reasoned out. The Hulsean and Bampton Lectures delivered at our universities may be regarded as illustrative of this distinction. To present them to an ordinary congregation is to assume that the ordinary capacity was competent to receive and follow the train of deep thought in which the practised minds of those seats of learning delight to revel. And profound is the debt of gratitude which the Church owes to men who have taken under their protection some disputed or disputable topic of theology, and proved that high scholarship may be an ally and not an antagonist of religion.

The question has often been debated of the construction which a sermon should present, and the manner in which its topics should be handled. With specimens before us presenting features of the greatest opposition on this point it were presumptuous to dogmatise. The well-known treatise of Claude on the Composition of a Sermon was long regarded as laying down the best rules on the point, and shows at all events that one idea had strong hold of that writer's mind—viz., that great care both as to the selection of topics, their arrangement, their proportion, their balance, was necessary for the proper performance of the duty of sermon writing. In much probability the rules laid down by him are much too artificial, and if carried out by all minds would perhaps produce something so stiffly methodical, so sharply guarded by laws and restrictions, as to be unnatural and decorously laboured. Nothing can be more different than the rules which appeared to have governed the great masters of public eloquence in times past. The French school, as exhibited by Bossuet, Massillon, and Bourdaloue, is

strikingly different from the English. With all their elegance and deliberateness, there is a mannerism about it which, though acceptable to a French, would be distasteful to an English audience. Of our own preachers we find a striking dissimilarity between Chalmers of the Scotch, and Hall of the Baptist Church, both confessedly masters of the craft. The former, compared by the latter to a door swinging on its hinges, always moving but never advancing, laying hold with characteristic power on one great idea, and presenting it in all lines of aspect, and helping it by all kinds of illustrations, sweeps the mind irresistibly onward to the conclusion, and compels it to feel that that one main subject had been brought out to a demonstration and riveted for ever in the convictions as "a nail in a sure place." The other, on the contrary, judging not only from the skeleton notes from which he preached, but from the finish of most masterly sermons left behind him, appears to have broken up his main subject into several divisions and treated it in reference to many collateral points. His sermon on "Modern Infidelity," and that entitled "Sentiments on the Present Crisis," present not only grand specimens of the highest eloquence, but traces of the previous arrangements on which the whole magnificent structure was built. In somewhat later days, the characteristics of Chalmers meet us in the sermons of Melville, less pointed and illustrative, but sweeping on in a mighty cataract of gorgeous phraseology. Of those of a more distant age, Taylor, Barrow, South, Sherlock, and many others, it is difficult to speak. Confessedly in the highest rank in their own class, their style and habit of thought are so unsuited to our days, that probably to reproduce them in the pulpit would be to dismiss the congregation. Of nearly the same time there is one man of the Dutch school whose sermons appear more than any other destined to be immortal. From the mixture of scholarly criticism, his power in the exposition of his text, the various lights in which he places it, the force with which he demolishes error, and the pathetic brilliancy of his application, there are few (if any) who rise to the level of the great preacher of The Hague, Jacques Saurin. All have their excellences, and yet it were hard to say which of them would bear a second appearance in the pulpit. Each age has its own tastes, its own conceptions of elocutionary excellence, and cannot transmit its own canon of approval to generations following.

The old adage in this as in other things holds good, "That which is best administered is best." But if our divines are to make the Pulpit an instrument of edification and of usefulness, an attraction and a power, they must see to it that the sermons be representatives of the word of truth, and so accompanied by earnestness of manner, by persuasive tenderness

and gentle force, by an unmistakable solicitude for their hearers' best interest, and such an effort to commend themselves to men's conscience in the sight of God, as will carry home to every soul the conviction that the appeal is not a mere customary discharge of a professional duty dryly and respectably fulfilled, but a real effort to bring God, through His Word, in contact with the human heart, and immortal spirits to the cross of Christ. That is the very temper in which Paul wrote and spoke, "Knowing the terrors of the law we persuade men." "My heart's desire and prayer for Israel is that they might be saved." "As though God did beseech you by us we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." When the Pulpit breathes out such a spirit as this, unmarred by any such uncouthness of manner, or vulgarity of diction, or incoherent statement, or affectation of sentiment as might pain the listeners, it will matter comparatively little after what example of ministerial oratory the sermon is constructed; for as "charity covereth a multitude of sins," burning and intense love of souls expressed in voice, manner, thoughts and words, will condone many defects, and send away a congregation if not excited by the brilliancy of oratory, at least dissatisfied with themselves and a step nearer to God.[1]

B.

Art. IV.—ENGLAND IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

AMONG the valuable collection of State Papers relating to English affairs in Venice, now being ably calendared by Mr. Rawdon Brown, under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls, is a most interesting report upon the state of England at the time of the accession of Queen Mary, which was drawn up at the instigation of the Doge, by the Venetian Envoy accredited to our Court. Early in the February of 1551, Giacomo Soranzo was appointed to succeed Daniel Barbaro as the representative of the Venetian Republic at the English Court. A man of considerable scholarship, a keen observer of life and character, and endowed with that taste and polish which a long career in the diplomatic service usually develops, he was cordially welcomed by the great, and every facility was afforded him for the performance of the duties of his mission. These duties were to "execute with all diligence the different commissions received by him," to send "detailed and speedy advice of

[1] This Paper, in type last month, through an accident was unavoidably postponed.—Ed.

what occurred at the Court where he resided," and to "acquaint the Senate with whatever was worth imparting on his return home." Shortly after his arrival in London, Soranzo set to work to rigidly examine the social and political life of the country, and as soon as his investigations justified him in the attempt, proceeded to write an elaborate account of England and her people. From this account we now quote.

After describing the events familiar to us all which preceded the accession of Mary—the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII., the slight passed upon the birth of Mary and Elizabeth, the progress of the Reformation under Edward VI., the plot of Northumberland in favour of Lady Jane Grey, Soranzo enters upon a personal description of the Queen. "The most serene Madam Mary," he says, "is of low stature, with a red and white complexion and very thin; her eyes are white (*bianchi*) and large, and her hair reddish; her face is round, with a nose rather low and wide; and were not her age on the decline she might be called handsome rather than the contrary.

She is not of a strong constitution, and of late she suffers from headache and serious affection of the heart, so that she is often obliged to take medicine and also to be blooded. She is of very spare diet, and never eats until one or two P.M., although she rises at daybreak, when, after saying her prayers and hearing mass in private, she transacts business incessantly until after midnight, when she retires to rest; for she chooses to give audience, not only to all the members of her Privy Council and to hear from them every detail of public business, but also to all other persons who ask it of her. Her Majesty's countenance indicates great benignity and clemency, which are not belied by her conduct, for although she has had many enemies, and though so many of them were by law condemned to death, yet had the executions depended wholly on her Majesty's will not one of them, perhaps, would have been enforced; but deferring to her council in everything, she in this matter likewise complied with the wishes of others rather than with her own. [How different is the interpretation History puts upon her conduct!] She is endowed with excellent ability, and more than moderately read in Latin literature, especially with regard to Holy Writ; and besides her native tongue she speaks Latin, French, and Spanish, and understands Italian perfectly, but does not speak it. She is also very generous, but not to the extent of letting it appear that she rests her chief claim to commendation on this quality. . . . . Her Majesty takes pleasure in playing on the lute and spinet, and is a very good performer on both instruments; and, indeed, before her accession she taught many of her maids of honour. But she seems to delight above all in arraying herself elegantly and magnificently, and her garments are of two sorts; the one, a gown, such as men wear, but fitting very close, with an under petticoat, which has a very long train; and this is her ordinary costume, being

also that of the gentlewomen of England. The other garment is a gown and bodice, with wide hanging sleeves in the French fashion, which she wears on State occasions; and she also wears much embroidery, and gowns and mantles of cloth of gold and cloth of silver, of great value, and changes every day. She also makes great use of jewels, wearing them both on her chaperon and round her neck and as trimming for her gowns; in which jewels she delights greatly, and although she has a great plenty of them left her by her predecessors, yet were she better supplied with money than she is, she would doubtless buy many more."

Soranzo then touches upon the restoration of the Roman Catholic religion and the devotion of the Queen to the cause of the Papacy. "She is so confirmed in the Catholic faith," he asserts, "that although the King, her brother, and his Council prohibited her from having the mass celebrated according to the Roman Catholic ritual, she nevertheless has it performed in secret, nor did she ever choose by any act to assent to any other form of religion, her belief in that in which she was born being so strong that had the opportunity offered she would have displayed it at the stake, her hopes being placed in God alone, so that she constantly exclaims: '*In te Domine confido, non confundar in æternum: si Deus est pro nobis, quis contra nos?*'" In an interview with the Venetian envoy the Queen said that "she did not believe she had incurred any ecclesiastical censure, having never consented to the things which took place against the religion, but that nevertheless to put her mind more at ease she moreover wished for absolution from the Pope, not only for herself, but also for the whole kingdom." She begged Soranzo "as everything was still so unsettled that the publication of her demand might seriously injure the affairs of the kingdom," to make her request privately to the Vatican; but, adds the envoy, "at Rome the secret was not kept as it ought to have been, and the Pope conceded the absolution to her Majesty and all those who were heartily disposed to resume their obedience to the Roman Church." The description of the one sister naturally leads to the portrait of the other. "The Lady Elizabeth," writes the observant diplomatist, "is now about twenty-one years old; her figure and face are very handsome, and such an air of dignified majesty pervades all her actions that no one can fail to suppose she is a Queen. She is a good Greek and Latin scholar, and besides her native tongue she speaks Latin, French, Spanish, and Italian most perfectly, and her manners are very modest and affable. During the lifetime of King Edward she held his opinion about the religion, but since the Queen's accession she has adapted herself to the will of her Majesty."

From the Sovereign we are now introduced to her subjects.

"The English for the most part," remarks Soranzo, "are of

handsome stature and sound constitution, with red or white complexions, their eyes also being white.

According to their station they are all as well clad as any other nation whatever. The dress of the men resembles the Italian fashion, and that of the women the French. The nobility are by nature very courteous, especially to foreigners, who, however, are treated with very great arrogance and enmity by the people, it seeming to them that the profit derived by the merchants from their country is so much taken from them, and they imagine that they could live without foreign intercourse. They are also by nature of little faith both towards their Sovereigns and with each other, and are therefore very suspicious. The nobility, save such as are employed at Court, do not habitually reside in the cities, but in their own country mansions, where they keep up very grand establishments, both with regard to the great abundance of eatables consumed by them, as also by reason of their numerous attendants, in which they exceed all other nations, so that the Earl of Pembroke has upwards of one thousand clad in his own livery. In these their country residences they occupy themselves with hunting of every description, and whatever else can amuse or divert them; so that they seem wholly intent on leading a joyous existence, the women being no less sociable than the men, it being customary for them and allowable to go without any regard, either alone or accompanied by their husbands, to the taverns, and to dine and sup where they please. The English do not much delight in either military pursuits or literature, which last, more especially by the nobility, is not held in much account, and they have scarcely any opportunity for occupying themselves with the former, save in time of war, and when that is ended they think no more about them, but in battle they show great courage and great presence of mind in danger, but they require to be largely supplied with victuals; so it is evident that they cannot endure much fatigue."

To a man accustomed to the warmth and brightness of the sunny south, the air of England, with its "clouds, wind, and rain," was anything but appreciated, though the Venetian admits that "in calm weather the climate is so temperate that the extremes of heat and cold are rarely felt, and never last long, so that persons clad in fur may be seen all the year round." The Conservative programme of *sanitas sanitatum* appears to have been much neglected by those in power. "They have," writes Soranzo, "some little plague in England every year, for which they are not accustomed to make sanitary provisions, as it does not usually make great progress; the cases for the most part occur amongst the lower classes, as if their dissolute mode of life impaired their constitutions." On the first year of the Envoy's residence in England there broke out, owing to some "atmospheric putrescence," the disease called the sweat:—

It commenced in Wales and then traversed the whole kingdom, the mortality being immense amongst persons of every condition.

The malady was a most profuse sweat, which, without any other indisposition, seized patients by the way, and the remedies at first administered taking no effect, they died in a few hours, so that during the first three days of its appearance there died in London alone upwards of 5000 persons, but some remedy having been devised subsequently, it ceased in twenty days. The alarm, however, was great and universal; all who could made their escape, all business being suspended, the shops closed, and nothing attended to but the preservation of life.

Upon the position of England as a commercial country Soranzo comments more favourably. The soil, he says, produces wheat, oats, and barley in such plenty that the people usually have enough for their own consumption, "but were they to work more diligently and with greater skill, and bring the soil into higher cultivation, England might supply grain for exportation, but they do not attend much to this, so that they sometimes need assistance both from Flanders and Denmark, and occasionally from France likewise." The brewing of beer, owing to the sun not permitting the vines to ripen, is, he remarks, one of the chief industries of the country. "This potion is most palatable to them, and all persons drink it, even their sovereigns, although they also consume a great quantity of wine, which is brought from Candia, Spain, the Rhine, and from France, the last being more prized than the rest." Both in the Thames and in the neighbouring seas fish is to be obtained in abundance, whilst the oyster-beds are so prolific that "occasionally as many as twenty smacks are seen filled with oysters, but during four months in the summer it is forbidden either to take or sell them." Owing to the excellence of the pasturage the cattle, and especially the sheep, are, he says, in first-rate condition and of great value. The wool which the sheep yield is the best in Europe, and the manufacture of cloth is one of the chief sources of the wealth of the country; "great part of this wool is manufactured in England, where cloths and kerseys of various sorts are wrought, which amount annually to 150,000 pieces of cloth of all sorts and 150,000 pieces of kersey, the rest of the wool being exported and taken usually to Calais on account of the staplers, who then sell it on the spot and have the monopoly of the wool exports from England, though occasionally export-permits are conceded by favour to other persons, though the staplers do their utmost to prevent it. The quantity of unwrought wool exported is said to amount to about 2000 tons annually." Lead and tin are extracted from the mines in Cornwall "in great quantity, and of such good quality that the like is not to be found elsewhere." The country is also rich in coal and iron. The great centres for all this commerce are the two cities of London and York:—

London [he notes] is the most noble, both on account of its being the Royal residence, and because the river Thames runs through it, very much to the convenience and profit of the inhabitants, as it ebbs and flows every six hours like the sea, scarcely ever causing inundation or any extraordinary floods; and up to London Bridge it is navigable for ships of 400 butts burden, of which a great plenty arrive with every sort of merchandise. This bridge connects the city with the borough, and is built on stone with twenty arches and shops on both sides. On the banks of the river are many large palaces, making a very fine show, but the city is much disfigured by the ruins of a multitude of churches and monasteries belonging heretofore to friars and nuns. It has a dense population, said to number 180,000 souls, and is beyond measure commercial, the merchants of the entire kingdom flocking thither, as, by a privilege conceded to the citizens of London, from them alone can they purchase merchandise, so they soon become very wealthy.

Like all foreigners, Soranzo is struck with admiration at the self-government of London and at the majesty of the Lord Mayor:—

This mayor [he says] usually keeps a most excellent table, with open doors, and in one year spends at least 4000 ducats out of his own purse; and on the expiration of his office he is for the most part knighted. His chief charge is to superintend the victualling department, to legislate for the populace in minor suits, and to have care for the custody of the city by day and night, the keys of its gates being in his possession.

A nation so eminently commercial is, in the opinion of the Envoy, not fitted for war. From her whole realm the Queen could easily raise 100,000 men, only "it is not the custom to enroll every sort of person" as is the fashion on the Continent. In cases of need "it is usual to order noblemen to collect such an amount of troops as required, which is done when the Crown does not trust everybody." When fearful of foreign invasion or some sudden insurrection of the natives, it is the custom "to place a light on the top of certain huge lanterns fixed on heights in all the villages, on appearance of which signal anywhere, all the neighbouring places do the like, and the forces muster at the first sight, so in a short time the general muster is made, the remedy and assistance proving alike efficient." From these musters some 15,000 horse might be raised, only "the native English horse is not good for war, and they have not many foreign horses." Of the arms and disposition of the troops Soranzo gives us the following account:—

The weapons used by the English are a spear, and not having much opportunity for providing themselves with body-armour, they wear for the most part breast-plates with shirts of mail and a skull cap and sword. The rest would be footmen, of which they have four

sorts: the first, which in number and valour far excels the others, consists of archers, in whom the sinew of their armies consists, all the English being, as it were, by nature most expert bowmen, inasmuch as not only do they practise archery for their pleasure, but also to enable them to serve their king, so that they have often secured victory for the armies of England. The second sort consists of infantry who carry a sort of bill; and there are some of these likewise who would make good soldiers. The other two sorts are harquebusiers and pikemen, of which weapons they have very little experience. Occasionally the Crown has subsidized German troops.

So much for the army, now for the navy. "Her Majesty's naval forces are very considerable, as she has great plenty of English sailors, who are considered excellent for the navigation of the Atlantic, and an abundance of timber for ship-building, as they do not use galleys, owing to the strong tide in the ocean.

Were her Majesty to take the vessels of shipowners in all parts of the kingdom the number would be immense; but she has only eighty of her own, including some small galleons; and whenever she pleased she could very easily obtain upwards of 150 from private individuals, but small, as in those parts but few large ships are seen, and they say that those of 400 butts and under sail better than the larger ones. Her Majesty has a great quantity of very fine artillery, both in the fortresses beyond sea as well as in many places within the realm, and especially at the Tower of London, where the ammunition of every sort is preserved. The courage of the English soldiers and sailors is beyond suspicion, but it is rendered almost useless by the lack of efficient commanders."

In the whole realm they have no persons, neither sailor nor soldier, capable of commanding either fleet or army. The only man they had, adds the Envoy, was the Duke of Northumberland, who by his bravery distinguished himself in both capacities.

The financial condition of the country is not prosperous. From the property belonging to the Crown, including that of the Church, the revenues of the Queen amount to a million of ducats, and as the ordinary expenditure is estimated at 830,000, it follows that her Majesty should have a surplus of 170,000 ducats.

But [writes Soranzo] from the research used by me I understood that the revenues do not suffice for the expenditure, partly because as usual everywhere it is impossible to levy all the taxes, and in part owing to the maladministration of the money to such an extent that since a long while stipendiaries receive barely half their pay; and the cost of the Coronation and the outfit of the thirty ships which put to sea this year for the coming of the Prince of Spain, were defrayed by a loan, for which the merchants in Flanders contracted at exorbitant interest.

So shrewd an observer did not fail to interpret aright the dangers that menaced both England and the Continent from the Spanish alliance. The Venetian notes how opposed the people were to the marriage, but "the Queen being born of a Spanish mother was always inclined to that nation, scorning to be English, and boasting of her descent from Spain." In vain Parliament besought her to marry an Englishman and satisfy the wishes of her subjects; "not only did she reply ungraciously, but without allowing them even to conclude their address rebuked them for their audacity in daring to speak to her, their Queen, about marriage, saying, however, that she would consult with God, and with no one else, which greatly disturbed everybody." Soranzo then proceeds to discuss the policy that her husband will in all probability pursue:—

"It is quite clear that should Don Philip choose to maintain himself in England by sheer force, he would require a very great number of troops, which I do not think he could muster at present during the Emperor's war with France, so it may be supposed that he intends to rule in peace and quiet, which would I think render him more secure; for the greater the amount of foreign troops introduced into the country, the greater cause would the English have for riots, and discontent, as very well known to his Highness. . . . . It may also be supposed that through a variety of opportunities he will endeavour to benefit the nobility, without whom with difficulty can the people ever do anything of consequence; and by associating with the aristocracy he, in time, will have no great difficulty about ascertaining their disposition, and will give them colleagues, who, acknowledging their dignity and profit as the gifts of his Highness, will seek his advantage, nor will he lack means for disposing adroitly of those who dissent from him. It may also be supposed that his chief care will be to garrison the fortresses with Englishmen who he can persuade himself depend on his own immediate will. These and very many other precautions he could take which might benefit him; but nothing would be more efficacious than the Queen's pregnancy, the mere hope of which is sufficient to curb the people."

This prognostication was, as we know, not fulfilled. Philip was so occupied with his affairs on the Continent that he troubled himself very little about England except, when he wanted resources, to draw upon her Treasury for funds; whilst the discontent of the people with the alliance was not appeased by the appearance of any heir to the Crown. One anticipation of the Envoy was, however, fully realised. "At present," writes Soranzo, "her Majesty is quite at peace with the most Christian King . . . . but should her husband determine on persuading her to make war on France, it may be believed that she will not refuse him, most especially if he made himself agreeable to her." This view was correct. Philip did persuade his wife

to declare war against France—a war which resulted in Spanish aggrandisement and in the loss of Calais to England.

The remainder of the Envoy's report does not call for particular comment. It is of great interest to the foreign State for which it was written, but it does not contain any novel matter for Englishmen. It is a treatise on our laws and forms of government, not from an Italian, but from an English point of view, and therefore familiar to us all. Soranzo describes our system of trial by jury, our courts of appeal, the power of the Lord Chancellor, and the jurisdiction of the Houses of Parliament. Trial by jury does not appear to meet with his approbation, as it seems to him a system dependent not so much upon the sense of justice in the individual as upon his powers of physical endurance. "To say," he comments, "how defective and reprehensible this mode of trial is, seems to me unnecessary, so I will merely observe that one of these twelve judges being better able than his fellows to withstand hunger and other inconveniences, has been the cause of the death of a person under trial, although the others wished to acquit him."

We have but seized upon the most salient points in this despatch, which appears to have been oddly enough overlooked by the more recent historians of this period, but to all interested in the reign of Mary the document, though of course partial and from a Roman Catholic point of view, is well deserving of attention.

ALEX. CHARLES EWALD.

ART. V.—AN EGYPTIAN FARM.

IF we are going to visit a farm in Egypt, we must abandon, of course, our English notions of farmhouse life; but these are so deeply rooted in most English minds, that though we do not exactly expect to see labourers in smock-frocks and hats, or rosy dairy-maids in pattens, red-brick walls with creepers over them, and trim vegetable gardens flanked by well-stocked rick-yards, still a vague sense of disappointment and amazement is apt to come over us unless well prepared for something very different indeed from the farms of our early recollections. But in its own way an Egyptian farm has much to please the eye, especially if it be an *artistic* eye, and to interest it in many ways. Let the reader accompany me to one, and try to see at least as much as, by pen and ink, he can of the farms in the Nile valley. The specimen chosen is like many others, the differences being trivial.

A wide plain of varied green is before us, for it is January, and the young corn is already in blade, and the clover has that emerald hue for which Egyptian clover is famed; the bean crops are in blossom, and the sugar canes, though nearly over in many places, are yet to be seen waving their sword-like leaves in others; clumps of trees, and little villages with palm groves around them, break the uniformity of the flat; and the bright, clear atmosphere of Egyptian winter makes everything look its best. Every shadow is purple, every ray of sun golden; in the far distance are the pale yellow tints of the desert, and the range of ochre and white cliffs faintly showing beyond them. In front is a cluster of huts grouped irregularly together and all of sun-dried mud, with rather a small window, or, yet more frequently, none at all in the huts of the poorer peasants. The door is low, frequently obliging people to stoop to enter, and the roof consists only of a number of reeds kept down by stones, or else bundles of maize straw, or palm branches.

The accommodation is far below the humblest stable or cow-house of English farms, yet here are families dwelling year after year. It must, however, be borne in mind that the people are almost always out of doors, so the discomfort of such abodes is far less than would be the case in our climate. These huts belong to labourers employed on the farm; the yard is enclosed by a wall of the same material as the huts, but tolerably high, and entered by an arched doorway with a massive wooden door, which stands open by day generally. On entering we find ourselves in a wide space shaded by two or three fine trees, either mulberry or *Lebich* trees,[1] or sometimes a sycamore fig. A deep well, with the wheel turned by oxen, which is called a *sacchea*, is very frequently found in this yard and takes up great part of it; if not here it must be elsewhere on the premises, and if a large farm, there must be several, as the crops depend greatly for irrigation upon the saccheas. The overflow of the Nile is sufficient in some places, but even there the three crops cannot be secured without artificial irrigation.

Buffaloes are often used to turn the wheel; but whatever animal it be must be blindfolded during the work, or its sight would be injured. The wheel turns a second furnished with rude pitchers attached to it by ropes, and communicating with a trough, from which little channels convey the water to the fields. On one side of the yard is the house, a rustic concern, generally built of mud brick, but often large, containing various rooms opening into a corridor, and sometimes a story with an outside flight of steps is found which is occupied by the owner and his family when they reside in "the peasant's land,"

[1] A kind of acacia, imported from India originally.

as the Egyptians term what we speak of familiarly as "the country." Instead of the animals being in separate divisions, the cows in their stalls, the horses in theirs, and so forth, they are seen lying down in a friendly way all together or wandering about as they like when in the yard; the huge buffaloes are almost always gentle and quiet, and the cows and calves likewise, the goats with their many little kids are mostly out by day with their keeper, but two or three are frequently to be seen skipping about the premises to pick up any stray leaves, or lying on the housetops to enjoy the sun; these belong to some of the labourers, but are kept out of the garden by the wall, or very few plants would be left uninjured. The fowls and geese, dogs, and ragged children, congregate in the yard and play together in the dust or dabble in the little water channels, according to their taste. A stout labourer's wife is probably washing clothes in the said channel while the wheels are at work; she does not spare trouble as she squats on the edge of the stone trough, her dark blue cotton mantle tucked around her, and the loose sleeves of her scanty dress of the same hue, rolled up from her brown, well-shaped arms; she wrings and scrubs heartily, but in washing coloured things rarely uses any soap and never *heats* any water, so that her clothes are never properly clean after all.

"*Malesh* (never mind), we are peasants," she replies, in answer to a remark on this deficiency; and laughing, she displays a set of milk-white and even teeth which many a fine lady might envy. But is there no dairy? What becomes of the milk? we ask. "Oh, we make butter out of doors," is the reply; and one of the women shows a goat-skin suspended by a rope to a nail in the wall, and half full of slightly-turned milk; she pulls a string fastened to this so as to jerk the contents of the bag to and fro, and thus the butter is made. They never salt or even wash it, so that it soon becomes sour, but is very good when quite fresh if washed properly. The people melt it down into clarified butter for cookery, and then it will keep through summer, when none can be made. The cheese is also prepared out of doors; this is made not only from buffaloes' milk, but from goats and sheep (the latter is extremely good when cleanly made). It is drained by means of a mat of fine reeds, and then salted, but not pressed at all, and is, in fact, only salted lard.

The ragged clothing of the women and children might lead one to suppose the farm labourers all wretchedly poor. But though there is much distress occasionally, it is caused either by a "bad Nile," when the water has been much under the mark; or by extra taxation administered by petty officials, who too often illtreat and fleece the peasants, to fill their private purses. Many peasant women, however, look poorer than they are, from

being quite indifferent to rags and dirt, and they keep a better veil and mantle for feast days or going to the weekly market at some country town. The men are usually better clad, though of course many are poorly off, but most peasants and farm labourers have a felt cap surmounted by a turban of stout muslin, cotton underclothing, and a great brown cloak or loose coat called a zabout, made of wool spun by their own hands from the brown fleeces of their sheep, or from goats' or camels' hair. While resting from hard work the countryman often spins (the women hardly ever do this work), a rude distaff and spindle being carried easily about with him; a shepherd always has these implements, as well as a reed pipe, on which very primitive and monotonous, but not unpleasant, tunes are played by him as he watches his flock.

They are a cheerful, contented people, and seem to enjoy life heartily, and to be patient under its ordinary troubles, though if excited they will be extremely passionate, and on the loss of relatives or other serious griefs give way to their feelings with the unrestrained vehemence of all Southern natures.

But what of man's higher part? Does no man care for their souls? Do they live and die like the cattle they tend? As far as the owner of the land is concerned they certainly might do so in general, and most of them are very ignorant even of the distorted religion they profess to believe. There is in most villages a small, rude mosque, and always a burial-place outside the dwellings, but there is no one answering to a parish minister or priest. The most influential person in the village is generally the *Sheikh*, or chief man; the Government Sheikhs are distinct from those appointed for religious purposes, and such an one exercises functions somewhat like a mayor or a French *Préfet*. He is responsible to Government for the quota of men furnished for conscription in the army and for other secular matters, but at the same time has a power, not very clearly defined but strongly felt, over the people's consciences. It is difficult to distribute portions of Scripture or speak a work of Gospel truth if the Sheikh of the village is a bigoted, obstinate man; if, on the other hand, he is sensible and kindly, it is comparatively easy to collect together a band of listeners.

In my yearly Nile boat mission journeys, I and my helpers in the work have found the people generally ready to listen to Gospel histories and conversations. Had we means we would gladly do much more, but very few among the numbers who toil in the cotton and corn fields year after year have any one to ask them, "Where is your soul going after death?"

The women are more profoundly ignorant than the men. They do not even go to the little mosque to pray on Fridays, nor, with very rare exceptions, pray at all, and many of them know

nothing but a few silly legends handed from one to another by oral tradition and the formula of their faith. "There is but one God, and Mahomet is the apostle of God." But it will not do to imagine they are the less bigoted because they are ignorant. Quite the contrary; but still there are many who are willing to listen to the reading of the Gospel. In these out of the way spots many will listen, no doubt, from mere curiosity, and because it is a novelty to see a lady in "frank" dress sitting among them. But some are really, as it seems, glad to hear the good tidings, to them so new, that God loves even them. Great is the joy and earnest the prayers of the teacher when she can see the poor peasant woman's eye fixed with an expression of real thoughtfulness, and hear her say "Truly this is good," or repeat the words "Lord be merciful to me a sinner"!

I once met a poor widow in the little cluster of huts belonging to a farm where I had formerly spent a few days, and heard her say, striking the sunbaked earth on which we were seated—"What is a poor woman to do whose heart is like this ground? How can she pray?" I replied, "Oh! my sister, hear the words of God on this; 'I will take away the stony heart and will give you an heart of flesh,'" and then I tried to show how in Jesus we find all we need: very imperfectly, no doubt, for it was many years ago, and I did not speak very fluently, though able to read and explain some simple texts; but she seemed to take it in, and be comforted, and promised to pray for light from above. This is only one instance of many among Moslim villagers, both men and women, who by my missionary friends and myself have heard something of the truth. The seed is cast on the waters. We go forth in the name of our Master in faith and in hope that one day He will cause the earth to bring forth fruit for His glory.

M. L. WHATELY.

ART. VI.—CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

1. *The Jesuits: their Constitution and Teaching.* By W. C. CARTWRIGHT, M.P. London: Murray. 1876.
2. *Comment l'Église Romaine n'est plus l'Église Catholique.* Par M. L'ABBÉ MICHAUD. Paris: Sandoz. 1872.
3. *The White Fields of France.* By H. BONAR, D.D. London: Nisbet. 1879.
4. *Histoire des Protestants de France.* Par G. M. FÉLICE. Sixième édition. Toulouse. 1874.
5. *Histoire du Synode Général de l'Église Reformée.* Par EUGÈNE BERSIER. Paris: Sandoz. 1872.
6. *La Crise Actuelle.* Par M. EMILE DE BONNECHOSE. Troisième édition. Paris: Meyrueis. 1868.
7. *Le Correspondant.* 1879.
8. *Le Signal.* 1879-80.

I.

IN a former Article we presented a historical review of the relations between Church and State in France during the past century. It must, however, not for a moment be lost sight of that the conflict between them is but the late manifestation of a struggle which has almost been perennial in France. With all her patronage and support of Rome, France was contending for her religious liberties in periods when by comparison England was contentedly Popish. A violent effort at the Reformation set us completely free. It was the misfortune of France, and of the world, that a declaration in favour of Protestantism, which might not have been quite impossible in the reign of Francis I., came to nothing.[1] It is hardly possible to imagine, so far as man can judge, what unnumbered wars would have been spared to mankind by a different result. Abandoning, however, such speculations, and reverting to the present, we have the fearful spectacle of two frightful antagonists contending for the mastery in France. Church and State there present themselves now in the horrible attitude of superstition and infidelity. Which will gain the mastery? How between them shall France attain to "God and Liberty"? We do not doubt that there are in that country many sorely perplexed partisans of neither extreme, who sigh like Falkland for "peace" in the midst of opposing factions. But how is their voice to make itself heard in the midst of the din and tumult of internecine war. With one con-

[1] The allusion is to the correspondence between Francis I. and Melancthon, in 1535.

sent all hold the present state of things, especially in the important matter of education, to be most unsatisfactory and dangerous. It does not suit the policy of either of the chief contending parties to proclaim the fact, but in reality the old conflict over the Gallican liberties is substantially resumed, to all appearance under very unfavourable circumstances for the Church. From the pressure of Rome, she, through her bishops and clergy, has for a long period ceased to struggle in any effective manner for these liberties. This task has devolved upon the laity almost exclusively. As French laymen are in too many cases very imperfectly under the influence of religious belief, their support of religious liberty is eccentric, and may be dangerous. Nevertheless, this is the real question at issue in France just now, as it was in the days of the Pragmatic Sanction. The opposition to Romish subjugation has passed out of the hands of kings and bishops into those of popular assemblies and tribunes of the people, out of those of religious men into those of sceptics and infidels.[1] It is hardly possible but that harm and loss will be gained. By common consent, therefore, although there is difference of opinion regarding the symptoms of the malady and the malady itself, there is disease in France in the vital matters of religion and education. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint." Some declare there is no God; others cry that there is no liberty. For the moment, apparently, the struggle of the patient has exhibited itself in favour of liberty rather than of "God." But this is not and cannot be a wholesome state. To whom then is France to look for remedy, and where is remedy to be found?

The first and most natural resource would be to call in the aid of the Church. Professedly the large majority of the French people still nominally adhere to Romanism as their creed. Multitudes are in such profound ignorance that they know of no other form of religion. We venture to assert that if the Church of France were in any measure or degree what the Church of England is, this would be not only the natural, but

[1] "L'exécrable journée de la Saint Barthélemy," dit M. de Chateaubriand, "ne fit que des martyrs; elle donna aux idées philosophiques un avantage qu'elles ne perdirent plus sur les idées religieuses, ainsi quelques millions de protestants de moins et plusieurs millions de philosophes ou d'incredules de plus. Voila le bilan de la Saint Barthélemy. Qu'est ce donc que les prêtres ont gagne à diminuer le nombre des disciples de Luther et de Calvin pour accroître celui des enfants de Montaigne et de Voltaire? Ils y'ont gagné la réaction anticatholique du dixhuitième siècle, les hostilités de l'assemblée constituante, les Massacres de l'Abbaye, les proscriptions de '93. Et quoi encore? l'esprit de notre époque. Cet esprit qui a passé de la France en Italie n'a pas dit sur le catholicisme son dernier mot."—De Félice, *Histoire des Protestants de France*, p. 228.

the expedient resource.[1] If the modern French Church sat loose to the trammels of the Papacy; if it had an independent and indigenous existence; if it were really national; if it set forward, even with partial admixture of corruption and error, the great saving truths of Christianity in a clear and saving manner; if it proclaimed and *used* the Bible as its great religious Charter; if it heartily recognised liberty of conscience and liberty of religious worship; if it kept clear of gross impostures and fanatical delusions, making no demands upon the human intellect inconsistent with Scripture and with reason, France might and France ought to commit her destinies to that which was once her Church. The Church of England is all this to us. The most enlightened men and the most ardent lovers of freedom can and do draw near to God through her medium. If they dissent from her doctrine and discipline, without let or hindrance, they follow out their religious convictions as they please. There is of course infidelity in England as there is also superstition, but neither of these is paramount. But what is the condition of the Church in France?[2] It is no longer the Church even of Fenelon and Bossuet. It may parade those great names, but it has no principles now in common with those which the latter, at any rate, so strenuously upheld. The Gallican liberties are as offensive to modern French prelates as they were dear to him.[3]

[1] In the *Correspondant* for July, 1879, l'Abbé Martin has an article on "L'Enseignement en Angleterre." It is disfigured with those astonishing blunders which Frenchmen habitually make concerning England. He asserts that children are brought up in England without religious teaching. He opines that there are several thousands of nuns in connection with the Church of England. The reply to the Abbé Martin is easy: if the Church with us had been to England what the Church in France has been to France, it would long since have ceased to exist as a national institution, it would not have been suffered to teach Englishmen.

[2] Even French ecclesiastics seem unable accurately to define this condition. Three Abbés have recently stated their views. M. l'Abbé Bougaud, Vicar-General of the Orleans Diocese, has published a pamphlet which has run through four editions, "Le grand péril de l'Église de France." M. l'Abbé Martin is controverting him in the *Nineteenth Century*. M. l'Abbé Michaud has undertaken to prove "Comment l'Église Romaine n'est plus l'Église Catholique." He maintains that it is neither one, nor holy, nor Catholic, nor apostolic, but that it is anti-Catholic and anti-Christian, its whole subtlety being (*singer Dieu*) to ape God. In all these three views there is truth. The Church in France is in great danger. It has made great exertions of late years to reassert its ancient dominion. As l'Abbè Martin explains, "regiments have been formed, troops have been disciplined, the ranks have been filled up, and an army has been formed." L'Abbé Michaud has demonstrated, with no ordinary force and ability, that the present Church in France, especially since the Vatican Council, is a compound of Judaism and Paganism rather than a true representation of Christianity.

[3] De Maistre describes Bossuet as the forerunner of the Jacobins, and the declaration of the Gallican liberties in 1682 as the cause of the death of Louis XVI. and the Terror!

It may be conceded that in episcopal palaces and in presbyteries there does exist jealousy of the regular clergy. A certain amount of hostility has ever and will ever prevail. But since the Restoration of the Monarchy in 1815, and notably during the last twenty years, the Church in France has been ultramontane and foreign, Papal and not French. Latterly, it is no exaggeration to say the Church in France, as, indeed, the Romish Church in all countries, is little other than the Order of Jesuits. As it has been admirably and most truly stated,

> Silently, but ruthlessly, that stealthy organization, which calls itself the Society of Jesus—in grim pursuit of what it calls the greater glory of God—has laid siege to, broken into, and razed those glorious and venerable sanctuaries, in Italy, in Germany, and above all, in France, whence, during generations, there had beamed forth across the wide plain of the Catholic world, with the calmly luminous glow of purified light, the mellow gleam of a religious sentiment, which did not divorce the fervour of Catholic piety from candid learning and heartfelt attachment to liberties, any more than it considered it essential for the triumph of the faith to propagate a belief in coarse superstitions, and to fortify the Church by a network of trickeries. Having succeeded step by step in outlawing every element that betrayed a policy for organic freedom, the Society of Jesus, in our time, has set the signature on their work by that momentous stroke in the Vatican Council, which has dogmatically identified the Church with the Order, and has practically transformed, at all events for the present, the organization of the former into an enlarged house of the latter.—*The Jesuits*, by W. C. Cartwright, M.P.

Recognising then the great truth that the State in France has now to do with Jesuitism, "pur et simple," it is necessary clearly to understand what the attitude of France towards the Jesuits has been. The originators of the Society were not Frenchmen, but Spaniards.[1] It was, however, in a small church on what were then "the lonely heights of Montmartre," where a large church is now being erected to the "Sacré cœur de Jesus," that in 1534 the first seven members laid the foundation of the Jesuit association. Whatever else the vast structure, when completed, may profess to commemorate, it will testify to the world that on that particular spot Jesuitism sprang into existence. In 1561 the Jesuits first obtained a legal footing in France. In 1594 they were sentenced to banishment from France, as corrupters of youth and enemies of the King and of the State. Ten years afterwards, through most discreditable influence, according to Saint Simon, they were, despite the strenuous opposition of the Parliament of Paris, restored by the peremptory order of Henri IV. "Assurez moi de ma vie" was the constant

[1] No Frenchman has ever yet been General of the Order of Jesuits.

answer of the king, who feared nothing "hormis le couteau Jesuitique." He perished by it. From a similar fear, Louis XIV., though ever struggling against them, chose his confessor from the Order. When Père la Chaise died, he selected the Père le Tellier to succeed him. "Il voulait vivre et vivre en sureté." Père la Chaise had warned him, "qu'un mauvais coup était bientôt fait et n'était pas sans exemple."[1] During the whole of his reign there was a struggle, and eventually a successful one, for Jesuit supremacy, in despite of the convictions and opposition of all well-wishers to their country. Through the confessional, and the hold which they obtained on public instruction; through their power and the wealth acquired by commercial enterprises of a most questionable character; by their learning and strenuous opposition to all which Rome deemed heresy; by the subtlety of their policy and the wonderful organization of their Society; finally, by their professed devotion to the Papacy, which they exalted by crushing not only the temporal power, but also the episcopal and general councils; they made themselves for nearly two centuries masters of the position. But, in so doing, they provoked relentless enemies. It is not too much to say that France never has forgiven them. Their favourite project was to establish the Inquisition there. When one of their chiefs (Père Lallemant) broached this project to the Marshal d'Estrées in the Abbey of St. Germain des Près, the Marshal, after listening to him for some time, told him that were it not for where they were he would have him thrown out of the window into the street.[2]

At length the day of retribution came. By an arrêt of Parliament, 1762, "the Jesuits were declared to be an institution from its nature inadmissible into any well-ordered (*policé*) state, as contrary to natural right, trespassing in all spiritual and temporal authority, and aiming at introducing into the Church and into States a political confederation, under the pretext of a religious institution, the essence of which consists in restless activity, by all sorts of underhand and public means, in order to obtain at first absolute independence, and then after that the usurpation of an authority." This embodies the deliberate judgment of France on the Jesuits. It is sometimes asserted that this is an obsolete decree. It was re-asserted in 1764; on the 13th of May, 1777; on the 18th of August, 1792; on the 3rd Messidor, an XII. (22 June,

[1] See "Mémoires de St. Simon," ch. ccxvi. for the whole of this most interesting historical anecdote.

[2] "Mémoires de St. Simon," ch. ccclxx. A similar proposition was made to the Duke by the Père du Halde, author of the "Lettres Edifiantes," and secretary of le Père le Tellier.

1802).[1] Similar proscription will be found in the Penal Code of 1810, and in the law of 10th April, 1834. In 1828, three educational establishments were closed by royal ordinance (June 13). In 1845, when the question was raised of the readmission of the Jesuit order, "the Chamber confiding in the Government—that it would insist upon the execution of the laws of the State," dismissed the question from consideration. At the present day and hour the law is in full force, and is likely to be enforced unsparingly. Upon this point, France has officially never changed or wavered. Through the supineness and connivance of successive governments the law has been evaded and defied, but it should be noted that each government which has been supine and conniving has fallen even though propped up with bayonets.[2] Now that to all practical intents and purposes Romanism and Jesuitism are convertible terms, is it probable that France would receive a remedy from such hands so odious to it and so persistently spurned?

Our conviction is, that if the Church in France could purge itself from complicity with Jesuit aggression and Jesuit intrigues it would not now be fighting a desperate battle for its own existence and for the instruction of the young. But since the Vatican Council that is impossible. Jesuitism could stir up France against Germany and lead it to Sedan, but the overthrow of the empire whose powers it wielded was only a conclusive step in the destruction of itself. It has now inextricably identified the Church with its own fortunes. May not the Church be involved in one common ruin with the Order? It is a further question whether, if France did not resist Jesuit aggression till the death, would she have any hope of liberty. If she delivered over the rising generation to ecclesiastics who can only speak and act at the volition and monition of Jesuits, what would be her hope for the future? Are the doctrines of the Syllabus to be the rule for French consciences? Can French bishops or French priests teach outside these fatal propositions, the handiwork of the Jesuit faction? At present there is in France fierce rebellion against the pressure of the Church; war with it and hatred towards priests; there are terrible aberrations

[1] L'Abbé Sicard has an article in the *Correspondant*, "La Question de l'Enseignement et les Congrégations religieuses au dernier siècle." He admits the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1762, but totally pretermits all mention of the successive confirmations of this expulsion during the subsequent portion of the century. The purport of his article is to show that Frenchmen of all classes wished them back again. This desire, if it existed, exhibited itself in fresh decrees against them!

[2] Le clergé, assisté de Louis Philippe, de M. de Broglie, et des magistrats a vaincu l'Université—M. Leon de Faucher, à M. Henry Reeve, 7 May, 1844. In July, 1848, Louis Philippe, as he himself said, just like Charles X., landed at Newhaven as Mr. Smith.

in religious matters. And how are these met on the part of the Church? By Peter's pence, by pilgrimages to ridiculous centres, by mystical associations, by attempts futile enough, such as banquets and religious demonstrations, by revolting teaching degrading to the intellect and morals of the nation. But will these heal the hurt? There has not in the recent action of Jesuitism, which is the propelling influence of the Church of Rome, been the slightest attempt at finding means to reconcile faith and morality with the great development of reason, and with the new social and civil conditions of nations.[1] Complete and entire subjugation of the conscience and the intellect is the inexorable claim preferred. To this, it is certain, France will not submit. Her instinct teaches her statesmen that they have not to do with Frenchmen, but with a foreign power over which they have no real control. It was no idle assertion of M. Dupin in 1845 that "the most characteristic trait of the French people is its antipathy for everything which bears the name or recalls the doctrines and practices of the Jesuits." Until the Roman Church in France can and will resolve itself into a distinctly national church, casting off Jesuitism openly and really, as a serpent casts its slough, the intellect and the statesmanship of France will be hostile to it.[2] No power but

[1] On the contrary, as Mr. Gladstone truly maintains, "the extreme claims of the Middle Ages have been sanctioned and have been revived without the warrant or excuse which might in these ages have been shown for them."

[2] The distinction between Romanism and Jesuitism, existed once in France. But from the very outset of the introduction of the Order there was danger of the two being confounded. So far back as the reign of Henry IV. that king felt it necessary to explain to the Parliament of Paris (1599), even then mistrustful of Jesuitism, "Je suis catholique, roi catholique, catholique romain, *non catholique Jésuite*. Je connais les catholiques Jésuites; je ne suis pas de l'humeur de ces gens là; ni de leur semblables." It may be worth while noting that in 1715 Father Jouvency, a Jesuit, wrote a Latin history of the Company. In it he ennobled as saints of the first rank, and as martyrs deserving public worship, Jesuits most abhorred for the furious disorders of the League, for the Gunpowder Plot, and for the conspiracies against the life of Henry IV. He maintains the superiority of the Pope over the temporal power of kings, his right to absolve subjects from their fealty, finally, that which is received as a dogma among them the right of killing tyrants, that is, kings inconvenient to them. This book was "muni de l'approbation de ses supérieurs." The Parliament was anxious to do its duty, but Louis XIV. "aima mieux tout passer aux jésuites que de les irriter au hasard des poignards." The book was therefore suppressed, without being burned by the hangman as the Parliament wished. The three superiors of Jesuit establishments in Paris were brought before the Parliament and admonished. So the affair was hushed up "à l'indignation du public, et au frémissement du parlement à qui le roi mit un baillon à la bouche." See "Mémoires de St. Simon," ch. cccxl. Compare the present different attempts made in England to rehabilitate some of those Jesuit martyrs.

force will inflict it upon the nation. Then would it groan and heave under it as Enceladus under Ætna. As it is impossible now-a-days to consider Romanism, much less Gallicanism, apart from Jesuitism, we look in vain to that ecclesiastical system for a remedy of the ills of France. Jesuitism, with all its subtle dialectics, can never delude the people into the notion that it can reconcile for them God and liberty. Even if there were value in its teaching concerning "God," it never can, nor does, refrain from crushing "liberty" when it has the remotest chance of doing so. Its hatred of liberty is what the rattle is to the snake. It warns those who meddle with it of approaching death. Plainly, if there is to be healing for France it must proceed from some other source.

II.

The next appeal for help would naturally be to French Protestantism, which is now the designation of the old Huguenot Church. If glorious memories, if countless martyrdoms, if persevering zeal for God and liberty, maintained through centuries, if present intelligence and political influence, wholly disproportioned to its diminished numbers,[1] could bring sufficient remedy, French Protestantism might be an important factor. No one can in thought recur to its history in the past without being conscious of the wonderful power for reconciling God and liberty that a Church has, which makes the Bible its Magna Charta, so long as it retains its faith in the Word of God complete and unimpaired. In this respect the Huguenot Church is not solitary, but it is a conspicuous instance of it. Belief in the truths of revelation, in the supernatural as well as its moral teaching of Holy Scripture, enabled the Huguenots, though crushed to the earth by brutal force most relentlessly exercised, still to resist and to survive. It was the one arm on which French Protestantism had to rely subsequent to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the most glorious period of the Huguenot Church. It was the rod and the staff which Rome could not wrench from them, and which comforted them when walking for a century through the valley of the shadow of death. When the revolutionary era arrived there was a remnant left, both in France and in the countries among which the exiles had been scattered. French Protestantism in '93 contributed more than its quota of victims to the Reign of Terror. One circumstance is so remarkable that it deserves a record here. The delegate of the Convention in the

[1] The Protestant population of France has been variously estimated. By the census of 1866 there were 1,591,250 Protestants. This official statement, however, considerably exceeds the returns made by the synods and consistories. They would not have estimated the number at a million. Since that period, too, there has been the loss of Alsace and Lorraine,

Department of the Gard, on the 16 Prairial au 11 (4 June, 1793), published a decree ordering priests and pastors to withdraw within eight days twenty leagues from the places where they had ministered. He did not trouble himself to draw it up, but simply transcribed an ordinance found in the office and dictated by the Jesuits in the reign of Louis XIV! It was only in the Consulate of Buonaparte that Protestantism in France can be said to have enjoyed peace and freedom. It then began to cease from a trembling heart and failing of eyes and sorrow of mind; its life no longer hung in doubt, and it had assurance of life. But the liberty accorded it was only liberty of existence. There was no persecution; no violence from any quarter; full and continuous security. But it was internal liberty walled-up, so to speak, within the temples. All sound, all religious movement, was strictly prohibited. There could be neither journals, nor associations, nor controversy, nor proselytism; if there was the slightest idea or attempt at transgressing the boundaries in which religion was imprisoned the iron hand of Napoleon instantly drove it back.[1] A Catholic village wished to join the Reformed Church. The minister went to visit it. He found himself immediately confronted with the Government and had to retire. During the fourteen years of the Consulate and Empire French Protestantism has no history. After the Restoration, with the exception of fanatical outbreaks in the south, for which neither the Government nor the ecclesiastical authorities are fairly responsible, Protestants were not subjected to violence, but attempts were made at insisting upon compulsory conformity with Romish ceremonies in their judgment idolatrous; no kind of liberty of proselytism was tolerated, although violent controversial attacks on Protestantism were encouraged. During the period of the Monarchy of July there was little improvement. Still Protestantism somewhat increased, but until the present time there has been too much truth in the assertion that "*la plupart des Français ont trop peu de foi pour changer de religion.*" M. de Félice said with sorrow, and only with too much truth, that no government whatever in France has yet known how to practise religious liberty thoroughly, "on est libre chez nous d'être incrédule; on n'est pas encore pleinement libre de proclamer sa foi et de célébrer son culte selon sa conscience." This was written in 1861.

This brief historical review of the recent history of Protestantism is necessary to explain the reason why little hope of remedy can be expected for France from its own Protestantism. Never, since it first arose, and was for a season an armed power capable of self-assertion, has it been in a condition to pro-

[1] Félice, "Histoire des Protestants de France," p. 607.

selytize. So rigid was the subsequent surveillance exercised over it that its utmost efforts were concentrated on self-preservation. It is not difficult therefore to understand the value which Rome places on persecution. When from the period of Napoleon to the present time Protestantism could exist freely, still it was hemmed in systematically within its own limits. A limb or a faculty permanently disused gradually decays and becomes withered up and enfeebled. It is often a charge urged against French Protestantism that is not proselytizing. There have been periods in its history when it was so in an eminent degree. In the days of Lefèvre, of Farel, of Calvin, there was no lack of proselytism in France and beyond its borders. It ought to have been more so since the fury of persecution was restrained. But just allowance should be made for the external difficulties with which it has had to contend. Until the present time it has always been face to face with a jealous and relentless foe, wielding directly or indirectly the power of the State.

Still, French Protestantism would, during the last fifty years have been exercising immense influence if it had not had to contend with more insidious adversaries than even Napoleon's iron hand or Jesuit intrigue against it. If it had not left "its first love" after all it had borne for Christ's sake, life would, nay must, have gone forth from it to all around. But its situation was disastrous. In the midst of persecution it had been a witness for God. It then sorely needed liberty. But who were the apostles of liberty in France? Nor the church, nor the State. The philosophers of the eighteenth century—like Voltaire and Rousseau, either sceptical and profane, or sentimental and deistical—had usurped, in the absence of its proper upholders, the guardianship and propagation of liberty. It was from them alone, not that there was any religious sympathy, that the down-trodden Huguenots experienced common humanity and protection from persecution. The reflex action of this spurious philosophy was as disastrous upon the Huguenot Church as it was in England and Scotland, where it originated with Bolingbroke and Hume. Like Robertson and Blair, the few French pastors that were left "preached commonplaces about morality and natural religion, leaving almost in total eclipse the great doctrines of sin and salvation." Nor had the French Reformed Church for a long time either the means or the opportunity of revival. There was no Venn, or Wesley, to stir the mantling pools of stagnant water and to impart fresh life and vigour to them. Still there was no formal divergence of opinion. The supreme authority of Holy Scripture was admitted by all, nor were any of the supernatural incidents of Holy Scriptures called in question. Dogma was insisted upon by some, but more as barren

orthodoxy than as living principle, while morality and sentiment were the substantial creed of a powerful section.

Had the way been open for French Protestantism to proselytism either at home or abroad, it might, if not altogether exempt from internal differences, yet have been less a prey to them than has unfortunately been the case. But this was not so. France has no colonial empire, and very meagre relations with heathen countries in any quarter of the globe. Even Rome, which finds through Jesuit organization its chief missionary instrument in French agency, can from this cause accomplish comparatively little that is permanent and influential. There are some valuable missions of French Protestantism in South Africa, but on a very limited scale. In default of the legitimate outlets for religious zeal, questions of what are termed in France methodism and rationalism—questions not unknown among ourselves—have largely occupied the attention of French Protestants. Separation between Church and State has not unnaturally been much discussed. From the peculiarity of their position, they do not approach the consideration of this last question either as English Churchmen or English Nonconformists do. Since 1830 there has been a violent controversy going on as to whether confessions of faith are essential to the existence of a church. Some hold that there can be no church, in the true acceptation of the term, when the pulpit is open to contradictory teaching; others argue that Protestantism cannot submit to a rule which does not allow each person to form his own belief for himself with his Bible in his hand. Not content, however, with this, many of this latter party have identified themselves with the Tubingen school. In the Bible they affect to discover sublime truths and incomparable pages of history mixed up with gross errors and absurd legends. With the inspiration of the Bible, the Divinity of our Lord and his work of redemption disappear. Jesus Christ is no longer the Son of God; he is the chief of wise men; he taught that God is the Father of all mankind by precept, and also by his spotless life. It is with these conflicting opinions that French Protestantism is rent asunder, and is likely to divide itself into two distinct churches. In one of these there will be what is supposed to be liberty; in the other there will be God. How this conflict has operated may be gathered from the treatment of M. Adolphe Monod. With the utmost fervour, some years ago, he taught the need of repentance, of conversion, of salvation by the Cross of Christ alone. He inveighed against indiscriminate communion. He was in consequence arraigned before the Consistory of Lyons for having troubled the Church by attacking the noblest, the most difficult, the most holy of all religions—the religion of good works dictated by the conscience. In his defence M. Monod alleged

that his teaching was in all respects conformable to the constant teaching of Reformed Churches, and especially to that of the Confession of Rochelle. He admitted the impossibility of the two systems continuing in the same Church. But he argued that the doctrine of grace was the doctrine of the Reformed Church of France, "qu'elle est chez elle, qu'elle doit y rester," and that it was for the doctrine of works, "à sortir!" The reply made to this was, the Confession of La Rochelle was, and had been, obsolete (*tombée en désuétude*); that it was incompatible with modern customs and ideas; that the Government had negotiated with the Church of 1802, not that of 1571. By a royal ordinance in 1832, in accordance with the sentence of the Consistory, M. Monod was deprived.

What, then, is the actual condition of the French Protestant Church? A brief account of the Synods of 1873-4 will form the best reply. During the last hours of the Second Empire authority was on the point of being obtained from M. Ollivier's Government for the convening of a Synod. But the war with Germany broke out. It was, therefore, under the Government of M. Thiers that, after the lapse of two hundred years, the Reformed Church was placed in possession once more of its ancient institutions, and became mistress of its own destiny. This was due to the perseverance of the evangelical section of the Church; it is, therefore, some proof of its power and vitality. What was termed the Liberal party beforehand contested the authority of the Synod in matters of faith. Three important questions occupied the attention of the assembly—the legality and powers (attributions) of the Synod; a declaration of faith; ecclesiastical organization. It is with the declaration only that we concern ourselves. It proclaimed, in conformity with the confession of La Rochelle and all the Reformation Churches, "the supreme authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, who died for our sins and rose again for our justification." It retained, as the basis of its teaching, its worship and discipline, the great Christian facts represented in its religious solemnities and expressed in its liturgies, especially in the Confession of Sins, in the Apostles' Creed, and in the Order for Administration of the Lord's Supper. The chief struggle in the debate was over the doctrine of the Resurrection. The Confession was finally carried by a distinct majority. By the adoption of this Confession the Reformed Church, whatever may be the objects of individual members, has constituted itself nominally an orthodox church. Adherence to it will necessarily involve the purging out of the harm of rationalism. For it cannot be said of this last Confession that it is an obsolete formulary of the past. It is an emphatic protest against the

most marked peculiarities of the misnamed liberal school.[1] In the Confession there is a principle of hope, a future of life. There may be hope, but can it be said that there is life? With much regret we doubt it. We are disposed with M. Bonnechose to think that the persecutions of the past have been less fatal to the Reformed Church than its recent state of division and dependence. In 1868 he summed up the situation, "Au dedans le chaos; au dehors, et pour l'empêcher de sortir, une étroite compression." If that had continued, this eminent man predicted that the end would be death, not life. The Protestant Church has now liberty. Its first use of it has been good and wise. But will that suffice? There is a symptom that the doctrines of grace expelled with M. Monod are re-asserting themselves. But when we consider the actual condition of the Church, hardly emerging out of terrible conflict in the past, and now sorely wounded in the house of her friends, we cannot but feel that, instead of helping others, she needs help herself, and that the prospects of remedy from this quarter are at present faint indeed.

III.

We hardly know whether it is worth while to dwell at all upon the recent movement inaugurated by M. Loyson (Père Hyacinthe). It has attracted some notice in ecclesiastical circles in England, if indeed it has not really originated here. Whatever importance it possesses is due to some distinguished patronage and to the zeal and abilities of M. Loyson himself. The whole thing savours very much of a private speculation, and seems little calculated to affect the community. Perhaps unconsciously it reproduces some of the features of that movement which was the precursor of the French Reformation carried on by Lefèvre, Briçonnet of Meaux, and Margaret of Navarre. We would rejoice if it were likely to be productive of as much result for good as that did. This, however, seems highly improbable. It is not by a species of homœopathic treatment, consisting in mitigated Popery without the Pope, that the spiritual condition of France is to be regenerated, "Latet ulcus." No superficial modification of existing abuses will reach the seat of the malady. A fresh arrangement of forms

[1] "Vouloir, comme les amis de l'école nouvelle veulent, qu'au sein d'un même corps, d'une même société religieuse, formée pour l'enseignement, l'édification, et la prière, on prêche et on enseigne les doctrines le plus opposées, dont les une soffenseront la conscience indignée de ceux-ci, et dont les autres provoqueront le dédain de ceux-là, c'est vouloir, non la paix, non la charité et l'amour, mais la discorde et la guerre. . . . . Exiger cela ce n'est pas la tolérance, ce n'est pas de la liberté, c'est du pur despotisme."—*La Crise Actuelle*, par M. de Bonnechose.

and ceremonies, lopping off some of the worst excrescences of vulgar superstition, the restoration of the cup to the laity, a married priesthood, are all steps in the right direction; but some of these things are especially offensive to Romanists, and there is the retention of too much to interest Protestants. We in England acknowledge the value of these improvements on the Romish system, but if this is all we had our gain would not be very great. It is the Protestant and Evangelical element infused into our Church at the Reformation which constitutes its strength. If it had been merely an improved ecclesiastical system, with some of the worst corruptions of Rome removed, it would not have survived the shocks to which it has been exposed, nor would it have been found in accordance with English conceptions of liberty and of God. Assuredly the project will not meet the necessities of France. It may serve as a plaything for dilettante antiquarians, who would like to see a Gallican Church restored, although they have little conception of what that was. But even they have little heart in it. Some who have promoted it have misgivings as to whether after all, upon their own theories, they are doing quite right. The scheme itself has no root in the affections or sympathies of any class of the community in France. It will be matter of much surprise if it does not pass away, perhaps even before the founder, without having done either harm or much good to anybody.[1]

But is there any other resource? are there any other means by which there can be reconcilement between "God and Liberty" in France?

(To be continued.)

ART. VII.—HENRY VENN.

Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn.—The Missionary Secretariat of Henry Venn, B.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Honorary Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. By the Rev. WILLIAM KNIGHT, M.A., Rector of Pitt Portion, Tiverton, and formerly Secretary of the C.M.S. *With an Introductory Biographical Chapter and a Notice of West African Commerce,* by his Sons, the Rev. JOHN VENN, M.A., Senior Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and the Rev. HENRY VENN, M.A., Rector of Clare Portion, Tiverton. pp. 550. Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

HENRY VENN, whose Memoir is now published, was born at Clapham, of which parish his father, the Rev. John

[1] Since this was written some discreditable revelations which have come to light confirm this augury.

Venn, was rector, in the year 1796. He lost his mother in early childhood, and being much thrown into the society of those older than himself, he acquired a degree of maturity and manliness of character which seems to have struck all those who became acquainted with him. The eldest son, he soon became to an unusual extent, while a youth, the guardian and adviser of his brothers and sisters, In the year 1805, Samuel Thornton went to be his father's pupil; and he remained at Clapham Rectory till he went to sea, in 1812. Another "dear and constant companion" was Charles Shore (the first Lord Teignmouth's eldest son); and in the year 1812, the two sons of Sir Thomas Baring, Thomas and John, became his father's pupils. Henry's recollections of his early years were "all of unmixed happiness." His father was always pleased with him and most tender to him; and from all his father's friends he "met with universal kindness and attention." The few survivors from the inmates, or constant visitors, at the Rectory at Clapham, would say, that for sunny cheerfulness, few family circles could compare with it. The estimation in which Evangelical opinions were generally held, of course prevented any great degree of intimacy, on the part of the rector's family, with persons outside the so-called "Clapham Sect." In those days, indeed, the breach between the Evangelical clergyman and the rest of his clerical brethren often amounted to a chasm. One instance was related by Henry Venn himself. In the seventy-fourth year of his age, writing in the *Christian Observer*, he noted with thankfulness the great change in the estimation of Churchmen generally towards the Evangelical revivalists of the last century:—

> Here [in Canon Liddon's sketch of Bishop Hamilton's life[1]] is one of the most prominent representatives of High Church principles doing homage to the memory of Cecil, Venn, and Martyn. Those of us whose recollections extend sixty years back can well remember how the High Churchmen of that day held these names in the lowest estimation, and how jealously they kept themselves aloof from all association with them. In the present day it will hardly be credited, but one of these early recollections may serve as a specimen. One of the most prominent repre-

[1] In concluding this *Christian Observer* article, Mr. Venn remarks:—"Our main object has been to protest against a very common assertion, that the Evangelical religion of the last generation had a work to perform which it accomplished, but that it now needs to be superseded by a more advanced system. Let the standard of Evangelical truth and ethics be studied in the biographies of its acknowledged representatives, and then compared with the standard of Holy Scripture. We do not fear or doubt the result. It needs only to be adapted to the prevailing modes of thought and phraseology of the present generation, and it will be found as efficacious, as in the days of our forefathers, to arrest the conscience, and to bring man from a life of sin, worldliness, and infidelity, to live the life of faith upon the Son of God."

sentatives of the High Church principles was the Bishop of London. A near relative of the Bishop, after being a guest at Fulham Palace, was to visit Mr. Venn at Clapham. We were ourselves sent to wait at the Bull's Head, a mere public-house, three hundred yards from the rectory of Clapham, and to bring the visitor to the rectory. The truth being that the Bishop of London could not allow his carriage to be seen to draw up at Mr. Venn's rectory, though it might be seen to set down a lady at a small public-house. Such was the estimation in which Evangelical names were then held.

In early boyhood, Henry Venn went to "the African Seminary," at Clapham, one Sunday afternoon, and heard the boys examined in the Bible by Mr. Zachary Macaulay, Mr. Henry Thornton being an interested spectator, while Mr. Wilberforce, going from boy to boy, patted them on the shoulder as they gave good answers. Eight of these African boys were baptized in Clapham Church, by the Rev. John Venn, in the year 1805. About this time, the two first missionaries, Messrs. Renner and Hartwig, were sent out by the C.M.S.; and before they sailed for Sierra Leone they spent a few days in the Clapham Rectory.[1] In March, 1813, Henry became a pupil of Mr. Farish, Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, who resided at Chesterton, near Cambridge, whilst in regard to Classics, his "cousin H. V. Elliott, kindly undertook to superintend" his studies. In the month of June, 1813, he was summoned back to Clapham, to his father's death-bed:—

It was upon this or upon a similar occasion that Mr. Venn, as he afterwards told some of his family, lifting up his heart to God, solemnly pledged himself in dependence upon His grace, to give himself wholly up through life to the service of his God and Saviour.

What an opinion his father had already formed of his ripeness and judgment and prudence, is indicated by the fact that he appointed him executor at this early age of seventeen. Amongst other duties to which this appointment introduced him, was the collection and publication of his father's sermons, a rather unusual employment for one who was not a freshman at college.

With Professor Farish he remained till he commenced residence at Queens' College, in October, 1814. Dean Milner, the celebrated President of Queen's, was then an old man, and infirm. Among the resident dons, the general tone prevailing

[1] Lord Teignmouth has written to the authors of the biography before us:—"My latest remembrance of your father at Clapham, was on my visiting him some time after we ceased to reside there (1808), when we ranged the neighbouring commons with his gun, the only instance in which he occurs to me in the character of a sportsman." Lord Teignmouth refers to the more than seventy years of "affectionate intercourse:"—"I shall ever feel that it has been one of the happiest circumstances in my life, and one of its chief privileges, to have enjoyed during so many years your father's uninterrupted and valuable friendship."

was "of a kind to startle a young man brought up in a strict household, and accustomed by the society of his family and friends to look for courtesy and refinement as a matter of course." Roughness and eccentricity of behaviour among the Tutors and Fellows, in those days, was—to say the least—no rarity. The Vicar, who remarked, on hearing that his church in Cambridge was being filled to crowding during his absence by a popular young substitute, "that it did not matter, for he could soon empty it again," was a resident fellow of Queen's at this time. Between a "religious man" and one that was not so, the distinction was still very sharply marked. At the close of the eighteenth century, Christians who were in earnest had been termed "Calvinists," or "Methodists," or "*Serious* Christians;" but in Mr. Venn's undergraduate days they were commonly called Simeonites:—

Charles Simeon was then in full enjoyment of his power and influence, and to attend his church regularly, and his Friday evening classes in his rooms in college, was the natural course for those who had any kind of leaning towards Evangelical views. In the case of Henry Venn, there were, of course, special reasons for this, owing to what may be called his hereditary connection with Simeon. It was to his grandfather, when rector of Yelling, that Simeon owed much of his change of views. His father was a college contemporary, a friend of Simeon, and remained in close intimacy with him through life. To these of course, was added his own personal admiration for Simeon's character, and his agreement with all that was essential in his religious opinions.

Of religious revival in the University there were encouraging signs. Simeon had, to a great extent, lived down the bitter opposition that marked the commencement of his career; but of the customary employments and oppportunities of a religious student at the present day scarcely any were then available. The Jesus Lane Sunday School was not established till some years later; and a Cambridge Association of the C.M.S. was not founded until 1818, Simeon "trembling" in regard to the public meeting. "With the exception of Simeon's parties, religious sympathy probably found almost its only experience in the private intercourse of intimate friends."[1]

[1] In a letter from the late Rev. E. B. Elliott, concerning Henry Venn, occurs this sentence:—"Looking back, what my memory mostly rests on regarding him is a long walk and conversation, in which the spirituality of his mind and earnest interest in the religious state and religious progress of those he was with (myself especially at that time) so came out that I never lost the recollection of it." It is added in the Memoir before us:—"The only approach to any public testimony to his views which we know him to have given during his student-days, was an address at a small Bible Society meeting at Haslingfield, a village six miles from Cambridge. The curate in charge there was a Mr. Clarke, a connection of his through the Stephens."

In the spring and summer of 1815, fever prevailed at Cambridge to such an extent that there was a general break up on the part of the University, almost resembling those which the plague had caused in the time of Cranmer and of Newton. Undergraduates were, by Grace of the Senate, excused their residence for that May time, and permitted to depart whither they pleased. Henry Venn went, with his sisters, to Cromer; and, at this time, by visits to Earlham, where one of his sisters was staying, he laid the foundation, of a long and intimate friendship with various members of the Buxton and Gurney family.

In January, 1818, he took his B.A. degree, coming out 19th Wrangler; the Tripos list being headed by Lefevre (afterwards Sir John Shaw Lefevre). "The following long vacation was one to which he ever afterwards looked back with affectionate remembrance. A considerable portion of it was spent at Rydal, with the Wilberforce family," and there he was introduced to Wordsworth and Southey. Wilberforce, then, of course, an old man, had been an intimate friend of the rector of Clapham, and the son had secured much of his love and esteem. In 1819, after a year devoted to classical study, he obtained a Fellowship, and was shortly afterwards ordained by the Bishop of Ely. "Having no notion of remaining in College, he began immediately to look about for a curacy. A suitable curacy, however, was not so easily to be procured at once by a young clergyman of decided Evangelical convictions." For a time he took occasional duty in or near London. When not preaching himself, he mostly attended Mr. Daniel Wilson's chapel in St. John's, Bedford Row. In 1821 he became curate of St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street; and Mr. R. B. Seeley, who was then resident in that parish, has given some reminiscences. Thus we read:—

> I heard from Mr. Venn in those years an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, so full and so clear, that nothing I have since listened to from the lips of more celebrated pulpit orators has obliterated it from my memory. . . . . Few people would have been able to anticipate the position which he occupied half a century later. The quietness of his demeanour, the absence of everything pretentious or aspiring, and his freedom from that sort of perhaps allowable ambition, which is so common nowadays, all tended to prevent the thought from arising, that in the curate of St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, in 1821-2, men beheld one who would possess a degree and extent of influence in the Church, which no other man, apart from rank and official dignity, could pretend to wield.

The post was a most laborious one, and Mr. Venn spared no pains in regard both to preaching and to pastoral work. The larger portion of his working hours was spent in courts and alleys. He found time, however, to attend the committee

meetings of the C.M.S., and occasionally he assisted in the neighbourhood of London at public missionary meetings. Towards the close of the year 1824 he resigned his curacy, and returned to Cambridge, intending to go through the exercises for a B.D. degree, as required by the College Statutes. In 1825 he became Proctor. In 1827 he held the newly-created office of Evening Lecturer at St. Mary's, to which he was appointed by the Vicar, Mr. Musgrave, Fellow of Trinity, and afterwards Archbishop of York. The lectureship was popular with the townspeople, but doubtless it gave a shock to many tutors and heads of houses. Simeon's evening service in his own church, our readers will remember, had been instituted some thirty years before, and had excited strong and lasting opposition. In the same year (1827) he received from Mr. Wilberforce an offer of a living—viz., Drypool, near Hull, as uninviting a parish as could easily be found in England; the income was about £200 a year. Mr. Venn threw himself heartily into the work, and soon made his mark, forming many friendships:—

> It was here that he made the acquaintance—or rather renewed it, for there had been some previous connection through the family of Henry Thornton, Esq., of Battersea Rise—of Martha Sykes. This acquaintance soon ripened into a love which never knew any check or change until its visible bonds were broken eleven years later at Torquay. Martha was the fourth daughter of Nicholas Sykes, Esq., of Swanland, Yorkshire. Another daughter married Matthew Babington, Esq., of Rothley Temple, Leicestershire, the second son of Thomas Babington, the well-known companion of Wilberforce and the other Clapham leaders of the anti-slavery struggle.

In January, 1829, he attended a College meeting for the last time, and then resigned his Fellowship. A few days later he was married. "How intimate and happy their moral union was, how mutual the spiritual assistance and support which they were able to yield to one another, none but their nearest relatives could gain the faintest idea." For the next five-and-a-half years he was busily employed at Drypool with the ordinary routine of parish work:—

> He established a complete system of district visiting there, a plan, it is believed, first adopted by his father at Clapham, so far as the Church of England is concerned, and still so little known and practised anywhere at the time in question, that he used often to receive letters from clergymen in various parts of England asking for information about the details of the plan. He also started Church Missionary Society meetings, clothing clubs, and the other now familiar agencies so well known in most town parishes.

In a letter from Mrs. Venn to Miss Venn, Feb. 1832, we read:—

I seem to tell you every time I write that the lectures are better attended, and the Sunday evening ones especially; and it really is so. The room is crowded, and they are very attentive. There seems to be a remarkable degree of (I hardly know where to get a right name for it) inquiry amongst the people, more particularly amongst the soldiers and their wives. I cannot tell you how many of this class have come to this house desiring to see Henry; not a week passes without two or three, sometimes more. They are all of them of the upper class, if I may so call them—that is to say, they are generally officers' servants, sergeants, or so—people removed above want, which does away with all fear of their coming from other motives. They attend his lectures, and in almost every instance they mention them as a means of their being brought to think seriously; they also now come to the Sacrament. Certainly Henry has much encouragement; and it makes him doubly anxious to secure an assistant who would thoroughly co-operate with him.

Such leisure as he could command during his Dryport career was employed in editing his grandfather's "Life and Letters,"[1] a work which had been commenced by his father.

After some six years of active work in Hull, Mr. Venn received the offer of St. John's, Holloway. The offer came from Daniel Wilson, trustee with Simeon, and Archdeacon Hodson. The venerated vicar of Islington has rendered many and remarkable services to the Church; his selection of Henry Venn, forty-five years ago, showed his sagacity. From this time Mr. Venn's attendance at Salisbury Square became, of course, much more regular and systematic. It was in 1834 that he came to Islington, and up to 1838 his life was on the whole a singularly happy one. A great change, however, came over his prospects. "Dark clouds gathered about his path, which, though they did not change the characteristics of a naturally cheerful and buoyant temper, or for a moment shake his perfect resignation to the Divine Will, left their impress upon his feelings, and contributed, doubtless, to that earnest and lifelong devotion to one great cause, which soon became so marked. The first of these events was his own severe and dangerous illness, which for nearly two years laid him totally aside from all regular work." Following his own attack of illness, an affection

[1] In his account of Henry Venn ("Christian Leaders of Last Century") Dr. Ryle has written:—"Few men certainly have been so fortunate in their biographers as the Evangelical Vicar of Huddersfield. In the whole range of Christian memoirs I know few volumes so truly valuable as the single volume of 'Henry Venn's Life and Letters.' I never take it down from my shelves without thinking of the words which our great poet puts into the mouth of Queen Katharine:—

> After my death I wish no other herald,
> No other speaker of my living actions,
> To keep mine honour from corruption,
> But such an honest chronicler as——."

of the heart, came the illness of his wife. Mrs. Venn died of consumption, at Torquay, in the year 1840.[1] Thirty-three years later he also entered into rest.

And here we must pause. We have given a slight sketch of Henry Venn's earlier career condensed, with a few quotations, from the biographical chapter in the interesting and important work before us. In the letters, and in the private journal, occur many touching and instructive passages, which, did space permit, we should gladly quote. After his bereavement, his life became more and more absorbed in the work of the Church Missionary Society.[2] With what loyalty to Evangelical Church principles; with what statesmanlike sagacity; with what courtesy, sympathy, liberality, and meekness of wisdom; with what unsparing devotion; with what prayerfulness and hopeful trust he conducted affairs, has long been well and widely known. But in the account of his Missionary Secretariat, given by Mr. Knight, his confidential coadjutor for several years, and in the valuable documents appended, many readers will observe welcome evidences of these things.

Art. VIII.—CEREMONIES.

IT is obvious to the eye of the most cursory observer of religious movements that the Church of England is in danger of becoming a church of ceremonials. Not that at any period of her history she has ever depreciated or denied the value of ordinances in their proper place in proportion to the other means of grace. That is sufficiently attested by the place she gives to the sacraments, to confirmations, and to ordinations. These are all in one sense ceremonials, included in the services of her Prayer Book, and studiously guarded by her Articles, canons, and rubrics. But in her provisions for public worship, and for the edification of her people, they hold only a place proportionate with other means of grace, such as the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the morning and evening prayer, and the instruction of the

[1] In a letter written two days after her death, Mr. Venn says:—"Such mercy has glittered in every part of this dark dispensation, such 'abundance of the gift of grace' was vouchsafed to her, that I can scarce admit any other feeling into my mind than that of thankfulness. . . . . There was 'perfect peace,'—not a care for husband, children, all was cast upon the Lord."

[2] He became Honorary Clerical Secretary in 1841, which post he held (always without pecuniary remuneration) until the close of life, though consenting a few weeks before his death to become a Vice-President.

pulpit. In the balance of her services they have their share, but not to the depreciation or displacement of the others.

To illustrate this distinction, let us place before us the systems of the Church of England and of Rome. In the latter, there is little of services rendered in a tongue understood by the people; little of the systematic utterances of the word of God, and not much of exposition from the pulpit. But, on the other hand, there is the constant service of the Mass, lighting and extinction of candles, genuflexions, attitudes, prostrations, sprinklings, and incense burnings. There is much that is addressed to the senses, conveying, it may be, to the initiated a symbolical or dogmatic meaning, but little that appeals directly to the conscience and intelligence. The people are not brought into contact with the "word that maketh wise unto salvation," either read or expounded, but are made spectators of a scene enacted by a priest; participators in a joint service in which they, as well as the minister, are actors. On the contrary, the Church of England in her simplicity of service avoids much of address to the senses. Her ceremonies are few, and derived directly from sacred examples. The water is sprinkled in baptism, the bread broken, and the wine poured out in the Holy Communion, the hand of the ordainer laid on the head of the ordained, and in confirmations a similar manual imposition. All these have distinct examples and warrants in the Scripture; and, in accepting them, the Church does nothing more than adopt the "pattern showed her in the mount." Her reliance for the impression and edification of her congregations lies much in a joint offering of prayer in a well-known tongue, in a copious utterance of the Holy Scriptures, and in expansion and application of those Scriptures from the pulpit. In her reformed simplicity, she has no desire to add to these authorized acts, or to invest the ordinance with unauthorized or scenic sublimity by superior elevations, peculiar positions or prostrations; she wishes to "do all things decently and in order," and not to put in peril the action of the intelligence by an undue attraction presented to the senses.

But it is painfully and alarmingly evident that we are departing, and that not slowly, from this guarded simplicity. A peculiar reverence is attached to one portion of the church over another, a mysterious sacredness attributed to the "altar;" a meaning conveyed by the eastward position; lowly prostrations there which are not observed elsewhere, and an apparent desire to clothe the elements in the Lord's Supper with a disproportioned sacredness by processions, conveying and removing them from the communion table. As innovations, these things are objectionable, as imitations of the practice of the Church of Rome they are contemptible, and as intimating a certain belief

in the Real Presence they are grave errors in doctrine under the disguise of scenic ceremonials. And the wide acceptance which these transferences of the Church's teaching from the intelligence to the senses, sufficiently show that the evil is both formidable and increasing. The vigour and tenacity with which the controversy about things puerile and unimportant in themselves is maintained, is enough to show how unmistakably the grave and decent simplicity of service which the Reformers insisted on in the face of stormy opposition, is giving way to a taste for theatrical representations.

It may be of advantage to consider some of the causes which have led to this recent departure from the simple but not severe order of our services. Some reason or reasons there must be for the production of a change so marked and so little required. It may be that the mere law of reaction may go far to explain it. The human mind is changeable and covetous of variety. Every department of life exhibits how much that impulse called "fashion" lies at the root of many of the eccentric customs we daily notice. There is no solid reason why we should not dress as our forefathers did. Yet we do not. Each season brings with it a costumal novelty, and the old mode silently gives place to the new. Architecture varies as to its schools from time to time, and the Norman extinguishes the Italian, and the Gothic the Grecian. Philosophic theories once held to be fixed become exploded, and move away at the despotic command of the new order of thought. The classic drama held possession of the stage until a craving for comedy and pantomime drove it off the boards. It is sad to think that a thing so sacred as religion should be at the mercy of such an impulse. Yet it is. The grave severity of the theology of the early part of the seventeenth century gave way to the High Churchmanship of the days of the first Charles, and that yielded to the sternness of Presbytery, destined itself to be expelled by Independency. And that, again, gave way to the frivolities of the succeeding reign, and that to the latitudinarianism and Erastianism following the Revolution. The wheel moved round, and different schools were in the ascendant, till it settled for a long time at the dead level of negative theology mercifully disturbed by the scriptural vigour of the days of Wesley and Whitfield, and the well-known names eulogized by Sir James Stephen as the "Evangelical Succession." Then, and for many a long year after, the pulpit—"perhaps unduly exalted" —reigned supreme in religion in England. That reign, productive of the resurrection of religious thought and religious energy, could not in the natural order of things last, and men began to weary of unchanging services, and perhaps, feeble pulpit ministrations, and to long for a change. The Tractarian movement (as it is called) acted

upon the unexpressed and perhaps undefined want, and led to æstheticism and change. The march was from dead to active formalism.

Not that we subscribe to the idea, currently accepted, that preaching has so far lost in attractiveness as that our people, enamoured of these dramatic novelties, would desire to see it abandoned as a part of our public services. There are some, no doubt, who hold that the Communion and the Liturgy are, properly speaking, the Services of our Church, to which the sermon is but a decent, but not necessary, adjunct. But to the bulk of our people we believe that the pulpit, as a means of impression and instruction, is an essential instrument of edification in the Church. And there can be little question that to the middle and lower classes, who in their sturdy good sense have little respect for attitudes and dresses, it is indispensable. The Church without the sermon, even though a tedious one, would soon exhibit a very diminished congregation. Yet it is a truth that the preaching of our clergy, amid, doubtless, many exceptions, does not enter the field as an attraction on fair terms with those of Ritualism. We look for the successors of men such as Chalmers, Hall, Irving, Wilberforce, Hook, Melville, to hold the masses entranced. Against the pulpit occupied by many such men, vestments and attitudes would have had but little chance. The old advice, "put the stove into the pulpit," though a witticism, spoke a truth notwithstanding. The complaint is a loud one, that the chastened beauties of our Liturgy, and the surpassing eloquence of the Lessons, are lost in the hands of untaught readers, and the force of pulpit addresses by cold and monotonous delivery. The answer of Garrick to the question: "Why the church did not *draw* like the theatre?" spoke a deep and instructive truth. "I deal with fiction as if it were truth; you deal with truth as if it were fiction."

It must also be borne in mind, while estimating the causes which give power to the undue elevation of ceremonials over scripture and preaching, that the Public Press has much to do with the matter. The truth is, that printing is doing much of the work of preaching. Newspapers, periodicals, tracts, little books, are absolutely silent preachers. They enter into our houses, and contain so much that is valuable and forcible, that men and women find themselves relieved from the necessity of listening to a sermon. They can read one at home. True; but that does not satisfy the conscience of one who absents himself from public worship. Yet that public worship may be, both in desk and pulpit, eminently unattractive, and the ritualistic church may supply that in the shape of a decorative service which the other church does not. And if there be no sermon, why the last magazine can supply one.

It may, besides, be assumed as a fact, that there are many, both of our clergy and laity, who are not indisposed to see the Church of England incorporated with that of Rome. Dissatisfied with the simple, graver services of the English communion; fascinated by the history, organization, extent, and power of the Roman Church; saddened by the controversies and divisions which are rending the English Church asunder, they half wish to see the strife ended, and the Reformation undone. And judging by the close correspondence between the services of the Mass and the acts, attitudes, and vestments of Ritualism, one feels inclined to suspect that the two are visibly brought so nearly akin to each other, that contact and then cohesion would not startle or dismay. There may be, in other words, a real craving for such union as carried out into strikingly similar performances comes little short of a conspiracy against the independence and purity of the English Church. If it be so, there exists a motive behind these novelties which may be well considered as a cause for the great prominence and importance given in our day to ritual over prayer and instruction.

We might pursue further this question of the principal causes producing this change in the Church; but it is of equal, if not of greater, importance to attempt to estimate the errors to which it is likely to lead. It cannot be but that an innovation so marked and so rapidly increasing must exercise a very serious power on the religion of this and perhaps succeeding generations. One result, and that of a grave character, we may clearly perceive in the formation of a school of religious dogmas which the Church of England, if we understand her sentiments, distinctly repudiates. The great emphasis of the present movement is thrown upon the celebration of the Holy Communion. To that all else gives way, as though the entire of religion were narrowed into that one point, made more emphatic by frequent repetitions. Modestly, the Church enjoins the reception of the ordinance thrice in the year; but now we hear the opinion expressed, and sometimes acted upon, that the Sacrament should be received daily, or at least that there should be daily administration. In some churches we have heard the announcements of four celebrations in the week. Connecting this stress laid on this particular ordinance with the views maintained as to the Real Presence entering into, and incorporated with, the elements, and with the sacerdotal dignity attached to the celebrant, we cannot but foresee a serious departure from the doctrine of the Church as maintained, even to the death, at the Reformation, and as avowed, as we think, by her articles and rubrics. This in itself is a tremendous evil, for it is the foundation of a wide division and extended strife in the Church. We maintain as strongly as any Churchman the solemnity and sacredness of the

Lord's Supper, and hold as firmly as any the reality of the Spiritual Presence of Christ in the heart of the believer (though not a substantial Presence in the elements), and we hold the same of any ordinance faithfully accepted and duly celebrated. And we cannot but protest against the elevation of a particular ordinance on the ground of a peculiar efficacy specially attributed to this.

If that result be likely to flow from the exaltation of ceremonies over the equally consecrated ordinances of prayer and preaching, we anticipate another in the form of the corresponding depression of them. It is obvious already that the pulpit is becoming studiously set aside. The omission of the sermon altogether, the contraction of it into the ten minutes' length, the perpetual sneers about the "inevitable homily," the growing apathy with which it is listened to, all speak alarmingly as to the possible surrender of a confessedly great implement of divine truth. In fact, in the busy, engrossing times on which we have fallen, we know not to what else we can turn, as a means of public religious instruction. No doubt the educated and the unemployed may invent a substitute for it (although in Scripture a special blessing appears to be attached to preaching), and feel, perhaps, that they have done well, if not better, in perusing a good sermon than hearing an indifferent one. But what of the employed, the day labourer and artisan, the busy tradesman and toiling clerk, men who pass the week in hard work, and whose only chance of receiving definite impression for good lies in hearing God's truth seriously forced upon them. It is a serious matter to lose or depreciate an instrument of good on which apostles relied, which Christ ordained, to which the world owes its Christianity, and Reformed England her faith. Yet, with the example of the Roman Church before us, we cannot but fear that an ordinance-exalting Church will be likely to become a non-preaching Church.

And then it is impossible not to feel that a Church of ceremonial is likely to become a Church of formalism. There is positively nothing which so deadens the soul as dealing with things done rather than with things felt. Men sink down into a calm and perilous contentedness with having done something, said prayers instead of praying, reading instead of apprehending, listening and not applying. The thing is done, no matter how, or in what spirit, and the formal soul is at rest, The Pharisee said: "I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all that I possess;" and it had been almost better for him to have done nothing than to have rested contented in a "bodily exercise." Such a mental condition is sure to be the parent of stupefying formality, or in some cases of utter infidelity. There is a medium between these two extremes, perhaps as bad as either, that of an earnestness which amounts to superstition.

The last result we mention we have already touched upon.

We do not like the English Church to be a copy of Rome, or to see her insidiously approximating to Rome. In inaccurate drawing parallels may be seen deviating from their courses and tending towards each other, and then sensibly coalescing, the larger engrossing the less. The dignity, the power, and prosperity of England may be fairly traced to her stern religious independence. The English Church can stand on her own truth, her own dignity, her own history, above all, her own fidelity to God's word, without condescending to imitate those puerilities of Rome which have made her the ridicule of all thoughtful men who feel that religion does not want attitudes and vestments to make her powerful. On that grand and dignified independence stood the men of the Reformation, who departed from Rome because she departed from inspiration, and because her efforts to captivate the ignorant by the meretricious aids of gorgeous ritual and "lying wonders" were at variance with the truth, both dogmatic and ecclesiastical, which "was once delivered to the saints."

B.

Reviews.

The Convocation Prayer Book. John Murray. 1880.

THE full title of this book, printed partly in red and partly in black lines, runs thus: (giving the red lines in italics, and the black in ordinary type);—"*The Convocation Prayer Book*, being the Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England; *With altered Rubrics, showing what would be the condition of the Book if amended in conformity with the recommendations of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, contained in Reports presented to Her Majesty the Queen, in the year* 1879." In an introductory note it is stated that the amendments on existing Rubrics recommended by the Convocation of Canterbury are distinguished by being placed within brackets, thus: [ ]; and foot notes, with the word "*York*" appended in italics, mark the two points of difference between the two Convocations. In the introductory note we read as follows:—

It will be understood that the Volume now offered to the English Church and Nation possesses no kind of authority. It is simply published for the purpose of indicating the amount of change recommended by the Convocations of Canterbury and York. Their recommendations are contained in certain Schedules appended to the Reports presented to Her Majesty, in reply to the Letters of Business, authorising the Convocations of the two Provinces to discuss or report on the Fourth and final Report of the Ritual Commission. But it is thought that in that shape the recommendations are less likely to meet the public eye than they will be in the form now adopted.

The volume has, undoubtedly, a peculiar interest, but, concerning its importance, there will be various and very diverse opinions. The Convocation Prayer Book serves, at all events, to show how small—many Reformers will say how insignificant—are the changes which have been agreed upon after long and laborious discussions. An ordinary Churchman might, by inadvertence, take the book to church with him, and use it almost without finding out his mistake. It is worthy of note that the two most remarkable changes recommended by Canterbury—viz., the *declaration* to be appended to "the Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius," and the new Ornaments Rubric, are rejected by York. On the latter point we quote the paragraph in full:—

[(*a*). Until further Order be taken by lawful Authority.

In saying Public Prayers and ministering the Sacraments, and other rites of the Church, every Priest and Deacon shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree; and in preaching he shall wear a surplice, with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree, or, if he think fit, a gown with hood and scarf; and no other ornament shall at any time of his ministrations be used by him contrary to the monition of the Bishop of the Diocese.

Provided, always, that this Rubric shall not be understood to repeal the 24th, 25th, and 58th of the Canons of 1604].

(*a*) Omit this addition, and keep the rubric of the Sealed Books unaltered. —*York.*

At the end of the Order for the Burial of the Dead appear several new rubrical paragraphs which, at the present moment, might possibly have value, were they recommended by both Convocations; but the foot-note, "Omit this. *York*," is appended to three of the most important suggested changes. The difficulties of the Burials Question, in fact, so far as concerns our country churchyards, are not so easy of solution as many persons suppose.

In an interesting Article on the Book of Common Prayer, the last number of the *Quarterly Review* dwells on the smallness of the amount of change recommended, and makes some seasonable suggestions.

The small amount of the amendments, which have found their way safely through the successive sieves of the Ritual Commissioners and of the two Convocations, goes far to establish the conclusion which we have already announced, as to the finality and stability of the form which was given to the Book of Common Prayer in 1662.

The *Quarterly* continues:—

It may be a great question with any one who examined the Convocation Prayer Book, and compares it with the book which he is in the habit of using, whether it is worth while to run the risk of some untoward accident in Parliament for the sake of making improvements of so infinitesimal a kind as most of those which have been suggested for adoption. The Convocations have evidently felt this strongly, and consequently have passed resolutions declaring it inexpedient to proceed with the legalisation of their own proposals, until some method of legalisation has been adopted similar to that contained in the "Draft Bill," presented to Her Majesty's advisers by the Archbishop of Canterbury. At present, certainly, the amended book does not appear to be ripe for legislation; it is inconceivable that either the Government or Parliament will

assent to a new edition of the Book of Common Prayer, either containing the Ornaments Rubric unamended altogether, which is the proposal of York, or amended in a manner so ambiguous as to be the probable source of future trouble, which is the proposal of Canterbury. What, then, is to he done? An amendment, in whatever sense devised and enforced by the secular power, would, undoubtedly, produce an ecclesiastical storm of no ordinary severity. There seems to be but one safe course at present, namely, to wait patiently. Our one opinion is, that if ecclesiastical legislation were made a more simple thing than it is; if, in fact, it assumed such a form as that proposed in the "Draft Bill;" and if a practically troublesome and unintelligible Rubric could be easily amended, without the ponderous machinery of Royal Commissions and subsequent Acts of Parliament; if, in fact, the Church of England could be permitted to ease her shoes a little when she found them pinching her feet, then the troubles connected with the reform of the Prayer Book would cease for ever.

On the "*ifs*" in the last sentence here quoted we need not dwell.

It is stated, in regard to the Prayer Book, as printed in England for use at home and in Her Majesty's foreign possessions, that the yearly production of copies exceeds one million. The English Book of Common Prayer is, next to the English Bible, not only the most abundant of all books, but also the cheapest.

A Church of England Hymn Book. Edited by the Rev. GODFREY THRING. Skeffington. 1880.

THIS new High Church Hymnal bears witness to much patient research and scholarly taste. We do not scruple to call it a High Church compilation, for its sacramental teaching will preclude its general introduction into Evangelical churches. For example: the Lord's table is freely and frequently designated as "the altar," although this term is so studiously avoided in our Prayer Book. And such lines as—

> His manhood pleads, where now It lives
> On Heaven's eternal throne,
> And where, in mystic rite, He gives
> Its Presence to His own.—*Hymn* 386.

And again—

> Then, as food to His apostles,
> Gives Himself with His own hand.
> By His word, the Word Incarnate,
> Maketh bread His flesh to be, &c.
> Willing faith the lack supplieth,
> Where our earthly senses fail.—*Hymn* 511—

appear inconsistent with the rubric, "The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here: it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

It is a very large compilation, consisting of 669 hymns, many of them very long ones; and it contains more than 200 favourite and familiar hymns, which will always give the book an intrinsic worth. But we regret the absence of at least 200 others, some of an older and some of a more recent date, which are now interwoven with the Church's service of song, such as—to select a few out of many—

"As pants the hart for cooling streams." (*Tate and Brady.*)
"Come, let us join our friends above." (*C. Wesley.*)
"From every stormy wind that blows." (*Hugh Stowell.*)
"Head of the Church triumphant." (*C. Wesley.*)
"Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face." (*Bonar.*)
"How sweet the name of Jesus sounds." (*Newton.*)
"I heard the voice of Jesus say." (*Bonar.*)
"Jesu, the very thought of Thee." (*From St. Bernard.*)
"Jesu, where'er Thy people meet." (*Cowper.*)
"Lord, I hear of showers of blessing." (*Codner.*)
"Lord, speak to me that I may speak." (*F. R. Havergal.*)
"My God, and is Thy table spread?" (*Doddridge.*)
"O God of Bethel, by whose hand!" (*Doddridge.*)
"O Jesu, Thou art standing." (*W. W. How.*)
"O Love Divine, how sweet Thou art." (*C. Wesley.*)
"O the bitter shame and sorrow." (*Monod.*)
"Pleasant are Thy courts above." (*Lyte.*)
"Safe in the arms of Jesus." (*Crosby.*)
"Stand up, stand up for Jesus." (*Duffield.*)
"The voice that breathed o'er Eden." (*Keble.*)
"Thou art coming, O my Saviour." (*F. R. Havergal.*)
"Welcome, happy morning." (*Tr. by Ellerton.*)

Isaac Watts, Charles Wesley, and James Montgomery will ever stand among the foremost princes of English hymn writers. But Mr. Thring only gives eleven by Watts; eighteen by Wesley; and eighteen by Montgomery; while he includes twenty-three by W. J. Irons; twenty-two by J. Ellerton, and no less than fifty-seven of his own. This is a proportion which the taste of the Church will hardly endorse.

Again, we mourn to see one verse pitilessly cut out from the peerless hymn, "Rock of Ages cleft for me;" and, "Days and moments quickly flying," is, to our mind, sadly mutilated. We hope, in another edition, these may be restored. We are sure that a special tune-book is indispensable, for so many of the hymns are of long and intricate measures. Still, though we have ventured to offer these criticisms on Mr. Thring's book, we hail its appearance as another and interesting contribution to the stores of the Church's hymnody. We would venture to commend to our readers an admirable Sunday hymn (No. 60) by W. J. Irons, which is not so generally known, beginning—

Hail, holy rest, calm herald of that day
When all the toils of time shall pass away;
First gift of God, as life on earth began,
We welcome thee, O Sabbath, made for man.

Rome's Tactics; a Lesson for England from the Past. By the Very Rev. William Goode, D.D., F.S.A., late Dean of Ripon. Pp. 93. Thirty-second thousand. Hatchards.

THE interest and the importance of "Rome's Tactics," at the present time, is not, we think, sufficiently recognized, even among earnest and thoughtful Protestant Churchmen. We are anxious, therefore, to make known the fact, stated, we observe, on the title-page, that numbers of the pamphlet for distribution at a reduced rate may be obtained from the publishers. To most readers of The Churchman this work of the late Dean of Ripon is, probably, well known. It may not be inexpedient, however, to give two or three extracts from its pages, while heartily recommending it.

On page 5 Dr. Goode quotes the remarkable testimony of Bishop Burnet, in a sermon which he preached in 1668 before the House of Commons. The Bishop said:

Here suffer me to tell you, that in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign our adversaries saw no hopes of retrieving their affairs, which had been spoiled by Queen Mary's persecution, but by setting on foot *divisions among Protestants* upon very inconsiderable matters. I myself have seen the letters of the chief bishops of that time, from which it appears that the Queen's stiffness in maintaining some ceremonies flowed not from their Councils, but from the practices of some *disguised Papists.*

On page 14 Dr. Goode gives a case, the account of which is copied from the Episcopal Registry of Rochester. From this account it appears that Thomas Heth, a concealed Jesuit, brother of Nicholas Heth, who had been Bishop of Rochester and afterwards Archbishop of York, labouring to sow dissensions among the English Protestants, having been allowed to preach in Rochester Cathedral, was detected by a letter which he accidently dropped in the pulpit addressed to him by a leading Jesuit at Madrid. In this letter, dated Madrid, Oct. 1568, after stating that "the Council" of the Fraternity had sent him some books for distribution, and adding, "these mixtures with your own will not only a little puzzle the understandings of the auditors, but make yourself famous," the writer says:—

Hallingham, Coleman, and Benson have *set a faction among the German heretics*, so that several who have turned from us have now denied their baptism, which we hope will soon turn the scale and bring them back to their old principles. This we have certified to the Council and Cardinals: that there is no other way to prevent people from turning heretics and for the recalling of others back again to the Mother Church than by *the diversities of doctrines.*

And upon searching Heth's lodgings, continues Dr. Goode, there was found "a licence from the Fraternity of the Jesuits, and a Bull dated the first of Pius Quintus, to preach what doctrine that Society pleased for *the dividing of Protestants*, particularly naming the English Protestants by the name of heretics."

On page 58 Dr. Goode quotes the following passage from Hallam, in regard to the reign of Charles II.:—

The Court, [says Hallam] entertained great hopes from the depressed condition of the Dissenters, whom it was intended to bribe with that toleration under a Catholic regimen which they could so little expect from the Church of England. Hence the Duke of York was always *strenuous against schemes of comprehension, which would invigorate the Protestant interest and promote conciliation. With the opposite view of rendering a union among Protestants impracticable, the vigorous Episcopalians were encouraged underhand to prosecute the Nonconformists.*

The learned Dean does not confine himself to the action and argument of Jesuitical Romanists. He refers, at considerable length, to the course pursued by Romanizers. Thus he quotes some striking passages from a pamphlet, "The Morality of Tractarianism." The author of this pamphlet complains of a system which gives "*sophistry* for *faith*," and "destroys the principle of honour." "Whatever force exists in arguing from its *good* moral results," continues the author, "neither more nor less must be granted, if we discover its moral effect to be *bad*:—

This is what disturbs thousands whom logic and controversy would never disturb. *It is a feeling which has lurked unexpressed in the hearts of its warmest followers.* NOT ONE OF US BUT MUST OWN IT: NOT ONE BUT HAS WRITHED UNDER THE TORTURE OF DOUBTING, WHETHER, ON THE THRESHOLD OF THIS SYSTEM, WHICH HE EMBRACES TO MAKE HIM HOLY, THERE RESTS NOT THE STAIN AND SEMBLANCE OF A LIE. Is this too harsh a term? But what is the fact?

Do we not as Catholics claim to believe doctrines which yet we dare not avow in their plain unmistakable words? We dare not: for, alas! the Church of England does not give us plain and unmistakable words in which to avow them: and *if we convince ourselves that she does not rather intend us to avow* THEIR VERY REVERSE, *it is only by a course of explanation which twists her apparently most Protestant statements into a positive sanction of Catholic truth.*"

Having quoted these passages in regard to prevarication, and non-natural interpretation, Dr. Goode proceeds as follows:—

I am quite aware that an endeavour has been made to raise a *tu-quo que* argument against the Evangelical party on this ground, on account of their denial of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, which their opponents hold that the Prayer Book teaches; and that this argument has also been urged against them in other quarters. The only reply which it seems to me at all necessary *now* to make to such accusations, and a very sufficient reply to all the lucubrations of newspaper editors, and writers in reviews, the dogmatism of Romanizers, the anti-Church prejudices of Dissenters, and the ignorance of historical theology (to which the question belongs) in some members of our Church, lay and clerical, as to point such cavillers first to the known views of the compilers of our Formularies, and more especially to the Judgment pronounced, after a long, careful, and elaborate investigation of the matter by some of the ablest legal minds in the kingdom,—known to have been previously somewhat inclined in the opposite direction,—in the case of Gorham *v.* the Bishop of Exeter: followed up, it may be added, by the frank and public admission of one who was an earnest adviser of the movement on the part of the Bishop, that the course of the discussion had produced in him the conviction that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, for which he had been contending, was not that of the Church of England.

The passages in which Dean Goode vindicates for Evangelical Churchmen their true position form not the least valuable portion of this ably-written work.

Short Notices.

The Edinburgh Review. No. 310. Longman's.

In the last number of the *Edinburgh* appears an ably-written Article on "Ritualistic Literature," under six heads, viz.:—

I. The "Sacrament of the Altar," or the "Mass;"
II. Non-communicating Attendance for the purpose of Assisting at Sacrifice and for Adoration;
III. The Obligation of Fasting Communion;
IV. Sacramental Confession and Absolution;
V. The Observance of Unauthorized Festivals, and the Invocation of Saints and Angels;
VI. Hymnology.

Ultra-Church literature is examined, fairly, and with sufficient fulness. Proofs are adduced of such assertions as these:—"It is virtually, if not formally, conceded that in regard to the doctrine of the Mass, the Romanists and the Romanizers are at one." On the doctrine of the Church of England as to "the Real Presence," the *Edinburgh* quotes the following words of the late Bishop of Exeter, to whose authority Ritualists often appeal:—

It is in this sense that the crucified Jesus is present in the Sacrament of His Supper, *not in, nor with, the bread and wine, nor under these accidents, but in the souls of communicants;* not carnally, but effectually and fruitfully, and therefore most really.

The Reviewer concludes by pointing out that the tendency and object of Ritualism is to un-Protestantize the Church. He says:—

The system of Ritualism is based upon a view of the visible Church essentially opposed to that of the Twentieth Article of Religion, and one which naturally leads either to secession to the Church of Rome, or to efforts in order to effect a corporate reunion with her. In total oblivion of the fundamental designs of Jewish ritual, as expounded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, our modern Ritualists seek to "build again" in the Christian Church those "rudiments of the world" and those carnal ordinances which it was the object of Christ's Gospel to destroy. Unmindful of the fact that under the Mosaic dispensation a gorgeous and imposing ceremonial was maintained only in one place, and that, as regards the nation at large, the worship of the Jews was strikingly devoid of outward rites and observances, the Ritualists proceed on the assumption that a minute ritual has been uniformly sanctioned, if not enforced, alike under the Jewish and the Christian dispensations.

Is the Papacy Predicted by St. Paul? (2 Thess. ii. 1–13). *An Inquiry.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. Second Edition. Rivingtons.

This interesting *brochure* was recommended some two or three months ago in our columns; and we cordially welcome an edition which contains fresh matter. Several criticisms, it appears, on special statements in the Essay, have been made by correspondents of the Bishop, who concurred in its general conclusions. Referring to the chief points in this correspondence, his lordship observes:—

1. That there is clearly a *terminus a quo*, from which the Prophecy of St. Paul *began* to be in course of fulfilment. That terminus was the *removal* of the *Roman Empire*, which has long ago ceased to exist. (See above pp. 7–14.
2. That there is also a *terminus ad quem*, to which the fulfilment of the Prophecy tends, and at which it will be completely accomplished. That terminus is the Second Advent of Christ. (Verse 8, above p. 6.)

Between these two *termini* the Prophecy moves.

3. As has been long since well remarked by Lord Bacon, many prophecies of Holy Scripture have a course of *successive fulfilment*; what he calls a "germinant accomplishment" in the series of many centuries.

So it is with this Prophecy of St. Paul.

"Consequently," writes the Bishop, "although I firmly believe this Prophecy to have long since *begun* to be fulfilled, and to be now in *course of fulfilment*, in the Roman Papacy, I do *not* suppose that it has been *exhausted* by the Papacy, as it now is. If I might venture to express an opinion as to the future, which I do with all reverence, I am inclined to believe that the Roman Papacy will develop itself into something worse. The impulse and encouragement which, by its monstrous dogmas, usurpations, and superstitions (revolting to the intellect of Europe), it has given, and is giving, to *Infidelity*, leads to the expectation that it will probably give rise to the appearance of some personal Enemy of God, who will exhibit in all their terrible fulness the features portrayed by St. Paul; and who will be destroyed by the Second Coming of Christ."

In the preface to this new edition, the Bishop thanks "the learned author of a recent popular work" ("The Life of St. Paul"), for his courteous assurance that some of the expressions in it commented on by the Bishop "will be modified." In thus yielding to the judgment of a Bishop so eminent for his piety and learning, Dr. Farrar does himself honour.

Songs in Suffering. Lyrics and Hymns for the use of the "Afflicted and Distressed." Selected by W. O. PURTON, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea. Author of "The Help of Prayer," &c. New Edition. Hunt and Co.

Trust in Trial. Lessons of Peace in the School of Affliction. By the Rev. W. O. PURTON. Sixth Edition. Hunt and Co. 1880.

Of "Trust in Trial" it may be said that, as a manual containing a meditation on some Scripture, with an appropriate prayer and selected hymn, it is probably unique. Both little books are neatly got up, printed in clear type, and cheap.

Fynie's Flower. By BRENDA, Author of "Froggy's Little Brother," "Nothing to Nobody," &c. Pp. 106. Hatchards. 1880.

Several stories by Brenda are well known, interesting, original, and good. "Fynie's Flower" is a very touching little story; it illustrates the resurrection power in nature and in grace. A tasteful volume. We do not care for the illustration of the little girl presenting her flowers in the chancel.

God's "Ten Words." A Course of Lectures on the Decalogue; preached in St. Thomas' Church, Nottingham. By the Rev. WALTER SENIOR, B.A. Pp. 364. R. D. Dickenson. 1880.

Vigorous, thoughtful, reverent addresses, with a ring of manliness. Mr. Senior certainly cannot be blamed for reticence. He speaks out clearly, and strongly denounces the shams and vices of the age. In the lecture on Chastity occur some statements and arguments which many, not to say most, clergymen would think unsuitable for the pulpit. Here and there we should have been pleased to notice a more distinct reference to the work of the Holy Spirit; but we bear in mind that this is a special course of Lectures. Against the opening of Museums and other places on Sundays the argument is forcible.

A Child. For a Mother. By Mrs. UMPHELBY. Pp. 94. Nisbet & Co. 1879.

A tender, thoughtful little book. "Trust begets truth," is one of its key-note teachings, as to dealing with children. We quote a specimen anecdote:—

A son nearing manhood once said to his mother about some bygone failing, "Do you remember?"

"No, indeed."

"Just like you, mother. How you have helped me all my life by forgetting all that has been bad in me!"

"Perhaps you have made me forget by so many dear things in you."

How expressive was the quiet kiss that rested for a moment on her forehead!

Holy Living and Holy Dying. By JEREMY TAYLOR, D.D. Edited by Rev. F. A. MALLESON, M.A. London: Ward, Lock & Co. Pp. 168.

A popular edition of the great Divine's celebrated work, with an interesting preface and notes. It will prove a boon to many who are desirous of reading, in an inexpensive form, this standard work.

Cæsar de Bello Gallico, Books I.–III. J. H. MERRYWEATHER and C. J. TANCOCK. Rivingtons. Pp. 234.

This little book is in every way worthy of being published in connection with the many excellent educational works of the firm. With really good notes, clear type, comprehensive maps, and indices, it is all that can be needed by the student.

Temperance Landmarks. By Rev. ROBERT MAGUIRE. London: *Hand and Heart* publishing office. Pp. 96.

Another protest against the great evil of drunkenness which is worthy of wide circulation, containing some very true and telling arguments, and issued in a neat and attractive form.

Illustrious Abstainers. By F. SHERLOCK. Pp. 230. Hodder & Stoughton.

Sir Garnet Wolseley, Mr. Burt, M.P., President Hayes, Sir Henry Thompson, Dr. B. W. Richardson, Canon Farrar, Mr. Plimsoll, M.P., Mr. Morley, M.P., and Canon Wilberforce, are among the total abstainers brought before the readers of this interesting book.

Among the Brambles, and other Lessons from Life. In which the Natural is used to Illustrate the Spiritual. By E. C., Author of "Lord, I hear of Showers of Blessing." Pp. 248. Nisbet & Co. 1880.

With this book we are much pleased. In a prefatory note it is stated that to the author the pleasure of lovely scenes and times of rest has been greatly enhanced by their connection with something beyond themselves, and when "the Natural" has pointed to "the Spiritual," it has become instinct with a new life. Suggestive, simple, and thoroughly Scriptural, these "lessons from life"—eminently *real*—are full of interest. No reader with any religious feeling about him, we think, would reckon them dry; to devout readers generally they will seem both picturesque and practical. The volume, we may add, has a very tasteful cover.

The Saint and his Saviour. The Progress of the Soul in the Knowledge of Jesus. By C. H. SPURGEON. Pp. 470. Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

A book which earnest seekers after truth and holiness may read with profit. Opening its pages here and there, we have always found some suggestive sentence. The style is simple; the thoughts are eminently practical. On page 131 we read—"The writer confesses his eternal obligations to an old cook, who was despised as an Antinomian, but who, in her kitchen, taught him many of the deep things of God, and removed many a doubt from his youthful mind." We have not noticed any expression which would reveal that the eminent writer is a Baptist.

The Student's Commentary on the Holy Bible. Founded on the Speaker's Commentary. Abridged and edited by J. M. FULLER, M.A. Vol. III. Pp. 473. John Murray. 1880.

The third volume of an abridged edition of "The Speaker's Commentary" needs, in these columns, no lengthy notice. It contains Job, the Psalms, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon. Mr. Fuller has done his work, so far as we have examined, with skill and great judgment. With the Psalms, as a whole, we are particularly pleased. The third volume, like volumes i. and ii., is well printed and neatly bound; a book very handy and usable. "The Student's Commentary" will prove a boon to many devout and thoughtful persons who desire to know the latest results of the inquiries of learned and orthodox divines, but who are unable to buy or borrow the volumes of the complete, unabridged Commentary, which is designed especially for critical readers.

The Forgotten Truth: or, the Gospel of the Holy Ghost, with Selected Hymns of the Spirit. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Pp. 144. *Hand and Heart* Publishing Office.

We heartily recommend this attractive little book. Mr. Bullock believes—and we thoroughly agree with him, that the special and urgent need of the Church of Christ at this time is a due sense of the absolute

necessity of the Divine influence of the Holy Spirit for the right teaching of Christian truth and the right doing of Christian work. The lack of setting forth Scripture doctrines concerning the ministry of the Spirit is great and grievous, and it lies, we are persuaded, at the root of many prevailing errors. A thoughtful and thoroughly spiritual treatise on this subject can hardly fail to do good. Mr. Bullock's Selection of Hymns is a good one; but we learn, from a brief preface, that he is anxious to prepare a large selection. We may mention the hymn "The Abiding Comforter" (in our judgment an excellent one), by Mr. Bickersteth, first published in *The Churchman*, No. IV.

Six Addresses on the Being of God. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Pp. 168. S.P.C.K.

These Addresses were delivered last autumn to the clergy and others of the Archdeaconry of Gloucester in the course of a Visitation. A desire was expressed at the time that they should be published. Accordingly, after revision, and with additions, they have been issued in a very usable form; and the little volume will prove, no doubt, a real help to seriously-thinking young men and others in these days of widespread doubt.

Christian Certainties. Five Short Addresses delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, at the Mid-day Service, Lent, 1880. By the Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury. Pp. 80. Elliot Stock. 1880.

Mr. Calthrop is known as one of the most eloquent, suggestive, and thoroughly practical Evangelical preachers of the day. Very many outside his own large congregation, in town, and elsewhere, have had the pleasure of hearing him; and his discourses, partly from his manner, and partly from the clearness and crispness of his language, are likely to leave an impression. In the five Addresses before us, delivered, we presume, in what were particularly short services, he has hardly given himself, here and there, room for exposition. For instance, we may refer to the phrase, "state of salvation," on page 52; a few additional words—a second edition will give the opportunity—would make it more clear to anxious inquirers. His chief aim, throughout, has been evidently to arrest attention and fasten in one leading thought. And these Addresses will, probably, prove most useful as regards the class of readers who are either careless or are at least content to remain uncertain. This class is a very large one; they need, above all things, to be made to see their real case—need to be brought, so to speak, to the point; and Mr. Calthrop's incisive language can hardly fail to excite inquiry in many such, and lead them, through the Holy Spirit, to give their hearts to Jesus. In heartily recommending this earnest little book, we may remark that it is well printed and has a neat cloth cover.

God is Love; or, Memorials of Little Nony. By her MOTHER. Preface by Miss HAVERGAL. Pp. 126. Nisbet & Co. 1880.

Few Christian people are likely to read these "Memorials" unmoved; but they have an especial value, of course, for children. The story of little Nony's early days, her earnest efforts to do good, the suffering which followed a fall of twelve feet, her submission to the will of God during a long and very painful illness, and her waiting, yearning prayers, is told without reserve in homely unaffected language. The great charm of the book is its unmistakable reality. Seldom have we seen so simple and yet so suggestive a picture of a child's patience during pain; and the motto, *God is Love*, is truly the key-note of the whole.

"Little Nony," we read, "fell asleep in Jesus," May 1st, 1879; she was nearly eleven years old. In the preface it is stated that her memoir was to have been (how the Master's call often breaks our "was to be!") written by Frances Havergal. "The pleasant incident of Nony's willingness to become the first collector in the Bruey Branch of the Irish Society, associates their names as fellow-workers." The Memorials are dedicated to the junior members of the Bruey Branch, of which Frances Havergal was the founder, and little Nony the first member. We may add that the little book, tastefully got up, contains some beautiful hymns.

Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By F. GODET, D.D., Professor of Theology, Neuchatel. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1880.

A Commentary on the Scripture which Coleridge deemed "the profoundest book in existence," and which Luther went so far as to term "the chief book in the New Testament," written by an eminent author of unquestioned piety and scholarship, deserves, to say the least, a respectful and really careful consideration. The characteristics of Dr. Godet's Commentaries are, probably, well known. We content ourselves, therefore, at present, with remarking that we have read many passages in the volume before us—just issued—with unalloyed satisfaction. When the second volume is published we shall, we hope, notice the work as a whole. With the present volume, it may be mentioned, Messrs. Clark begin a new series of their valuable "Foreign Theological Library." The binding of the new series is modernized so as to distinguish it from the former series.

The Life of David as Reflected in his Psalms. By ALEX. MACLAREN, D.D. Pp. 260. Edinburgh: Macniven & Wallace. 1880.

Dr. Maclaren's suggestive sermons and essays are valued by many Churchmen. His present work—first volume of a new "Household Library of Exposition"—is not unworthy of its predecessors; it brings out fresh thoughts, and is interesting all through. The eminent Baptist writes with polish and power.

A well-written little book—from one point of view, a very interesting book—is Dr. A. Nicholson's *Apostolic Succession in the Church of Sweden.* (Rivingtons). There was some conversation in Convocation on this subject last summer. Anxious to increase knowledge, Dr. Nicholson, some time H.M. Consular Chaplain at Gothenburg (now Incumbent of Christ Church, Leamington), went to Sweden, last autumn, and consulted various authorities at Stockholm and Upsala. He brings forward abundant testimony to the consecration of Bishop Peter Magnusson in 1524. When the breach took place between the King, Gustavus Vasa, and the Pope, Bishop Magnusson consented to serve the King's measures, although he hated the Reformation. He consecrated three bishops, without the Pope's sanction, in 1526. One sentence in this book shows its author's leanings. "The Church of Sweden," says Dr. Nicholson, "has never called in question, much less prohibited, the use of those Eucharistic vestments which are the immediate testimonies to the Apostolical succession of Catholic bishops and priests."

What do we Owe Him? is the title of a very timely little book about Raikes and Sunday Schools, by the Rev. C. BULLOCK (*Home Words* Office). Cheap, attractive, and instructive, this "Story of a Grain of Mustard Seed," ought to have a large circulation.

ART. X.—THE MONTH.

AN Administration was formed by Mr. Gladstone, at the end of April, after Lord Hartington and Lord Granville had been "sent for" by the Queen. The Cabinet is essentially Whig; but the Radicals are represented by two of the members for Birmingham, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Chamberlain. The introducer of the American *caucus*, Mr. Chamberlain, an extreme Radical as regards Bible teaching in Board Schools and other great questions, became a Cabinet Minister *per saltum*; and many Churchmen who are strongly Liberal will join with the *Guardian* in regretting such an appointment. Of the members of the Government several, no doubt, are pledged to disestablishment. With sound statesmen in the Cabinet, however, such as Lord Selborne (Chancellor), Lord Northbrook, and Mr. Childers, extreme opinions on religious or ecclesiastical questions are not likely to receive Government support. The Marquis of Hartington will make an admirable Secretary for India; and that able and accomplished diplomatist, Earl Granville, will probably carry out the policy of his Tory predecessor with success. Mr. Goschen, who has shown, in recent periods of excitement, both independence and statesmanlike sagacity, is sent to Constantinople as a special Ambassador; and the Porte is to be gently coerced to carry out provisions of the Berlin Treaty without further delay. The Prime Minister's letter of apology to the Austrian Ambassador for "painful and wounding words" against a friendly Power, founded on rumours and uttered—as were many most regrettable expressions—to election crowds, is probably without a parallel. The misapprehension, according to Mr. Gladstone's letter, is obliterated from his own mind; but "whether it is likely to be as easily obliterated from that of Austria," says the *Times*, "is a different question."

Sir William Harcourt, on his appointment as Home Secretary, has been rejected by Oxford; and in the opinion of an esteemed incumbent in that city, the Rev. A. M. W. Christopher, the chief cause of this sudden change is Mr. Gladstone's appointing a pervert (Lord Ripon) to the Viceroyalty of India, and another Romanist, Lord Kenmare, to the post of Lord Chamberlain. "Not a few Oxford citizens are Gospel-loving Protestants *first*, and Liberals or Conservatives, as the case may be, afterwards." At Sandwich, and in the Wigton Burghs, a Conservative has been elected.

The debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Bradlaugh's

position was damaging to those who were chiefly concerned in the Northampton election. Another Liberal candidate, it appears, was "hustled out of the way" by Mr. Gladstone's whipper-in, Mr. Adam, in favour of Mr. Bradlaugh; and Mr. Newdegate's remarks on the grave Constitutional question involved[1] were endorsed by the refusal of a majority of the Committee to make matters smooth for the Ministry. It is startling in the extreme to notice the off-hand way in which proposals are made for the legalization of Atheism in Parliament. On the suggestion that a Bill should be introduced to do away altogether with Parliamentary oaths, the *Record* remarks:—

> We should regard such a measure as involving a terrible descent from the ancient Constitution of this country, under which Christianity is part and parcel of the common law of England, and a profession of faith in the Almighty GOD is regarded as the basis of all sound morality.

The appointment of the Marquis of Ripon to the Viceroyalty of India was referred to by several speakers in recent religious anniversaries. Dr. Ryle, for example, at the Church Missionary Society meeting, spoke of it as possibly a danger ahead in regard to Protestant Missions. Lord Ripon is, indeed, a man of the highest character, and greatly esteemed; but that Mr. Gladstone should select a pervert to be the representative of a Protestant Queen in India, has excited the greatest astonishment. Canons Bell and Clayton, in published letters, and Lord George Hamilton, M.P., in a recent speech, have quoted Mr. Gladstone's statement that a pervert renounces his freedom and places his loyalty at the mercy of another:—

> Well, now [said Lord George] that statement of Mr. Gladstone is either true or it is not true. If it is untrue, he has been guilty of circulating throughout the whole of England an unwarrantable insult upon a large number of his fellow subjects; but, if it be true, then I ask him why did he appoint Lord Ripon Viceroy of India?

Mr. Gladstone's statement first appeared in the *Contemporary Review*, October, 1874; it was quoted, and defended, in the right hon. gentleman's tract, "The Vatican Decrees." The chief portion of the passage runs thus:—

> In the nineteenth century "when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith;

[1] Mr. O'Donnell, a Roman Catholic member, said: "Although the House might, on due consideration, deem it right to admit a Member who objected entirely to all faith in morality and in God, who explained religion as a disease of the brain, and conscience as a nervous contraction of the diaphragm, yet the question ought to be brought plainly before the House; and no backstairs arrangements or electioneering contrivances ought to turn the responsible Government of a great Christian country from its plain duty to the Christian representatives of the nation."

when she has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; *when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another;* and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history."[1]

The italics are of course our own. Mr. Gladstone inquired, first, were his allegations "*true*," and secondly were they "for any practical purpose *material*;" and he set himself to prove these points. He was not at that time in office. His Irish University Bill which, by its gagging clauses, "repudiated modern thought," had proved a failure. The question, then, arises, how far an eminent man's arguments out of office are for "any practical purpose material" when he returns to office.

Mr. Gladstone, indeed, has replied to Lord Oranmore that the citation from his work on which such stress has been laid "presents, when taken alone, an incomplete and misleading view" of his opinions. We have looked at the passage on page 34, to which the Prime Minister refers (May 19th), and we find these words:—

> What I have less accurately said that he renounced, I might more accurately have said that he forfeited.

The Radical Dissenters, no doubt, will speedily call upon Mr. Gladstone to show, in some practical way, his gratitude. At the annual meeting of the Congregational Union, Dr. Mellor said that no one could deny that to the Nonconformists they were largely indebted for the great change which had taken place, and he had no doubt the Government would recognise that fact, and as the best expression of its gratitude seek to promote religious equality, and in due time they would have a free Church in a free State. *The Nonconformist and Independent*, similarly, speaks of "the union of Nonconformist principle and democratic fervour" as sure to bring about ere long the downfall of the Established Church. Mr. Spurgeon, also, is filled "with unspeakable delight;" "the iniquity of a privileged sect," he says, "is to be swept away!"[2]

---

[1] "Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion." Three Tracts. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. Murray. 1875.

[2] A letter from the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D.D., to Mr. Christopher was recently published in the *Record*. Dr. Bonar says:—"I have taken no share in the politics of the day; and I mean to adhere to this somewhat negative procedure, as I think it most becoming in a minister of Christ. I decline pulpit politics altogether. . . . . The withdrawal of the Christian element from social and political questions must not only lead to failure in their solution, but issue in results of the most disastrous kind. . . . I do not belong to either of the Established Churches of the land. But I have no sympathy with the attacks made upon them, especially in the interests of political partisanship, by professedly Christian men."

The May Meetings, as a rule, have been well attended, and the reports, financially and otherwise, encouraging.

The Anniversary of the Church Missionary Society afforded matter for thankfulness and rejoicing. At the clerical prayer meeting on the Monday evening an address was given by Canon Money; the sermon in St. Bride's was preached by the Bishop of Rochester. Canon Garbett's *ad clerum* address on Tuesday morning was admirable; and the great Hall was crowded in every part. We have never seen a more attentive or appreciative gathering. The very carefully prepared Report was well read by the Hon. Sec., Prebendary Wright, and its opening sentences were most heartily applauded:—

The Committee cannot otherwise begin this Report than by calling upon the friends and members of the Society to unite with them in rejoicing before the Lord for the willingness with which his people have offered to him for the work. The offerings of all kinds which have been received during the past year for the general work of the Society have reached the grand total of £221,723.

The chief passage in the Report concerning Ceylon runs as follows:—

It is well known that in Ceylon, as in the Church of England at home, a contest has been for some time going on in defence of those Gospel truths which are to the Committee dearer than life itself, and compared with which all questions of ecclesiastical organization sink into insignificance. Difficulties connected with this cause have troubled the Ceylon Mission during the last four years. The Committee would again bear their cheerful testimony to the noble and forbearing, though firm, attitude maintained by the Society's missionaries throughout that period.

To the settlement which has been agreed upon Lord Chichester referred in his impressive opening address. The noble Earl said:—

I am sure you will all join with me in an expression of thankfulness to God for the satisfactory settlement that has been made of what we have called "the Ceylon difficulty." The Committee have assented to that arrangement without the sacrifice of a single principle or point which they thought of importance for the work of the Society, and they have at the same time opened a way by which the Bishop himself can, consistently and conscientiously, co-operate with them in carrying out that work. In reference to this satisfactory settlement our best thanks are due to our beloved and most revered Primate.

At the seventy-sixth Anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, its President, the Earl of Shaftesbury, occupied the chair for the thirty-second time. The Report opened with three notes of thanksgiving:—

The past year has been in some countries a year of reaction, but no old field of labour has been closed; it has been in some countries a year of exhaustion, nevertheless new fields have been opened; it has been in all countries a year of depression, in spite of which your Committee have to acknowledge the receipt of funds sufficient to hold their own and even to go forward. . . . The total free income of the Society for the year has amounted to £110,806, as against £96,426 last year; more than a quarter of this, however, is due to legacies. The total receipts for the year have been £213,374; the total payments have been £193,569."

The first resolution was moved by the Archbishop of Canterbury and seconded by the Rev. A. E. Moule. Having alluded to the cry for the unity of Christendom—"better to be obtained," he said, "by the circulation of the Scriptures than by any other means"—the Archbishop referred to the Christianity of America; our sympathy is with the West as well as with the East. In concluding, his Grace touched upon Missions:—

"I was looking yesterday at the Life of Henry Venn, a man whose name in this Hall and in all England will be ever venerated, who from his office in Salisbury Square controlled the missionary efforts of the Church of England throughout the whole world to their great advantage for so many years. In his Life you will find a speech[1] which he delivered before this Society in this Hall, and you will find him testifying that the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society was the great pattern of the work of Missions throughout the world; that it is not right merely to regard the Bible Society as being the handmaid of the missionary societies, but that, by dispersing the Scriptures of truth throughout the world, it gives them a power for the conversion of the whole world to the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour such as could be attained by no other means.

In an effective speech, heartily cheered, Dr. Ryle mentioned the reformation going on in Mexico:—

How did that work begin? It began by the Bible being introduced by your Society. Nearly 100,000 copies of the Bible and parts of Scripture from your Society went through Mexico and set the people thinking, and this was the means, under God, of laying the foundation of the Protestant work there, which is likely to bear such good fruit.

Dr. Manning, well known as a secretary of the R. T. S., spoke of the revival in France:—"Never since the Reformation has there been in any other land such a movement, such a revival, such an awakening, as seems now to be commencing in France."

[1] "Memoir of Rev. H. Venn," p. 248. The speech was delivered in 1861. Mr. Venn also said:—"This Society is a centre of union among the various Missionary Societies, and exercises a moderating and binding influence upon them all. . . . The same benefit which manifests itself in the Church at home, manifests itself, I think, much more in the Churches abroad."