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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. III.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1881

PREFACE.

THE present year will probably prove a momentous period in the history of Christianity in England. That we are passing through a crisis is a saying repeated within the National Church from one border of the country to another. In the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, for example, it has been argued, during the month of February, that the present is a grave crisis in the history of the Church, inasmuch as three clergymen, who felt themselves constrained to "go against the law of the Church," as it was euphemistically expressed, were imprisoned for contempt, and yet were supported by the sympathies of a section both of the Clergy and of the Laity. "Conscientious" resistance to the law brought about in ecclesiastical proceedings a dead-lock altogether without precedent, and which was undoubtedly a serious scandal. Further, the Memorial signed by five Deans, and three thousand clergymen, in which it is stated that the immediate need of our Church is a tolerant recognition of divergent Ritual practice, has been welcomed, in certain quarters, as implying that, unless the Bishops consent to connive at Ritual which the Courts have again and again declared illegal, the Liberationist agitation against the Church will have the support of the Ritualists and their friends. It is urged, moreover, that the political condition of the country is such that sudden and sweeping changes are, to say the least, within the bounds of probability.

Now, it is true, as has been stated by the Dean of Llandaff, in his place in Convocation, that those who, on the ground of an

ecclesiastical crisis, plead in favour of Ritualistic illegalities have mistaken the issue. The times, said the Dean, are truly critical; we are living in a great crisis; but it is one in which Infidelity is the foe and Christianity the defendant. The present period, however, in regard to the Church of England, has, undoubtedly, its peculiar perils; and if the rulers of the Church, yielding either to appeals or to threats, had given a *quasi*-legalization to Romanizing-ritual, the grand old Church established in this realm would have received a deadly blow. It is surely incumbent upon those who are loyal to the principles of the Reformation to put aside misconceptions, and to draw together on common ground to maintain the purity of the Church and increase her beneficent influence.

The completion of another volume of THE CHURCHMAN lays upon us the grateful duty of tendering thanks to the many friends who, by suggestion and in other ways, have given us aid. The circulation of the Magazine, they will be glad to hear, has been steady, and is improving; but we still desire to increase the number of our readers among the laity, and we venture to solicit the co-operation of our clerical supporters in bringing THE CHURCHMAN under the notice of their lay friends. A Right Reverend correspondent writes to us:—"My conviction from the first that such a Magazine was urgently needed has been intensified as I have read the successive Numbers." That THE CHURCHMAN may continue "faithful" in its defence of great principles (to quote the testimony of the venerated Vicar of Islington), the Editor earnestly asks the prayers of its readers.

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1880.

ART. I.—THE DISESTABLISHED CHURCH OF IRELAND.

I. FINANCE.

1. *Reports of the Representative Body.* Hodges, Foster & Co. Dublin: 1871–80.
2. *Parliamentary Reports of the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners.*
3. *The Irish Church Directory.* 1871–80. Charles & Son. Dublin.
4. *Statement at Lambeth.* T. P. CAIRNES, Esq., J.P. Charles & Son. Dublin: 1877.

FOR ten years the Church of Ireland has now been disestablished and disendowed. She has had to perform a task which had scarcely a precedent or parallel. Christians had often forsaken existing churches, and organized themselves anew; but they did this in obedience to some powerful impulse or conviction of their own, which guided their councils, and showed them what to aim at and to avoid. And when missionaries founded new churches in heathen lands, their work grew upon them: they began with a handful of converts, and their experience increased with their responsibilities. It was otherwise with the Church of Ireland. She entered upon her new career reluctantly and with aversion. She did not emigrate from her ancient pastures, but was exiled. And a constitution and a code were demanded offhand for unknown emergencies, and for a Church already of full age, not the more elastic through its venerable associations, and co-extensive with the island. This problem had to be solved by representatives chosen without any clear knowledge of what their bearing would prove in such a crisis, yet every foolish and angry word of these was as mischievous, and dis-

Difficulties of the Church's task.

credited the Church as far, as if it had been possible to test beforehand the temper of any one of them.

Nothing, indeed, was more striking in our early deliberations than the anxiety with which every new speaker was watched, the surprising difference between men's expectation and the result, the failure of great preachers in debate, the creation of new reputations, the utter uncertainty, for a while, how men would behave and vote. It should not be forgotten that our first synod was elected for three years, with only the experience of one session of the Convention to guide the voters.

Another and a very grave danger has been so happily surmounted that many persons have never known of its existence. The bishops and senior clergy were the natural leaders in our debates. Nothing could be enacted upon which they imposed a veto. But neither the prelates nor the beneficed clergy had any personal interest in the success of the new system. Incomes larger than it could bestow were already secured to them. The habits of life and thought which had won success under the Establishment were naturally the first to recoil from change. As long as men are human, elderly persons who have won great prizes will be *laudatores temporis acti*, averse from what is new, even when it is most necessary, and ready to quarrel over the details of even what is seen to be inevitable, if it be an innovation. Thus the very class upon which everything depended could not be pressed forward either by selfishness or by enthusiasm. What is more, a very powerful motive was always tempting them into opposition, for no clergyman, beneficed before disestablishment, could be subjected to any legislation against which he would lodge a formal protest. Not doing this, he put his neck under the yoke. The love of independence, the uncertainty of the action of our new courts, countless vague apprehensions on one side, and on the other the impossibility of loss, in fact, every selfish consideration urged the clergy to protest consistently against all that the Church would do. And there were some who apprehended that in the smoothest water and under the brightest skies this rock alone would ensure our shipwreck. But the issue has gone far to prove (what is a real evidence of the faith) that if the *homo naturalis* be, as he frankly confesses, a selfish animal, then the *homo spiritualis* is a distinct species. For no class contributed such laborious intelligence and self-denial to mould the disestablished Church, as the class in whose persons alone the Establishment still survives. In every diocese in Ireland honorary secretaries, treasurers, clerical members of the Representative Body, of the Diocesan Court, of the Council and of the Board of Education, are chiefly men who hope for nothing from the organization to which they contribute con-

stant and unobtrusive labours and no small outlay. We who are of the new system do not see how these men are to be replaced, even when the first and most extreme pressure is at an end. We, whose votes upon the whole were given to the winning cause, are filled with admiration and reverence as we remember how its most resolute and formidable opponents yielded up everything but vital convictions when the future of their Church was in danger of being compromised, and obeyed her decisions at a sacrifice that was most painful to themselves. The ablest anti-revisionists in the General Synod were men who now read the revised Prayer-Book every Sunday, because they are loyal Irish Churchmen. Of these facts no reporter makes a note, yet they are infinitely more significant than any random and heated utterance, repented of and retracted on the spot, which made the round of the newspapers of England, and estranged from us many sympathies and prayers. Persons who judge of the tone and temper of the Irish Church by such extravagances are like the American who wanted to visit Siam, because he understood that all the people there were twins.

There were more serious reasons than the too swift flight of an angry epigram why the Church of Ireland and its actions are imperfectly understood in England. Bitterly hostile statements had just been widely circulated as part of the machinery by which our establishment was to be overthrown, and prejudices, once excited, do not quickly pass away. Perhaps it has not occurred to English Churchmen to correct their judgment of those romances by their knowledge of the "facts and figures" that are now being hurled against their own altars. Again, there is said to be some unwillingness to observe that a disestablished church can work well. The precedent is unwelcome. But it is always wiser to know the truth than to conceal it, and indeed the circumstances of the sister churches are too unlike for an argument from analogy. Misunderstood in England.

Nor has England naturally heard the best report of us from the clergymen who have left us. Here it is most important not to be misunderstood. The outcry against compounding clergymen and "the three C's" ("commuted, compounded, and cut!") has often been cruelly unjust. Composition, not excessive in quantity, was beneficial to the Church herself. To many individuals, without fault of theirs, the new system was distasteful. Many excellent clergymen found that under it their special qualifications would have little scope or recognition. It was well, therefore, both for them and us that they should promptly seek a new sphere in which their energies would have play. But we could hardly hope that their report of us would be very sympathetic, since defective sympathies were what led them to another shore.

We are entitled to claim a large allowance for all these circumstances, when English Churchmen come to ask what the Irish Church has done. It is whispered, indeed, that we have contented ourselves with spoiling our Prayer-Book and reducing Episcopacy to a nullity, which assertions will be treated in another Article. But if only these heroic operations had occupied us, financial difficulties would before now have abolished the Church of Ireland, since more than two-thirds of our parishes are already more or less indebted to the new system, and have had appointments made since disestablishment. Let us try then to understand the monetary position.

Finance. What has been seized.

It is asserted that after disestablishment so much money was given back to us that disendowment became a mockery, and our Church was left almost as affluent as ever. From our former property, however, a million of money has been already spent upon intermediate education, a million and three hundred thousand pounds upon pensions for the teachers of Irish national schools, and a million and a half to relieve the acute distress of last winter, which some persons have found it convenient to call a famine. And the very people who declare that disestablishment is a mockery and the Church has lost nothing, are the loudest clamourers for other millions of the plunder.

In truth, while the Commissioners treated individuals with all the consideration in their power, the Act could scarcely have stripped the Church more completely, unless the flesh had been torn off with the raiment. Of disestablishment we need not complain. How much soever some of us lament it, as a national abandonment of truth, we admit the competence of the State to divorce us, since it was pleased to do so. If the unbelieving husband will depart, let him depart—but let him not carry off his wife's property with his own. We say that the State disendowed us of what never was our dower from the State. Not only were the tithe rent-charges appropriated, but even the glebe lands were taken. Two thousand two hundred of our burial grounds, with the sacred associations of hundreds, or even of a thousand years, are now in the grasp of Poor Law guardians and Boards of Health. The graves of St. Patrick and St. Columkille have been secularized. Ancient churches, coeval with Irish Christianity, are now the property of restorers, and Irish restorers, who have made some of these "national monuments" as charming, with fresh stones and mortar, as if they were only five years old. In fact they are as good as new. Only the one thousand six hundred and forty-eight churches which were in actual use, and such graveyards as touched them without the intervention of any public way, were restored to us after undergoing the rite of confiscation. They could scarcely have

been retained without disturbances. Nearly all had been built by us (even since our National Church reformed herself) and the rest would long since have crumbled but for our loving care, and an expenditure continued through centuries.

The very glebe-houses were seized. It is true that we repurchased them upon good terms. Some were in places where no civilized gentleman would consent to bring up a family, except for the love of God and his Church: many had been rebuilt within the last few years, and the rest had been restored. It is no wonder that we recovered them at a price which, to us who needed them, was advantageous; the surprise is that one penny should have been exacted for houses which were built by former incumbents, out of their own yearly incomes. The State had never given us one of them: we ourselves had long since paid for them; and we have now paid for them, this second time, to the Temporalities Commissioners, in round numbers, five hundred thousand pounds.[1] Nearly half of this money has been contributed by parishes or by generous individuals (besides more than thirteen thousand pounds spent upon repairs and improvements), and for the balance a rent is charged which saves the Church at large from loss, while the clergy have good houses—sometimes, indeed, so good as to be an incumbrance—upon very moderate terms.

We received half a million as compensation for private benefactions and endowments of so recent a date that no principle, except that of barefaced and open pillage, could pre- Private endowments. tend to lay hands upon them. In the same way, a second sum of twenty thousand pounds was paid for certain proprietary churches. The bulk of this money has been allocated to particular places, and none of it can be called re-endowment by the State.

But whence come the vast sums which have been transferred to us by the Temporalities Commissioners—rather more, excluding what has just been stated, than seven millions sterling ?[2] How did we obtain this great capital, the very mention of which creates a prejudice against us ? Commutation.

---

[1] £499,589 16*s.* 10*d.* The English reader should perhaps be informed that "the Commissioners of Church Temporalities" were gentlemen of high position appointed by the State as its agents in all the finance of disendowment. The Church elected "a Representative Body" to act on its behalf in these transactions, and the Representative Body now hold a charter, and act as our trustees in all matters of finance. They possess no legislative power whatever, and, as far as their trusts leave them free, are controlled by the General Synod, which elects thirty-six of them. The number is made up to sixty by adding the twelve bishops and twelve co-opted members.

[2] The gross total being £7,577,477; from which the above £520,000 is to be deducted.

We got it as any one may raise money who has an annuity to sell. We released the State from its obligation to pay the life annuities of a whole generation of bishops, incumbents, and curates. We became responsible for yearly payments, which the State had undertaken, of almost six hundred thousand pounds.[1]

Out of the seven millions and a-half, four millions and three-quarters have already been paid away, and against the remainder there are annuities still existing of more than two hundred thousand pounds.

The transaction was as follows:

When it was seen that our Irish clergy, with whom the State was so anxious to part company, should still, by reason of their vested interests, draw State payments for a whole generation, it was sought to transfer to the Church the task of paying them. Along with the obligation would be transferred the sum which would exactly meet the annuities, if it were promptly invested so that every shilling, until it was demanded by the annuitant, should bear interest at the rate of three-and-a-half *per cent.*, and provided also that the average annuitant would have the good taste to live no longer than Mr. Finlayson's table of longevity instructed him that he ought to live. Upon these conditions the last annuitant should spend upon his last draught of medicine the last penny which we should have thus received in trust. If he were generous enough to die three months sooner, the Church would have gained a quarter's salary; but if he selfishly survived the allotted period she would be a loser by his annuity through the remainder of his life. What would she gain then by taking this responsibility off the shoulders of her spoilers? She would simply gain whatever interest, over and above the stipulated three-and-a-half, she could obtain for the capital while it was yet in her custody. Thus stated, the adventure was not inviting. Not one penny was to be allowed us even for office expenses. The clergy were unwilling to relinquish their Government security. Eminent actuaries trembled lest so temperate and exemplary a body of men should set Mr. Finlayson's tables at defiance, and live, and demand pensions, long after they had eaten up the stipulated sum.

Finally, a compromise was arranged. A sum of five *per cent.* was allowed for office expenses, and seven *per cent.* more to cover the double risks of longevity and bad investments, but only upon the strict condition that three-quarters of the clergy should exchange the unrivalled security of the British empire for the untried credit of a struggling Church. Irish Protestants are proud to remember that two thousand and fifty annuitant clergy-

[1] £592,892.

men made this venture for their Church, while less than ninety clung to the national security for their daily bread.

This is the transaction known as commutation, and thus we received the money, charged with liabilities, by which romantic journals like the *Times* declare that we are "re-endowed." The result might have been a serious loss. In the hands of moderately capable men it would probably have been a slender gain, to set against immense anxieties.

The Representative Body.

But the men who came forward, at the call of the Church of Ireland, to direct her finances, were much more than moderately capable; and it is to their priceless services, given without price, that the remarkable success of this great operation must be ascribed. The very first financial authorities in Ireland—great calculators from the University, great bankers and lawyers from Dublin, great manufacturers and men of business from Belfast, Drogheda, and Cork; Orangemen and Home Rulers, and persons of every intermediate shade in politics—consulted anxiously upon every question that arose. The greatest of English railway boards and chambers of commerce could not match the trained financial intelligence of the forty-eight elected and co-opted members of the Representative Body of the Church of Ireland.

Safety of their operations.

About two years ago, some rash correspondence in the *Guardian* excited alarm about their investments, which the General Synod resolved to put at rest by appointing an independent committee to investigate the matter. It was then shown, indeed, that the whole truth had not been made public, for their securities had been rising in value so greatly as to make a difference in their favour of many thousands of pounds, for which no credit had been taken, because it was thought undesirable that their balances should rise and fall with the Stocks list. But there was not a solitary investment to which the most cautious banker could object.

The profit of commutation.

The gratuitous services of these gentlemen not only saved us a great part of the percentage allowed us for expenses, but gained a very important profit on our investments. We have seen that if our money were invested at three-and-a-half *per cent.*, it should last exactly as long as the calculated life of the last annuitant. Any higher percentage, therefore, would remain as profit. Nor should the State grudge us any such advantage, since it procured the money at a quarter *per cent.* less than it charged us; gaining, as would appear, about nineteen thousand pounds by the difference. Our gain was greater.

Landowners paid off their creditors, and took more than three millions of our money at four-and-a-quarter *per cent.* We hold

nearly three millions of British railway debenture and preference stock, and our investments, taking one with another, bear interest at the rate of £4 8*s.* 6*d. per cent.*[1] It is very plain that we owe this profit, not to the nation, but to the able labours of our laity and the enterprise of our commuting clergy.

"Time is money."

One only gift we received from the nation, and it has proved highly valuable. That boon was Time. If all our parishes had been simultaneously cut adrift as the chimes rang for the new year 1871, perhaps it would have gone hard with us. But when the right of the existing clergy to receive their incomes for life was recognized, their obligation to do duty for life, as a condition, was not forgotten. They continue to be so bound, although a grievous hardship is thus inflicted upon many junior clergymen, who must work as hard all their days now, for their present pittance, as when all the prizes of an Established Church were theirs in reversion. Their stipends, indeed, are not snatched from them. But if a medical man, an officer, or a barrister, were forced to continue practising all his days, with only the same remuneration for his matured intelligence which he received during his novitiate, that would not be deemed a sufficient compensation. And a clergyman is worse off, because he cannot renounce his profession, and seek a new career. The position of a curate, or minor incumbent, who does not find favour under the new system of patronage, is indeed a pitiable one, and it was hoped until very lately that some redress might have been granted by Parliament, which inflicted the injury. For the parishes, however, this arrangement was a good one, since they were practically disendowed only when they lost the clergyman who held office in 1870. And he could only vacate it by death, or with the consent of the Representative Body, which is readily given in cases of promotion.

Composition.

But some clergymen were restless; some were hopeless of the future; some had prospects elsewhere. With these the Church makes the bargain known as composition, which releases them from all obligation to serve, with a certain portion of the money which would otherwise have paid their salaries. An aged clergyman takes with him all but a small proportion, because he would in no case have rendered a long term of service; a young clergyman leaves more behind, because he is purchasing release from protracted duty; but what the

[1] It has been shown that, out of the seven millions, less than three remain; and it may reasonably be objected that we have still more than six millions invested. The balance consists chiefly of private endowments and the hoardings of the Diocesan Schemes, which will presently be explained.

Church retains in either case is counterweighted by the duty of at once paying a successor; and the true gain by composition is not money, but a prompter amalgamation of parishes, a consequent economy of labour, and relief from the reluctant ministrations of men whose hearts were elsewhere.

Hitherto we have been concerned with the successful financial operations of the Representative Body. But meanwhile the Church had not been idle, nor seeking a re-endowment without cost, from the ingenuity of her trustees. The diocesan schemes. It was urged upon the parishes that the lifetime of their annuitant incumbents was a respite, during which they were bound to store up something for the future. Means were suggested by which certainty could be given to their arrangements; for although no parish could say whether its breathing-space would last one day or twenty years, yet if the Churchmen of each diocese would pay into a common fund, the chances might be equalized as in an insurance office, and a larger stipend secured in perpetuity than it would otherwise be possible to reckon upon. Taking one diocese with another, an immediate payment of one hundred a year continued for ever secures a stipend of one hundred and seventy-two pounds from the time the new arrangement begins to operate. And this payment will ultimately be increased from those profits of commutation which have just been explained.

To this proposal a vigorous response was made. It was agreed to reduce the number of parishes from 1,542 to 1,227, and 1,070 banded themselves into "diocesan schemes"—for so these mutual guarantee societies are called. It is a striking fact that, of the salaries thus contracted for, sixty-eight *per cent.* are already being drawn.

Some of the remaining parishes have been re-endowed by private liberality, and some from the half million already mentioned. A few have chosen to insure their incumbents' lives rather than to join a scheme; and it must be owned that some have subscribed for so paltry an amount, and others are so extensive in area, and so undermanned, as to be a source of the gravest anxiety; while there remains a *residuum* of about a hundred pauper parishes, which must either go down utterly or be sustained by the generosity of others. The great bulk of the parishes, however, have risen manfully to meet the crisis. During the last four years (including the year of distress, which some call famine) an average of more than £116,000 *per annum* has been paid to the representative body for these schemes, and for other purposes seventy thousand pounds a year besides.[1]

[1] In the diocese of Tuam, stricken at once by persecution and by the nearest approach to famine which has afflicted any part of Ireland, the

During the last ten years of disestablishment, the Representative Body alone has received, as the free-will offering of Irish Churchmen, two millions one hundred thousand pounds.

It is true that revenues derived from voluntary sources must always be precarious, and to some extent will always actually fluctuate. We are not blind to this evil, but it was not of our seeking, and the hoardings of each diocesan scheme are at least a mitigation of its worst effects. It is something, however, that our parishes have pledged themselves to secure, through these schemes, a future stipend of £234,682, while our private endowments amount to about £31,500, and a return has been printed of "other sources" of income, amounting to £27,350, making a total of £293,532. This will leave a comfortable margin, after providing an average income of £210 for 1,227 incumbents, and £120 for 211 curates.

The task is more than half accomplished of providing a permanent endowment for our bishops, larger than any unendowed church of our communion has attempted, and quite equal to that of the new English sees. And some steps have been taken towards the creation of a few prize-parishes.

But this is only a portion, and probably the smaller portion, of what has been accomplished during these ten years. In Dublin, every stranger visits a magnificent cathedral and synod hall, of which the former has been restored and the latter built by a single noble-hearted Churchman, at a cost of not less than £180,000. The city of Cork is crowned by the triple spires of another new cathedral, for which £100,000 were subscribed by the Churchmen of that diocese. In Tuam a minor cathedral has been consecrated, and in Kildare, Waterford, and elsewhere, cathedrals have either been restored or are now in the hands of skilful architects. It must not be denied that in some rural districts the due maintenance of the fabric of churches will soon become a grave difficulty. But everywhere, except in the remotest and poorest spots, the parishioners have taken a new interest in the sacred structure since their responsibilities were so rudely brought home to them. In forgotten by-places of Dublin, large sums have been spent upon the oldest and gloomiest churches. In the city of Cork, not less than £24,000 have been collected for rebuildings and improvements. In Belfast and its immediate vicinity, the process has not been checked for a moment, which was already going forward, of providing for the enormous increase of population by a systematic work of church-building and endowment.

Other outlay.

---

receipts of the year ending with last December are greater than those of the previous year by £647: other dioceses have also shown a substantial increase.

It is impossible to divide the money which was already given or promised from that which has been raised since 1870, but it is certain that no part of Ireland has ever witnessed so vigorous and successful an attempt to deal with the lapsed masses. The Church accommodation has been far more than doubled; a greater permanent endowment has been created than was swept away; of the older churches scarcely any remain unrenovated, and a good number of handsome glebe-houses have been either built or purchased. It would not be impossible to thread one's way from Belfast to Dublin through a succession of parishes, in every one of which the same work has gone forward; while the southern province has not been at all behind.

The total outlay upon such work cannot be ascertained, but every one who has watched the process knows that the aggregate would be startling. Church officers are maintained just as usual (except the obsolete parish clerk), and Church music has certainly made some sadly-needed progress.

A great number of new glebes have been built, under the Glebes Loans' Act and otherwise.

By our thirty-six Diocesan or County Orphan Societies, we maintain 2,990 orphans, most of them comfortably boarded in respectable families of their own class, and this, at the modest average of £10 per head, represents in the decade a sum of £299,000. For the evangelization of Ireland (chiefly through the Irish Church Missions and the Irish Society, with their schools, and the Scripture Readers' Society), we have given about £130,000. To the two leading missionary societies we have subscribed £87,500, besides helping the South American, the Spanish and Mexican, the Colonial and Continental, and many other societies. Upon the maintenance of religious education in the primary schools we have spent, at the lowest computation, £25,000.

It is impossible to say how much in our altered circumstances has been given from the offertories to the local poor: in the parish which the writer knows best it has been more than £2,000; and although this is an exceptional figure, the aggregate of the country would doubtless show a very great sum of money.

Taking these figures into account, remembering that the Representative Body's accounts do not include nearly all those large benefactions by which the private endowments above-mentioned have been created, and that very little passes through its hands of the £27,000 *per annum* derived from "other sources," and glancing at the Christian Knowledge Association, the Jews' Society, the Bible Society, and about seventy others to which we contribute more or less, it may be asserted with the utmost confidence that the estimate, made with some authority, of

another two millions sterling, besides the two millions paid to the Representative Body, is very much within bounds. And it thus appears that during the period which we are accused of having wasted in fruitless wrangling four millions of money have passed through the hands of our Church, for the cause of religion and of charity, without reckoning the immense time and skilled labour given to her, at great personal cost, by the ablest of her sons.

Now let it be considered that our ranks include all the poorest Protestants of Ireland, that the raising of money is a new art among us, that we have passed through a long period of severe privation, in which no class of the community has suffered more than the landlords, to whom we naturally look for help in supporting the Church upon their own estates, and it will appear that four millions of money, given by six hundred and eighty thousand men, women, and children, who are neither driven (like the Romanist) by dread of purgatory, nor (like some others among us) by the threat of excommunication if "the stipend" be unpaid, is a free-will offering of which we need not be ashamed.

Beyond doubt there are dark shadows upon the picture; but it is highly unjust to fix the attention upon these without observing, first of all, the gallant effort which Irish Churchmen have made for the maintenance of the faith among them.

G. A. CHADWICK.

ART. II.—THE RULE OF FAITH.

IT has been subject of remark by one of our Bishops,[1] when alluding to the question of the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders,[1] that there exists no work, from an English pen, on systematic dogmatical theology, which could be recommended as an introduction to that study. The criticism is just. Our theology is singularly deficient in that particular branch, copious and valuable as it is in others. We possess excellent treatises on isolated topics, but hardly any work corresponding to those of the great foreign theologians, whether Romish or Protestant, which professes to occupy the whole field, and give a connected view of the subject. It is obvious that mere commentaries on the Thirty-Nine Articles, of which we have several of varying value, by no means meet the want. No attempt is made in them to *group* the Articles under the heads to which they belong; which, since several of them really present but different sides of the same subject, is the first step towards gaining a clear view of the system which forms their basis. Hence

[1] Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Charge, 1867.

translations of such works as those of Martensen and Van Oosterzee have been largely used by our students; and no doubt with profit. But, independently of some graver defects, a translation seldom succeeds in conveying the sense of the original; and, moreover, the original itself is commonly too racy of the soil whence it sprang to fall in readily with English habits of thought and expression. Prolixity repels many readers, though this fault cannot be laid to the charge of Martensen's able work. On the whole, there seems room for an attempt in this direction, even if it should not succeed in supplying the particular want above alluded to. Manuals for candidates belong rather to the class of compilations than of treatises; and are likely to be the more useful in proportion as they exhibit no distinctive views. But dogmatic theology has a higher aim, though it may fail to attain it. As a specimen of this branch of study it is proposed, in some consecutive numbers of this magazine, to furnish a few Papers on one important topic, the Rule of Faith, as held by the Protestant churches—that is, as stated in their public confessions of faith, and maintained by their great divines with a tolerably uniform tradition of teaching.

To obviate misunderstanding, a few remarks must be premised on the position which the writer assumes. The true idea of dogmatic theology is to be an exhibition of the faith which either the Catholic Church holds as against unbelievers and heretical sects, or which particular churches, such as the Anglican, profess as against other Christian churches, with which, unfortunately, they cannot agree. It is identical neither with the department of Christian evidences nor with Biblical theology, which aims at reproducing the Christian faith as it was expressed by the inspired writers before controversy arose on certain points: its purpose is to expound the system of belief which is actually professed by the Church universal, or a particular church, as the case may be; to translate into language, with the necessary explanations, what is often held as a sentiment rather than a dogma, in solution as it were, by the Christian community to which the writer belongs. But here a difficulty at once occurs. How is the peculiar aspect of the Christian faith, which, in each church, is the foundation of its distinctive dogmatic theology, to be ascertained? Most churches, especially if national, such as the Anglican, exhibit such a variety of teaching, whether in the pulpit or by the press, that it may seem a hopeless task to attempt to mould it into a consistent whole. The same may be said of the Protestant foreign churches, and even, to some extent, of the Church of Rome. And, indeed, it would be impossible to obtain from this source any basis of a definite dogmatical structure. We must, therefore, look beyond the surface, and

endeavour to discover wherein, notwithstanding the eccentricities of individuals, the substance and core of the doctrinal teaching of each church are to be found; what it is that imparts a definite character and historical continuity to each church. And this can be nothing but its authorized confessions of faith, supposed to be assented to, if not by all the members of the communion, by those in it who exercise the function of public teaching. As long as these confessions are not repudiated or altered by the society in its corporate capacity, they must be taken to decide what is the position which, in the controversies which agitate Christendom, that particular church occupies. And this, although from time to time individual teachers, or a considerable body of them, may, in the opinion of impartial judges, maintain sentiments inconsistent with such confessions.

The dogmatic theology, therefore, of the Anglican Church must, like that of any other, be sought in its authorized public symbols, and primarily in nothing else; but here, in our communion at least, a fresh difficulty arises. Is it possible from her formularies, taken as a whole, to construct a scientific theology "of the Church of England?" The question thus stated hardly admits of a direct answer. It may in fact be doubted whether, *as a whole*, the formularies of the Anglican Church are susceptible of such treatment. They are derived not only from different sources, but from different modes of Christian thought and sentiment: as indeed might be expected when mediæval forms are found side by side with doctrinal expositions identical with, if not actually founded upon, the confessions of faith of the foreign Protestant churches. The theology "of the Church of England," taken as a whole, must be confessed to be of the composite order; in which symmetry of system was sacrificed, probably designedly, to the practical aims of the compilers. Some may think this a defect, others admire in it the wisdom which so framed the symbols of a great National Church that, within certain limits, different schools of religious thought may find in them what suits their taste. There is much to be said in favour of this latter view as long as it is a question of practical unity and brotherly recognition. It is possible for those who differ seriously on certain points of doctrine, while agreeing on fundamentals, to be equally loyal members or ministers of our Church; forbearing one another in love, and conceding each party to the other a liberty which it claims for itself. With men of high religious sentiment doctrinal differences are often found happily merged in a common aim to promote the cause of practical piety at home and abroad.

It seems otherwise when we come to treat theology as a system. Heterogeneous elements which, in the practice of a holy life, may coexist without jarring, are apt to make them-

selves felt when religion becomes, as it does in dogmatical theology, an object of the speculative faculty; when the connection of doctrines and their legitimate consequences come to be examined and traced out. A defect of substantial unity on certain leading points soon makes itself felt; compromises are sought for which generally prove unsatisfactory; at some point or other the inquirer finds himself in presence of a difficulty which will not allow itself to be set aside, or passed by; and then he is tempted to take refuge in unreal distinctions, and a mere semblance of consistency. It may illustrate what is meant if we refer briefly to the history of what has been called the *via media* theology. Many years ago a body of men in one of our Universities, eminent for learning and ability, proposed to themselves to construct a system which should neither be Romish nor Protestant; suitable, as it was argued, to the position of our Church, Reformed and yet Catholic, protesting against Rome, and yet, as distinguished from foreign Protestant churches, retaining the ancient polity, and, as far as possible, the ancient devotional forms. It was hoped that an Anglican theology, holding a middle position between the two extremes, might issue from their united labours. A leading principle, of course, was to insist neither on the Thirty-Nine Articles alone, nor on the Liturgy alone, but to let each speak for itself;[1] a true and valuable principle if it had *been only a question of Church comprehension;* but more difficult of application, as the event proved, when the problem was to frame a consistent system of theology. In short, the attempt proved a failure. The *via media,* instead of hitting on the happy medium, was constantly oscillating between the rival claimants; recoiling from each in succession accordingly as premises were argued out to their legitimate conclusions, but never finding rest for the sole of its foot. As time went on, the hollowness of the system became more and more apparent, and it was seen how difficult it is to weld the Anglican formularies, taken collectively and in their plain literal meaning, into a consistent whole; and the desperate expedient had at length to be resorted to of sacrificing the undoubted sense of the Thirty-Nine Articles to the exigencies of the situation. With this attempt the whole system exploded. It did not deserve a better fate. It was, in every sense of the word, an *insular* production; and not untinged with arrogance. It aimed at exhibiting the English Church as the one body in Christendom that had preserved the

[1] "In giving the Articles a Catholic interpretation, we bring them into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer, an object of the most serious moment to those who have given their assent to both formularies."—Tract 90, Conclusion.

Apostolic deposit in its primitive exactness: to which, therefore all other churches were to gravitate as a common centre of unity: Canterbury was to take the place of mediæval Rome. The vision dissolved the moment logical tests came to be applied. The golden mean, in its actual application, was found to involve difficulties as great as either extreme. To take one instance—the question of the interpretation of Scripture. The Romish doctrine of an infallible living expositor, in the person of the Pope, has the merit of simplicity, is quite intelligible, and, *if only the fact could be proved*, removes numberless perplexities; equally satisfactory in its way, when properly understood, is the genuine Protestant doctrine of the right and duty of private judgment. The *via media* adopted neither the one nor the other in its integrity. It admitted in some sense the right of private judgment; it denied the infallibility of the Pope; but its right of private judgment was accompanied with the proviso that the interpretations should always be in accordance with "the voice of Catholic antiquity."[1] How, or where, the voice of Catholic antiquity, ruling disputed points of interpretation, was to be ascertained, could never be satisfactorily explained. In point of fact, can there be a *via media* between truth and error? Can truth be truth if shorn of its proportions, or error become less innocuous by losing its grossness? There may be, and probably always is, in *individual minds* a mixture of truth and error, which is nothing but saying that the most sincere inquirer is yet fallible: such a juxtaposition, if not harmless, may and must be tolerated. It is different when a *system* of theological eclecticism is put forward as an ideal; like its predecessor in the schools of philosophy, it can only issue in an emasculated bantling, which, after a short period of sickly existence, deservedly sinks into oblivion. The great writer, then in Anglican orders, who was the intellectual leader of the movement, has left on record how the *via media* broke down in his hands as a dogmatical edifice. "By the great words of St. Augustine (*securus judicat orbis terrarum*), the theory of the *via media* was absolutely pulverized" ("Apologia" of Cardinal Newman, p. 212). "My new historical fact had to a certain point a logical force. Down had come the *via media* as a definite theory or scheme under the blows of St. Leo" (*ibid.*,

[1] On the subject of our proposed Papers, the issue of an examination of Arts VI. and XX. was, that "Not a word is said, on the one hand, in *favour* of Scripture having no rule or method to fix interpretation by" (in other words, in favour of the sufficiency of Scripture to interpret itself), "or, as it is commonly expressed, being the *sole rule of faith*; nor, on the other, of the private judgment of the individual being the ultimate standard of interpretation" (in other words, whether an infallible *judge* is necessary or not to make an interpretation valid).—Tract 90, § 1.

p. 216). "The *via media* was an impossible idea; it was what I had called standing on one leg; and it was necessary, if my old issue of the controversy was to be retained, to go further one way or the other" (*ibid.*, p. 260). "The *via media* had disappeared for ever, and a new theory, made expressly for the occasion, took its place" (*ibid.*, p. 269). So it must ever be, if the controversy falls into the hands of consecutive thinkers.

There are, in fact, only two systems of theology coherent in themselves and capable of scientific exposition, the Romish and the Protestant; these words being used not to designate the popular forms of creed as they practically exist, but the principles of the respective systems as they are found stated in the symbolical books and elaborated in the works of the chief doctrinal writers on either side since the Reformation, a Bellarmin and a Möhleron on the one, a Chemnitz, a J. Gerhard, a Quenstedt, on the other; worthy successors, all of them, of the great scholastic divines of the Middle Ages. A writer, therefore, on dogmatic theology, who wishes to produce anything of real value, must make his choice between these two; stating each fairly, but not attempting to fuse them into a *tertium quid*. This does not imply that within the main lines of each system subordinate differences of opinion may not exist; a Protestant church would not be what it professes to be if it discountenanced all such; and even in the Romish communion a considerable latitude of private opinion is allowed. But an attempt to combine the fundamental *principles* of the two systems can hardly succeed.

In our Church, one formulary, at any rate, furnishes the requisite consistency of structure—viz., the Thirty-Nine Articles. No one who compares them with the confessions of the Reformed churches abroad can for a moment be in doubt as to their parentage. Like these confessions, they are Catholic as regards the great doctrines contained in the three Creeds, and Protestant as against Rome; and of the two families of foreign confessions they lean rather to the Reformed than to the Lutheran type. On the Thirty-Nine Articles, at any rate, as a basis, a body of genuine Protestant doctrine may be constructed. On these, therefore, the present writer takes his stand; and of course on any other formularies of our Church so far as they point to the same parentage: but he advances no claim to represent "the theology of the Church of England," even if such a thing exists. This might be possible were the assumption sometimes made well founded, that the Articles, not the Liturgical services, express dogma; though this may be true in a qualified sense it cannot be maintained absolutely. On the subject of Church comprehension we have no more right to insist upon the one than upon the other. A writer who is convinced of the truth of Protestantism as against Romanism has a right to avail himself of

the principal dogmatical symbol of our Church, under a belief that it expresses his opinions; but hardly so to abridge the liberty of others who, in other formularies of the same church, may profess to find what better suits their spiritual taste. In short, the further we remove ourselves from the invidious question, What constitutes a loyal member or minister of our Church? to the open ground of scientific controversy, the better for the interests of truth, though the more difficult for zealots on either side. For nothing is easier than mutual recriminations of this kind, while a properly conducted controversial discussion is the fruit of research and patient thought. There are limits, of course, to this mutual toleration, and there is no more difficult problem than to draw the line between what is compatible and what is not with honest subscription to the formularies of our Church. Happily the present writer, as will be seen, is in no way called upon to entertain this problem. His aim is nothing but to expound *genuine* Protestantism on the basis of that particular Anglican formulary which is called the Thirty-Nine Articles.

As regards the particular subject of the following Papers (and the same may be said of some others) there is the less need of the disclaimer just mentioned, inasmuch, as on the question of the Rule of Faith, the Articles (those that are concerned with it are the Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Twentieth, and Twenty-first) are in complete accordance with the other symbolical statements of our Church; on this point, at any rate, she is unmistakably Protestant, and speaks with no uncertain voice. And a church which is Protestant on the Rule of Faith possesses in herself, by virtue of that one decisive principle, both the right and the means of further reformation, should a deeper knowledge of Scripture, or the lessons of experience, suggest such a step; an inestimable advantage which none but a Protestant church can enjoy, and which the Romish Church, in her rejection of Scripture as the sole Rule of Faith, has precluded herself from sharing.

E. A. Litton.

Art. III.—MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE RÉMUSAT.

Mémoires de Madame de Rémusat, 1802-1808. Trois tomes. Paris. 1880.

THESE memoirs, the third volume of which, though untranslated, has now appeared, throw a light upon the character and Court life of the First Empire, which leaves little to be divulged or imagined. Madame de Rémusat was one of the ladies-in-waiting to the consort of the great Napoleon, and thus had ample opportunities for the exercise of her observant

powers. The central figure at the Court, whether as First Consul or afterwards as Emperor, absorbed all her attention. Napoleon is the one man which this keen lady-in-waiting is never wearied of examining, criticizing, and sounding. She has eyes for little else; she is incessantly watching his conduct, listening to his remarks, and weighing him in the balance. What Hamlet is to Shakspeare's play so the first Emperor is to these memoirs—remove him and the centre of interest vanishes. In the pages of Madame de Rémusat we have Napoleon brought before us as vividly as is Louis XIV. in the chapters of St. Simon; as is Charles II. in the diaries of Pepys and Reresby; as is George II. in the works of Hervey and Horace Walpole, and as is George III. in the letters of Madame d'Arblay.

Within the limits of a review it is impossible to do aught but briefly sketch the nature of the remarks which our authoress in these goodly volumes brings before us. Those who wish to become more accurately acquainted with their contents must peruse them for themselves. Napoleon Buonaparte was First Consul when Madame de Rémusat was appointed lady-in-waiting to the unfortunate Josephine. The young woman soon attached herself to her mistress, and from constantly seeing the husband was enabled to form an estimate of his character worthy of Balzac or Bruyère. Womanlike, she takes stock first of the externals of Napoleon. Short, ill-made, the upper part of his body being too long in proportion to his legs, the despot owed his beauty to his face not to his figure. His forehead, the setting of his eye, the shape of his nose, were all exceedingly handsome, and reminded one of an antique medallion; his mouth was thin-lipped, but owned a pleasant smile; his chin was short, and the jaw heavy and square. He was as proud as Cardinal Mazarin of his hands and feet, which were small and aristocratically moulded. So far for the physical, now for the moral. Although remarkable for certain intellectual qualities, no man was less lofty of soul than Napoleon. In him there was no true greatness, no generosity; he always regarded every indication of good feeling with suspicion and openly scorned sincerity; nor did he hesitate to say that the superior man was he who practised with more or less dexterity the art of lying. "Metternich," he said one day, "approaches to being a statesman—he lies very well." On another occasion he avowed that if it would be useful to him he would commit even a cowardly act. "In reality," he sneered, "there is nothing really noble or base in this world. Frankly, I am base, essentially base. I give you my word that I should feel no repugnance to commit what would be called by the world a dishonourable action; my secret tendencies, which are, after all, those of nature, apart from certain affectations of greatness which I have to assume, give me infinite resources

with which to baffle every one." Like most men whose moral qualities are defective he detested the society of ladies. He both despised and had a contempt for women; he regarded their weakness as an unanswerable proof of their inferiority, and the power they had acquired in society as an intolerable usurpation. Hence Buonaparte was under restraint in the society of ladies, and as every kind of restraint put him out of humour he was awkward in their presence and never knew how to talk to them. Vain in most things he was not vain in dress. Whilst his colleagues were adorning themselves in lace, ruffles and gorgeous coats, Buonaparte contented himself with his simple uniform, breeches, silk stockings and boots. When he became Emperor he developed into somewhat more of a dandy, wearing a richly-laced coat, with a short cloak and plumed hat, and a magnificent collar of the Order of the Legion of Honour in diamonds. But he was indifferent to such adornment except that it might impose upon the vulgar. He was eaten up by one ambition—self-advancement; wherever he was, he said, he wanted to be in front. Outside the region of military matters and mathematics he was uneducated; he did not care for music, or letters, or science, unless connected with geometry or engineering. With the instincts of the true despot, Napoleon, as he rapidly developed in power, determined to carve out a line for himself and to be indebted to no one for assistance. "Talleyrand," said he, when he was raised to the throne, "wanted me to make myself King—that is *the* word of his dictionary; but I will have no *grands seigneurs* except those I make myself. Besides which the title of king is worn out; certain preconceived ideas are attached to it; it would make me a kind of heir and I will be the heir of no one. The title that I bear is a grander one, it is still somewhat vague and leaves room for the imagination." He surrounded himself by a new Court, with a new aristocracy that made the Faubourg St. Germain shudder, and new marshals, but all moved on the principles of the old etiquette. It was the Court of a *parvenu* affecting the airs and graces of an ancient and established dynasty. Madame de Rémusat gives us an amusing account of the jealousies that ensued in the family circle of the Buonapartes, on Napoleon having installed himself as Emperor. The brothers of the Emperor were styled princes, and consequently their wives were also called princesses. The sisters of Napoleon, Madame Bacciocchi and Madame Murat were not ennobled; *hinc illæ lachrymæ*. These ladies were thunderstruck at the distinction of rank between them and their sisters-in-law. They could scarcely conceal their ill-humour before the world, but sulked, snubbed the Court dames right and left and were very sarcastic. As for Madame Murat, who was younger than her

sister, she appeared to be in the depths of despair, and could scarcely keep back her tears when she heard her brother address the princesses by the titles he had conferred upon them. Frequent were the storms that broke out between the Emperor and his two sisters upon this point; they assailed him with tears, complaints, and reproaches. "Why," they asked, "are we to be condemned to obscurity and contempt when strangers are covered with honours and dignities?" Napoleon, however, declined to be softened into a more generous mood; he was able to distribute dignities according to his will, and he would have no interference. "In truth, ladies," said he, after one of these stormy requests, "to see your airs one would imagine that we hold the crown from the hands of the late King, our father." At this sarcastic answer we hear that Madame Murat fell on the floor and fainted away.

Another and a more important object of the jealousies of the Buonapartes was now to be attacked. Since the Emperor had attained to power the whole of his family made a dead set against Josephine. She was childless, a *parvenu* compared with the throne, and not wealthy. It was necessary for a man like Napoleon to consolidate his position by an illustrious alliance which should command the homage of Europe. He knew—none better—how to tickle the vanity of Frenchmen with stars and crosses and frothy speeches, to represent them as the bravest of the brave and the head of civilization; but the proud Courts of the Continent, though they feared him, yet sneered at him as a usurper, a Corsican, and the soldier of fortune. The brothers and sisters of the Emperor were ever harping to him upon his barren consort, and the necessity that now arose for him to seek the hand of the daughter of some monarch of long descent. At times their poisonous advice half succeeded making him, as he said, "wretched, oh! so wretched," and creating the most terrible agony in the mind of her who was his wife. Shortly after the Emperor's usurpation of the throne—"he saw the crown of France," he said, "on the floor and he picked it up on the point of his sword"—the question of the coronation was discussed. From the first the Buonapartes were most anxious that Josephine should be excluded from the ceremony. The sisters were jealous of the Empress, whilst the brothers deemed it more politic that she should remain only as a spectator of the ceremony. For a time it appeared as if Napoleon was about to give way to the intrigues of his family, when he accidentally heard that his brothers had boasted that they had complete authority over him. To a man of the Emperor's arrogance and love of command this accusation was sufficient; he told the Empress that the Pope was coming, that he would crown them both, and that she might now begin to occupy herself with the preparations for the cere-

mony. She was crowned by Pius the Seventh, but her amiable sisters-in-law did their best to revenge themselves upon her by holding her train so that she could scarcely move her limbs. Napoleon crammed the crown down upon his brow as if, now that he had gained it, nothing should part him from it.

The life of the Emperor was one of such intense military activity that he knew not what leisure was. It has been stated that out of a reign of ten years Napoleon spent only 955 days in Paris. Holiday and relaxation were strangers to him, and on the few occasions when he indulged in pleasures his great delight was to imitate the *fourberies* of a lawyer's clerk. He was a bad whip, rode indifferently to hounds, and gave dinners which bored him—for his habits were abstemious and simple—but which he considered it like royalty to be careful about. Writing, dictating, reading, and issuing rapid and constant orders were his chief occupations when not at the head of his troops. He exacted from all the most implicit obedience, and conscious that he was deficient in those social charms which go to swell the name of gentleman, he preferred to be the autocrat of the *salon* and mistook brutality for power. "Kings," writes Madame de Rémusat, "are very apt to show their good or bad humour before every one; and Buonaparte, more king than any other ever was, scolded harshly, often when there was no occasion for it, and humiliated all who belonged to him, as he hectored them for some worthless trifle." But at this time—to serve an excuse for what Talleyrand called his 'wretched ill-bred' manners—the Emperor was worried both with himself and with the political condition of Europe. The idea of a divorce from Josephine now began to assume a definite shape. He felt more and more the necessity of having an heir to succeed to his dynasty. Madame de Rémusat gives an interesting account of a conversation that ensued between husband and wife upon this painful topic. One day he spoke to the Empress of the need that he might have to experience of finding a wife who could give him children. He was much moved, but added, "If such a thing were to happen, Josephine, then it would be for you to help me to such a sacrifice. I shall count on your friendship to save me from the odium of an enforced rupture. You would take the initiative, would you not, and, aware of my position, would have the courage to determine on your own withdrawal?" A strange request, truly, from a husband to a wife—to bid her come to his aid for his own culpably selfish ends, and help him to cast her forth into shame and degradation! It was not she who had sinned against her vow, as her base and vicious husband well knew. In the words of Katherine of Arragon, Josephine could have said:—

> "Have I lived thus long (let me speak myself,
> Since virtue finds no friends) a wife, a true one?

A woman (I dare say without vain-glory)
Never yet branded with suspicion?
Have I, with all my full affections
Still met the King? Loved him next Heaven? Obey'd him?
Been, out of fondness, superstitious to him?
Almost forgot my prayers to content him?
And am I thus rewarded?"

To the question of her husband's the Empress replied in that calm, grave tone which she often employed, and which was not without effect upon Napoleon. "Sire," she said, "you are the master and you will decide on my lot. When you order me to quit the Tuileries I will obey on the spot, but for that your positive order will be required. I am your wife. You have crowned me in the presence of the Pope; such honours deserve that one should not voluntarily lay them down. If you divorce me, all France shall know that it is you who drive me away, and she will be ignorant neither of my obedience nor of my profound grief." Though she had answered Napoleon calmly and with dignity, the blow was a terrible one. At times she wept bitterly, and at others sharply railed at his ingratitude. When she had married Buonaparte she now remembered that he had thought himself much honoured—he, a plain soldier, she the daughter of a Count, and the widow of a Vicomte—by the alliance; and now that he had risen to be one of the mightiest of the land, she who had been willing to share his bad fortune, was not to be permitted to enjoy his successes! It was cowardly, mean, and infamously selfish. Sometimes her imagination was so excited that she even expressed fears for her life. "I will never yield to him," she once cried; "I will certainly behave like his victim; but if I come to be too much in his way, who knows of what he may be capable, and if he will resist the need of getting rid of me?" The comments of her companion upon this charge are very grave. "When the Empress said such words as these," adds Madame de Rémusat, "I made a thousand efforts to calm her shattered imagination, which had, without doubt, carried her much too far. Whatever opinion I might have had on the facility with which Buonaparte lent himself to political necessities, I in nowise believed that he was capable of conceiving or of executing the black designs of which she then suspected him. But he had so acted on different occasions, and, above all, often so spoken, that a profound grief had a right, in its excitement, to conceive such a suspicion of him; and though I attest solemnly that in my utmost conscience I do not think that his thoughts ever recurred to such a method of getting out of his difficulty, nevertheless my answer to the dreadful anxieties of the Empress could not be more than this. Madame, be sure that he is not capable of going so far." From the man who had

murdered, on a trumped-up charge, the young Duc d'Enghien, all crimes were possible.

The intrigues for the Crown of Spain and the hostility of England for a moment laid aside all domestic questions. Napoleon had his hand full and could not busy himself with details which were, compared with his political ambition, purely secondary. With this agitation the third volume of these Memoirs ends; the period embraced by them is so important, the authoress is so keen an observer of all that surrounds her, and she is so felicitous a writer, that her work is among the most interesting of all that have served to elucidate the history of the First Empire. No man is a hero to his *valet-de-chambre*, and we suppose no monarch is a hero to the *dame du Palais* of his consort. Madame de Rémusat does, certainly, not spare Napoleon, nor for the matter of that, his family. By the light of her pages we see the Emperor rude, coarse, unfaithful, fond of a brutal display of authority. Shy, yet offensive in woman's society; unscrupulous; a great man, so far as the intellectual gifts are counted, but unredeemably bad so far as his moral qualities are concerned. "It must be said of him," remarks our authoress, "because it is true that there is in Buonaparte a certain innate wickedness of nature which has a particular taste for evil, and that shows itself in him in great things as well as in smaller matters." He whipped his little boy before Talma, the actor, because, he said, it amused him to "spank" a future king. At the Court balls his delight was to wander about the rooms and make remarks to such ladies as he was not shy of, that would make them blush. He often cruelly ill-treated his wife. One of his favourite tricks was to inform some unfortunate husband, who dared not reply, that his name was being dishonoured by the conduct of his wife. Truth he openly admitted should be disregarded by all who wish to succeed in the world. Religion, honour, good faith were not in his vocabulary. Yet such was the man who, during the first years of this century, was the tyrant of Europe; who made and deposed kings; who kept every country in a state of anxiety, and whose ambition, if it had not been, under the Divine blessing, for the stern opposition of England, would not have been satisfied until the world was at his feet.

Art. IV.—LOCAL OPTION AND LOCAL CONTROL.

TO any one unacquainted with the Temperance question the phrases "local option" and "local control" convey of themselves no definite ideas. As to what is to be controlled, and in reference to what option may be exercised, the terms

afford no light. To the initiated, however, the words imply a principle which, it is confidently believed, must underlie the satisfactory settlement of any licensing reform in the administration of those laws which have to do with the sale of intoxicating liquors. As in reading the geological records of past ages men find all practical questions affecting strata associated with the boulders which are embedded in their midst, so those who in future years, searching our temperance literature, shall rightly understand these phrases, will have an adequate perception of the temperance problems by which they are surrounded.

So far as it can be traced, the phrase "local option" was first employed by Mr. Gladstone in reference to the licensing question more than ten years ago, when, in a letter on the subject, he remarked that, so far as it could satisfactorily be arranged, he was disposed to "let in local option." The other phrase, "local control," is frequently found in pamphlets of seven and eight years ago, and was brought into currency by those who spoke and wrote on the Gothenburg system of licensing, of which local control is the distinctive feature.

The principle implied by both phrases, broadly stated, is this, that those persons for whose local convenience public-houses in any locality are assumed to be established, shall directly have a voice as to their existence—their numbers and regulation. It has been argued that the phrases are equivalent, and, among others, by Sir Wilfrid Lawson in the House of Commons on the 18th of June last. "Some people," said he, "prefer the word control to option. Well, I don't see much difference between the two words. If you are able to control a horse, you are able to stop him altogether. If you cannot stop him, he is not under control. My object is to give the power of stopping an evil altogether where they wish to do so." The sentence of the witty baronet contains a fallacy. Local option, strictly, has reference to the question *whether it is lawful to have the horse under any circumstances.* Local control assumes the lawfulness, but insists that *those who keep the horse shall have power to ride it,* to control its pace and general movements. If we consult the speeches of those who respectively use the terms, we find that "local option" is the favoured phrase of those who desire the *extermination* of the traffic; "local control" the formula of those who desire its *due regulation.* Those who believe that it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic which wastes the national resources, corrupts the social habits, and destroys the lives of our people, must seek that the local community should have the power to suppress its existence; and "local option" will be the phrase which fitly expresses their end and aim. Those, on the other hand, who, recognizing the perfect lawfulness of intoxicants as beverages

and as articles of traffic, but equally recognizing the misery which accompanies their excessive use, seek to restrain undue facilities for their consumption, and to allow the people of any locality the power to regulate the number and character of the houses where they are dispensed, will claim "local control" as their special formula.

As, then, the phrases "option" and "control" must not be regarded as equivalents,[1] it is in the word "local" that we must look for the principle which commends itself to the enthusiastic support of all who respectively employ the terms—viz., the principle that the ratepayers of any district shall have a direct say, "yea" or "nay," in the existence of that traffic which more than all other social causes influences the social and moral well-being of that district.

I. Before directing attention to the prospects of the ultimate triumph of this principle and to the position which the Church of England occupies in reference to its adoption, I will ask attention to certain facts which may profitably be considered by those who wish to arrive at a decision on this question.

(*a*) There are 1,000 parishes in the province of Canterbury in which there is neither public-house nor beer-shop, almost in every case because the rights of property allow the great landowners the exercise of "local option;" that is, of determining whether such houses shall exist on their estates. The evidence given before the Committee on Intemperance of the Southern Convocation testifies that in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as all the friends of temperance would anticipate.

(*b*) There are districts in Liverpool where no public-houses

[1] When crossing to Holland a few years ago on my way to Sweden, to study the experiment of "local control," I was curiously reminded of the magical effects a mere change of word can produce. The night was delightfully calm, the ship crowded and overflowing the cabins, the floor of the saloon was strewn with prostrate forms of those who, however vainly, sought sleep. Through the long hours of early night, in an adjoining berth, in the ears of a callous, unheeding mother a little child persistently cried "Ma-ma, ma-ma!" With all the metallic sound and mechanical regularity of one of the automaton toy babies constructed to traverse our floors and emit the familiar sound, the child cried on. Irritated beyond endurance, the passengers freely expressed opinions about the mother, whilst others called for the steward. All in vain, until from the end of the ship, and out of the darkness, suddenly from the lips of a foreigner came the advice, "*Little 'oon, try pa-pa, pa-pa.*" Like a peal of thunder rolled forth the roar of laughter from the floor and sides of the ship; then came stillness over the scene, for the "little 'oon" was convinced, and gratefully slept, the passengers—many, I doubt not, in dreams—blessing the unknown "pa-pa." After all, "tweedledum" is not "tweedledee," and "local control" may succeed where "local option" fails.

can be found. The Corporation, in the land over which it has absolute control, prohibits in its leases any such houses; whilst in the south part of Liverpool, through the action of Lord Sefton and Mr. John Roberts, a district has been covered with houses in which there live some 30,000 people, among whom not a drop of alcohol can be bought or sold. As a business speculation it is found a profitable investment of capital to exclude such houses from the neighbourhood of workmen's dwellings, inasmuch as the artizans themselves are willing to pay a higher rent for residences in such prohibitory districts. There the working classes migrate as fast as the houses spring up, as to an oasis in the desert; there the medical officer testifies that the death-rate is exceptionally low; there the chief-constable bears witness the police have little to do; and there, when it was proposed to erect a public-house on the boundary line, so as to supply the "poor men robbed by this tyrannous edict" of their beer, a crowd of opponents filled the magisterial court to seek protection against the incursion of a traffic from which they had fled. The question cannot but suggest itself—If great landlords, enterprising builders, and powerful municipalities, by the exercise of local option for the protection of their own interests, can incidentally secure such priceless blessings to the dwellers upon their estates, why should not the people themselves, for whose convenience it is affirmed that such houses are required (and among whom they have been established by the exercise of magisterial discretion), to the extent of three adjoining houses in some instances, have a voice in giving expression to their own wishes; that is to say, the local option of deciding whether and to what extent they wish such houses to exist in their midst.

(*c*) There are districts in England in which, through the will of the landowner, the trade has been allowed, but restrained and regulated after the following fashion (quoted from Dr. F. R. Lees' Sequel to his Prize Essay):—

> Lady Noel Byron has suppressed all drinking houses on her property at Kirkby Mallory, Leicestershire, save one. That was let under stringent restrictions to a publican, but manifest mischief still followed, and her ladyship at last took the inn into her own hands, appointing a respectable person to conduct it at a fixed salary, so that profits might not induce the seller to wink at drunkenness, or to drive as near to the precipice as may be. Over the door of "The Wentworth Arms" the passer-by may read the following inscription:—
>
> "May he who has little to spend, spend nothing in drink;
> May he who has more than enough, keep it for better uses;
> May he who comes here to rest, never remain to riot;
> And he who fears God elsewhere, never forget Him here."

Although things were not completely satisfactory, a great and

striking improvement, we are informed, followed this experiment, both as to property and as to people.

(*d*) There are nations among whom a similar experiment has been tried on the larger scale with the most cheering results. The state of Sweden fifty years ago, in consequence of free trade in the production and sale of spirits, was thus described by Mr. Laing in his "Tour in Sweden":—

> Notwithstanding this powerful, effective, and complete Church establishment, and notwithstanding the very wide diffusion of education and religious instruction by an extensive and efficient national establishment of schools suited to all classes, the Swedish nation stands amongst the lowest in point of morality; no other three millions of moral beings in Europe appear to commit within a given time so large an amount of crime and moral transgressions.

To remedy this terrible state of things the Swedish Diet passed a great measure of licensing reform in 1855. By that Act the parochial authorities in the country, and the town councils in towns (subject to confirmation by the governor of the province), fix annually the number of retail shops and public-houses. These licenses are sold separately or collectively by auction for terms of three years. As there is no minimum fixed for the number of licenses, it is possible, subject to the sanction of the governor, to prohibit the trade entirely. The direct result of this Act was to reduce the distilleries from 4,500 in 1850 to 457 in 1869, and the production of spirits to less than one-fourth of its former production. How extensively the Swedes have employed this Act to reduce the number of public-houses is seen when it is stated that, among three and a half millions of people living outside towns—that is to say, seven-eighths of the population—there were in 1876 only 450 places for the sale of spirits, or one house for every 8,000 of a scattered population.

The marvellous change which has taken place in Sweden is not, however, wholly to be explained by the Act of 1855. The town of Gothenburgh has had the great honour of developing one section of that Act into a scheme known as "the Gothenburgh licensing system," of which the chief features are as follows:—The purchase, by a company formed for the purpose, of all existing public-houses; the subsequent reduction of their numbers to a point considered reasonably necessary for the wants of the people; their conversion from mere drinking to bonâ fide victualling houses; the refusal to sell spirits on credit; the managers of such houses being allowed a profit on the sale of tea, coffee, cooked food, but none for the sale of spirits; the payment of all profits on sale of spirits, after expenses and 5 per cent. on capital invested, to the fund for town purposes. Further details may be seen in the evidence

given before the Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance, as well as in the publications of Mr. Alexander Balfour, of Liverpool, and of the present President of the Board of Trade. Such, however, have been the beneficial results, that Stockholm and all other towns in Sweden, save one, with a population over 5,000, have adopted the system.[1] Whether in our own country such boards for the local control of the liquor traffic should be, as proposed by Mr. Chamberlain, in towns, the Town Council, or, as strongly advocated by Mr. Balfour, and as is actually the case in Sweden, boards expressly formed for this one purpose, are matters of detail. In either case we should have the principle of local control. And it is matter for extreme regret that when Mr. Chamberlain had carried the necessary consents in Birmingham, Parliament did not grant the sanction to an experiment in that midland capital which would have been watched with the deepest interest by the civilized world. The clause in the Lords' Report which bears on this subject will command the hearty assent of all :—

When great communities—deeply sensible of the miseries caused by intemperance; witnesses of the crime and pauperism which directly spring from it; conscious of the contamination to which their younger citizens are exposed; watching with grave anxiety the growth of female intemperance on a scale so vast and at a rate of progression so rapid as to constitute a new reproach and danger; believing that not only the morality of their citizens, but their commercial prosperity, is dependent upon the diminution of these evils; seeing also that all that general legislation has been hitherto able to effect has been some improvement in public order, whilst it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance—it would seem somewhat hard, when such communities are willing at their own cost and hazard to grapple with the difficulty and to undertake their own purification, that the Legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to entrust them with the requisite powers.[2]

II. It was assumed in the early paragraph of this Article that the principle common to Local Option and Local Control will lie at the foundation of that measure of licensing reform which it is agreed by all cannot long be postponed. This assumption

[1] Experiments in Scandinavia in connection with "the drink problem" must possess an especial interest for ourselves in consequence of the similar conditions and difficulties of race, customs, and climate. The frequency of rain and dampness reminded me of our English November days, when at home our public houses become a fatal refuge. My own visit was practically curtailed by many days of incessant downpour. At Christiania I was much amused by a desponding Frenchman, who came to me in the hotel, wringing his hands as he exclaimed, "What shall we do? Here are no theatres, no distractions. This place ought to be called '*Triste*iania' and not Christiania!"

[2] The Select Committee of the House of Lords' Report on Intemperance, Session 1878–9, par. 36.

will be seen to be well grounded when certain facts have been enumerated which plainly point to *the prospect of a speedy triumph of this principle.*

(*a*) Let it first of all be remembered that this principle has been recognized in all the recent proposals, from whatever quarter suggested, which have had to do with licensing reform. It is seen in the proposals of the United Kingdom Alliance, which would empower certain districts having the necessary majority of votes to rid themselves of these houses—in Lord Aberdare's Bill of 1871, which gave power to the ratepayers to demand a poll, and by a majority of three-fifths to negative the proposals of magistrates to license a number of houses if exceeding certain proportions to the population—in Mr. Cowan's Bill for the creation of a licensing board, to be appointed solely by the ratepayers—in Mr. Chamberlain's proposed scheme investing the municipal authorities with powers as a local board to carry on the trade so far as they shall see fit—as well as in all the proposals which from time to time have had the sanction of the Church of England Temperance Society.

(*b*) Again, let it be remembered how rapidly the principle has made its way within the circle of practical politics. It would not be difficult to adduce evidence that this question, as much as any, decided the complexion of the present Parliament. At the recent election the Licensed Victuallers' Association, through their chairman, stated that very complete arrangements had been made for dealing with candidates at the general election. To every gentleman who sought their suffrages four test questions would be submitted, and the way in which those questions were answered would decide their action towards the candidate. Among the questions came first the inquiry—"1. Will you, if returned to Parliament, oppose every bill or measure which aims at transferring the licensing powers from the present authorities (the Justices of the Peace) to periodically elected local boards or bodies, municipal, parochial, or the like?" How this challenge was received by the great body of the electors those associated with the brewing interest learned to their cost. Names honoured by all for philanthropic and munificent deeds were banned through this ill-advised action on the part of the Licensed Victuallers' Association.

(*c*) The temper of the new House of Commons was speedily made manifest. The month of June not only saw Mr. Pease's resolution in favour of partial Sunday Closing in England and Mr. Roberts' resolution in favour of total Sunday Closing in Wales carried, but also Sir Wilfrid Lawson's *Local Option resolution.* Amid the greatest enthusiasm, and exceeding the most sanguine anticipations of all its friends save a few, in a full House, on the 18th of June,

including tellers and pairs, 245 members voted in its favour, whilst 219 were opposed to its adoption. Three months before, in the last days of the expiring Parliament, only 114 votes could be rallied in its favour, whilst 166 were given against it. In the majority were no fewer than *nineteen members of the Ministry*, including the Home Secretary, the President of the Board of Trade, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and the Vice-President of the Council on Education. Even more significant was the fact that, though the Premier, Mr. Gladstone, voted in the minority, he gave the following pledge:—"Among the great subjects to which the attention of the Executive Government shall be directed as early as the pressure of business will allow, will be the task of reforming the licensing laws, and I believe that in that reform, which is so loudly called for and favoured by the circumstances in which we now stand, *we shall take as an essential principle* the motion of my hon. friend." This remarkable pledge is one not likely to be forgotten by the statesman who has declared—"Greater calamities, it has been said, are inflicted on mankind by intemperance than by the three great historical scourges, war, pestilence, and famine. Though this is not true for civilized countries in general—certainly not for Italy, for Spain, and for Portugal—it is true for us, and it is the measure of our discredit and disgrace." Assuredly the pledge will not fade from the minds of those who plead for "local option" and "control"—the great masses of our working classes, who cannot see why, when the upper classes in their squares and crescents can keep away the nuisance of a legal but dangerous traffic, they, who of necessity must live in crowded streets, should have no power to exclude from the frequent corners those polluted beershops and glaring gin palaces which, to their growing boys, their tempted girls, their toiling wives, mean temptation in a thousand forms. There are many strong politicians, it is believed, wholly opposed to the principles of the present Ministry, who are reconciled to their present occupancy of the Treasury in the belief that, under their term of office, this vexed question of licensing reform will at length have its solution in some measure of local control.

In conclusion, *the position which our own Church occupies* in reference to this great question is one which reflects the greatest honour upon her as the friend and pioneer of all movements which can promote the social and moral well-being of the people of this country. The Church, more than any other body, has moulded public opinion, and brought it round to the furtherance of this great principle. The recent resolution of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, with the exception of the last sentence, he has again and again declared, was taken by him from the eleventh recommendation[1]

[1] "11. Your Committee, in conclusion, are of opinion that as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors is

made by the Committee of Convocation of Canterbury in 1869. It is the same principle which was endorsed by the memorial to the archbishops and bishops which was signed by 13,600 clergy of the Church of England, and which had for its issue the Committee on Intemperance of the House of Lords. It is the principle, under the modified form of "local control," which is being introduced into Parliament by the Church of England Temperance Society, in their Bill which provides that licensing boards shall be formed, in which representatives of the rate-payers shall be associated with the magistrates in equal numbers, and to which the power shall be given of reducing by an equitable provision the number of existing public-houses. The question is one which is prominent in the programme of the ensuing Church Congress, and by the discussion which it will then receive, and the wide distribution and consideration at our Diocesan conferences in the coming autumn of the Bill which the Church of England Society, under the experienced leadership of Canon Ellison, has prepared, I am not without hope that, in loyal co-operation with other temperance reformers, it will be the crowning privilege of our Church to have the chief place in settling this great question, on the principle which she was first to propound, and on the lines which she has carefully and equitably laid down.

In the enforcement of all those principles which seek to promote temperance by moral suasion, the Church has recently been honourably conspicuous, believing that—

> 'Tis more heavenly
> First by winning words to conquer willing hearts,
> And make persuasion do the work of fear.

It now remains for her to exercise her due influence in the introduction of legislative measures on such foundations that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations.

JOHN W. BARDSLEY.

---

to supply a supposed public want, without detriment to the public welfare, a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licenses should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected —namely, the inhabitants themselves, who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system."—*Convocation of Canterbury Report on Intemperance*, 1869. Sir Wilfrid Lawson's resolution consists of the above recommendation, verbatim, and the addition of the following words to the last clause, "by some efficient measure of local option."

ART. V.—*IN MEMORIAM.*

JOHN C. MILLER.

AMONG the severe losses the Evangelical section of the Church of England has recently sustained, the death of Dr. Miller must on several grounds be estimated as one of the heaviest. The venerable Prebendary Auriol, justly regarded as a Nestor amongst us, had of late, as the weight of advancing years pressed heavily upon him, gradually ceded his place to others, and as a shock of corn fully ripe was gathered into the garner. Prebendary Wright, snatched away in the prime of life and vigour, in the mysterious providence of our Father Who doeth all things well, though he occupied a post the importance of which can hardly be overstated, yet from the absorbing nature of the duties devolving upon him—"standing," as his predecessor Henry Venn said, "between the Church abroad and the Church at home"—was almost precluded from giving attention to those many matters of deepest concern to the Church of Christ, both at home and abroad, which bring the Evangelical School of the Church of England into contact with, or opposition to, Nonconformity on the one hand, or the High Church, or Broad Church Schools of its own Communion, on the other. It was here, we think, that Dr. Miller's special value was proved; it is here that his loss will be most keenly felt.

At the very beginning of his ministry of forty-three years Mr. Miller was able to place his feet firmly upon the two great foundation rocks—justification by faith through the atoning and all-sufficient blood of Jesus, and the full inspiration of the Bible, rendering it a complete and sufficient revelation of God's will to man; and never one inch to the right hand or to the left did he shift his position. In the preface to a volume of sermons, preached by him in his first and only curacy at Bexley Heath, which, with a vigour of illustration and eloquence of language that gave early indication of those powers of preaching he afterwards so fully developed, set forth in uncompromising terms these great truths, in reply to an objection which he supposes some friend might make to so young a man appearing before the public as an author, that "it was rash and imprudent that he should tie himself to particular opinions, and thus oblige himself hereafter to be consistent with views and statements now advanced, even when he may have seen reason for modification or change," he says, "The author believes and trusts that there is not any one view or statement of truth contained in the volume which is of a *novel* or *peculiar* character; he trusts there is no view of an ultra character, and as a minister of the Church of England he would have shrunk from advancing

views and statements in which he did not conceive himself fully warranted by her Scriptural articles and formularies." And not long before his death he was heard to declare in public, that the study and experience of a forty years' ministry had only tightened his hold of the same principles and convictions to which he deliberately set his hand as a curate of two years' standing. This unflinching and uncompromising consistency in the maintenance of the fundamental truths gave him from an early age an important place in the councils of Evangelical Churchmen.

But he was none the less, but rather the more, a consistent Churchman; he believed firmly that the Evangelical interpretation of the formularies and articles of the Church of England was the true one, both in spirit and in grammar; and he was therefore always as ready to uphold and abide by Church order, as Church doctrine; both to him were dear, because both to him appeared to be distinctly proved by "most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." This was well illustrated during his ministry at Birmingham. While his own pulpit at St. Martin's bore abundant testimony to the deep spirituality of his teaching, the town hall of Birmingham was filled again and again by enthusiastic audiences, as, at one time, he proved compulsory confession to an earthly priest to have no warrant in Holy Scripture, and therefore to be intolerable in the Church of England; when, at another time, he demonstrated in one of a series of lectures, others of which were delivered by the Evangelical Dissenters of the town, that the inspiration of the Bible is not contrary to any demands man's reason may reasonably make; or at another time, when, with equal power, he vindicated the honesty of the Evangelical section of the Church of England in remaining within her communion, which, in the excitement of the Bicentenary celebration of the ejection of the Ministers in 1662, had been impugned by an eminent Nonconformist minister of the town.

These convictions were not with him as a precious heirloom, of intrinsic value it may be, and to be jealously preserved for the honour of those who had handed it down to him; nor were they the mere shibboleths of the party to which he belonged, to be uttered therefore with due care and correct pronunciation, but devoid of that inexpressible, but most real, value which attaches to opinions which are the result of honest conscientious research. Dr. Miller's intellect was of that robust and independent character which delighted in mental labour, and forbade him to hold as an opinion any thing upon which he had not brought his mind to a definite conclusion after a thorough examination. When his opinion was asked, it was quite certain that it would be given in a straightforward, though courteous manner, and would be exactly what he thought, and not a weak

attempt to please those who sought his counsel. The Bishop of Rochester, in a sermon preached in the parish church of Greenwich on the Sunday after his funeral, spoke thus of him:—

His character is, in my judgment, sufficiently defined in a single word—*manliness*—his strong face, his broad shoulders, his ample form, his slow and stately tread, were all reproduced in a will that knew no vacillation, in an independence that brooked no interference, in a nature which was sufficiently endowed with the quick self-protection of a rather sharp displeasure; and the dignity of a courage which feared neither friend nor foe. Whenever I was in council with him—and I was often in council with him—I always felt perfectly confident that his sense of justice would carefully weigh and candidly appreciate all the argument brought out in the discussion. I was equally assured that it would never even occur to him to give his opinion upon a statement that he had not minutely examined, or to approve with the entire judgment of his conscience the most earnest wishes of those he loved and respected best if before God he could not approve of them. If he was one of those men of whom it is sometimes said—and it may be no mean praise—that you never know where you will find them, in his case it was not from indefiniteness of principle, but from sturdiness of conscience; and if he frequently made objections and did not quickly recede from them, those who were at first disconcerted often in the end found cause to be supremely grateful.

This characteristic made him a most valuable member of committees and councils; and while it was acknowledged by all who worked with him that he was a first-rate chairman, he was scarcely less appreciated when occupying a more subordinate position, both by those with whom he agreed and those from whom he differed. Many notable instances might be cited, but we we will only mention, as illustrating the remarkable versatility of his powers in this respect, that he won equal admiration as chairman of a committee for settling the affairs of Attwood and Spooner's bank in Birmingham, as one of the three arbitrators in the investigation into the state of Dr. Barnardo's Homes, and as a member of the Committee of Convocation for the revision of the rubrics, where, by his sound common sense and sturdy Evangelical churchmanship, he gained the respect of all his coadjutors. His management as chairman of Attwood and Spooner's committee is thus alluded to by a Birmingham newspaper:—

It was by his pen that a masterly and exhaustive report was drawn up and presented to the shareholders, the result being an unlooked-for dividend, which undoubtedly saved many families from ruin.

Of Dr. Barnardo's investigation the Bishop of Rochester said:—

A very eminent living judge observed of the judgment, mainly composed by Dr. Miller himself, that had he written it he should hardly have altered a word.

But while we think that scarcely too much importance can be attached to the position which his powers in this respect enabled him in God's providence to fill, he had other gifts for which the Church has to thank God, and there are other circumstances in his career well worthy of remark.

The early promise given by Mr. Miller, as a curate, of attaining a high place amongst the preachers of the English Church was abundantly fulfilled. He had most of the natural gifts which make a successful orator; his stalwart presence, and the penetrating glance of his eye when in the act of speaking, commanded the attention of his audience, whilst with a voice at once powerful and almost fascinating in its musical tones he gave utterance in an easy flow of words to thoughts which his sometimes vigorous, and always transparently natural gestures made it evident came from his heart. Besides these things, God had given him a powerful intellect, and a clear and logical mind; but he ever, as the last written words he left behind him testify, regarded these things as entrusted to him to be used and improved in the Master's service, and so, though he had the power of preaching without much, or indeed any preparation,[1] his study of his subject was always deep and thorough, and a strict critic would say that as a general rule the introductions to his sermons were almost too elaborate. It was said once by one who valued his teaching very highly, "He is almost too careful in laying the cloth before he puts the food on the table;" but the food when it was put on was the Bread of God; the Lord Jesus Christ in all the fulness of His redeeming love and sanctifying power; food, too, it was which it was evident the preacher had tasted himself. It was this diligent use and improvement of God's good gifts to him, combined with his own personal experience of the power of the grand truths he expounded and enforced, that made him what in ordinary language is called a popular preacher. And in the truest sense he was a "popular preacher;" whatever kind of people he was called upon to address, he compelled their attention for the whole length of his sermon, which not unfrequently extended over an hour. The boys of "King Edward's School," Birming-

[1] The news of the death of the Prince Consort arrived in Birmingham on Sunday morning, and Dr. Miller received it as he was starting for church. He changed his text and entire subject, and preached a most powerful and touching discourse on "Lazarus sleepeth." On another occasion his son, walking with him to church, asked him to preach during his stay at home on the personality of Satan; he was astonished and delighted to hear a most exhaustive sermon that very morning on the subject. As a third instance, when standing ready to preach an open-air sermon, the working men of the parish brought him a portable wooden pulpit, he immediately changed his subject, and preached from Nehemiah viii. 4, "A pulpit of wood."

ham, who regularly attended his church, listened with an unflagging attention, and not a few of them, now themselves ministers in the Church, look back with deep gratitude to his plain and forcible teaching; the rough artizans of Birmingham crowded his church, which he delighted to open for—what were then almost, if not quite, unknown—special services for the working classes; indeed, whether he preached in the Black Country of Staffordshire or in a University pulpit, whether he addressed a country congregation or stood up in St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey, a crowd of eager listeners always gathered to hear him; and many are the proofs proffered by grateful hearers that his heart-searching faithful words have been used by the Holy Spirit for the conviction of sin and the building up of God's people. This latter function of the ministry he always considered most important; and on his coming to Greenwich one most prominent feature in his work was his Friday morning's service, instituted by him for this purpose. The large Church of St. Mary's was well filled on these occasions by a congregation, gathered from all parts, of Christians who came to feed upon the Word of Life; and the cessation of these services will create a great blank in the spiritual life and enjoyment of many advanced servants of God.

As an organizer and personal director of parochial machinery Canon Miller was most successful, and not a few of what have now come to be the ordinary arrangements of a well-ordered parish owe their origin to his sagacity and courage. The first Mission Services ever conducted in an orderly Church of England fashion were held in St. Martin's, Birmingham, and he often lamented that to the sober model there laid down, and abundantly blessed by God, so much was often added that opened the door wide to a flood of unhealthy spiritual excitement and extravagance. Though he was never able to convince himself that wine was not one of God's good gifts, and because many people abuse it he ought not therefore to use it, he yet led the way in the most practical attempt to wean the working man from the snare of drunkenness. The first working men's club, combined with a night school, was started in Inge Street, Birmingham, in St. Martin's parish. Penny readings and concerts for the working classes were almost, if not quite, unknown when Dr. Miller issued his first programme, in which his own name as a reader appeared. Mr. Henry Venn had already at Hull devised the plan of district visiting under the direct superintendence of the clergyman. This was adopted by Dr. Miller in Birmingham, and enlarged by the addition of a body of working men, trained for the purpose in the working men's Bible class, who devoted their Sunday afternoons and some of their leisure time in the week to act as missionaries to their

fellows. This band of parochial missionaries became a most valuable agency in the parish. St. Martin's, Birmingham, was also the first church in England in which a regular system of the division of the services was adopted, with the sanction of the bishop of the diocese.

It is well known that the credit of the practical origination of what is now known almost throughout the British dominions as Hospital Sunday belongs to Dr. Miller. He was always careful to say that the idea itself came from Mr. Wright, the editor of the *Midland Counties' Herald*, but the practical organization of that Annual Festival of Charity, which now unites in so many places all bodies of people in one grand effort to relieve their suffering fellows, was Dr. Miller's work.

After twenty years' arduous labour in Birmingham, both as a parochial clergyman and as the recognized leader in all the great social and religious movements of that energetic and stirring community, he in 1866 accepted, on the nomination of Lord John Russell, the then Prime Minister, the Crown living of Greenwich, and in the enlarged sphere of London work found abundant scope for the exercise of all his varied powers. He was elected one of the members for Greenwich of the first London School Board, but he found its duties incompatible with his ministerial work, and retained his seat but for a short time, long enough, however, to cause his colleagues to lament his resignation. He gave much time to the committees of various Church societies, never being absent from the Church Missionary Committee whenever important questions were under discussion, and always serving most readily and punctually on any sub-committees—and they were many—on which he was nominated, for the settlement of the more delicate questions that from time to time arose.

His nomination by Mr. Gladstone, in 1871, to a residentiary canonry in Worcester Cathedral opened up a new, and to him most interesting, sphere of Church work, and both at Worcester and at Rochester, to which latter cathedral he was transferred in 1873, he devoted himself, and not without success, to make the cathedral church a centre of spiritual light and usefulness to the whole diocese. He was elected by the Chapter of Rochester to represent them as their proctor in Convocation, and, his presence in that assembly added greatly to the strength of the small band of Evangelical clergymen who have as yet obtained seats; and also in a most marked manner compelled, by his clear and judicious utterances, increased respect and consideration for the Evangelical view of Church questions at the hands of the large High Church majority.

But his appointment to a canonry must be reckoned amongst those second causes by which the Master sees fit to call his workmen to their rest. The only way in which Canon Miller

could, with satisfaction to his conscience, make the necessary three months' residence in the cathedral city fit in with his parochial duties, was by arranging with his brother canons to keep his residence during the three summer months, when a very large number of his parishioners were from home. This he did from the very first, and thus deprived himself of a real holiday from the summer of 1873. There is no doubt that it was this incessant work that brought on the disease that closed his earthly life; for on consulting a physician early in the year 1879 he was enjoined to take four months' rest. He consented so far as to spend two months at the English lakes; but the other two were spent at Rochester; and though, on his return from the lakes, he seemed somewhat benefited, when he went back to Greenwich in October it was evident the disease had obtained firm hold of him. He did not, however, relinquish his work, though the performance of it entailed upon him much physical discomfort and fatigue. This is alluded to in touching language in an article that appeared in the *Kentish Mercury*[1]:—

But, perhaps, nothing in his whole life more marked the fixed purpose of the late vicar of Greenwich to spend, and be spent literally, in his Master's service, than the efforts he made, for the last few weeks that it was possible for him to appear in public, to preach to his beloved people. He felt the shadows of death gathering around him, and his heart was oppressed with the longing desire to testify to them of the grace of God with his very latest breath. Many of his last few sermons were delivered under circumstances of great physical weakness, apparent to all who heard them, but yet there was a pathos that melted every heart, and a spiritual power which no physical weakness could overcome. It was the privilege of the present writer to hear the last sermon Dr. Miller delivered in the church of St. Alphege, and as he listened to the lucid exposition of the text, the second and third verses of the fourth chapter of Colossians, he felt, as no doubt others did, as if the words spoken were not so much those of a dying man as of one who, in the spirit of the Resurrection, proclaimed in triumphant confidence, as it were from heaven, the truth he had so well proved. Physical weakness indeed there was, painful to witness as he commenced to speak, but as he proceeded the spirit proved mightier than the flesh, and those who heard never will forget the plaintive tenderness, and the powerful appeal of the last words he uttered from the pulpit of St. Alphege. Perhaps even more memorable was the last sermon of his life, preached at St. Mary's Church on the 9th of May. Pressed with exceeding weakness, it was almost impossible for him to ascend the pulpit, and then for a few minutes his tones were tremulous and almost inaudible; but a remarkable renewal of his strength was accorded to him, and the last words the late vicar of Greenwich ever uttered from the pulpit were words

[1] This Article was written by Mr. James Watson, a former Editor of the *Kentish Mercury*, and is published in a tract form.

declaiming with his old force and his old fidelity the Gospel he loved so well.

The last nine weeks of his life were passed in complete physical prostration, borne with a patience and resignation manifestedly granted to him in answer to his repeated prayers that he might not by impatience dishonour God. He could only bear the repetition of texts and hymns, but in these he found great comfort, especially in all texts that set forth the power of the blood of Christ to cleanse from sin, and the completeness of His atoning work. The end came suddenly and most peacefully: without any apparent change in his condition, just as the services in his churches were concluded, on Sunday evening, July 11, he quietly passed away from the scene of his earthly work to the place of his spiritual rest. He left behind him a paper strictly enjoining that no "funeral sermons" should be preached or "pulpit eulogies" uttered, ascribing "any usefulness he may have had to God, who giveth the increase;" and this article has been written with the endeavour to carry out this wish: less than what has been written would not have given a true description of the place he was called upon to occupy in the English Church; and without violating the spirit of his dying wishes we may well thank God for giving him to our Church, and enabling him to occupy the post for which He fitted him; and with our thanksgivings we may join the prayer that his mantle may fall on some other shoulders.[1]

We cannot better conclude this slight sketch of Canon Miller's character and work than by quoting some words from a letter

[1] It may interest our readers if we put in a footnote the chief dates connected with Canon Miller's life—and a list of some works of which he was the author. Born in 1814, he was educated at Brompton Grammar School, and matriculated at St. John's, Oxford, in 1831. He gained a scholarship at Lincoln, from which college he took his B.A. Degree (First Class in Lit. Hum.) 1835; M.A., 1838; B.D. and D.D. in 1857. He was ordained in 1837, taking his title from Bexley Heath, in the Diocese of Canterbury. After two years he became assistant minister to the Rev. T. Vores at Park Chapel, Chelsea; and afterwards succeeded him as sole minister. He was elected by trustees to the rectory of St. Martin's, Birmingham, in 1846; and was appointed hon. canon of Worcester in 1852. In 1866 he accepted the Crown living of Greenwich, and was nominated by Mr. Gladstone to the canonries of Worcester and Rochester successively in the years 1871, 1873. He was Select Preacher of the University of Oxford in 1859. He has left behind him two volumes of sermons, preached at Bexley Heath, and Park Chapel; a valuable volume of advice to young clergymen, entitled "Letters to a Young Clergyman," which appeared originally in the *Clergyman's Magazine;* two series of Lent lectures on "Solomon" and "Joshua;" "Bible Inspiration Vindicated," a lecture; "Courtship and Marriage," a lecture; a lecture on the life of "John Angell James;" besides numerous single sermons and addresses, and tracts for the Christian Knowledge Society.

written by one who had long worked with him on the committee of one of our religious societies:—

Well may we repeat over his empty seat, how mysterious are the ways of God. Mysterious indeed, for he was one who had proved himself to be fitted for the times he lived in: who was a power we could ill spare, whose place I know of no living man able to fill. How clear he was in all things to himself, how clear he made things to others. Then his powerful common sense swept away by its very presence half the cobwebs of theory and fancy which perplexed other men, even before he spoke; and his first words always gave one the assurance that we were going to be shown land at last. He was simply invaluable in difficult times as a counsellor, and as a chairman he was the best I ever met.

To this we cannot forbear adding the closing portion of the Bishop of Rochester's sermon, from which we have already quoted. Bishop Thorold says:—

His gifts may be summed up in one word, capacity. He was capable over folios of accounts, even with men whose lives are spent in figures; capable in the pulpit, where his close dialectics and compact but never heavy reasoning was lightened by illustration, quickened by pathos, and sanctified by the Word of God; capable on the platform, where for many years he held a front place with some of the most brilliant orators of his own religious school; capable in Convocation, where, amongst differing but ever kindly and courteous brethren, he asserted his principles and expounded his convictions with a moderation and sagacity that won him as much regard as his courage and ability earned him esteem; capable above all in committee, where, if there was a weak spot in a proposal, he darted on it like a falcon on a linnet, where he would defend the right of the absent, and assert the privileges of the feeble, with an emphatic earnestness, that, if sometimes indiscreet, was always generous; where I, for one, shall miss him, and mourn for him for many years to come, for, if he was one of the kindest of my counsellors, he was also one of the most valuable.

The Bishop adds:—

The main results of his life, as I seem to see them on review of his career, are briefly summed up thus:—first the fearless, consistent, powerful, reasonable exposition of the great truths of the gospel from the standpoint of the Evangelical school in a way that compelled a respectful attention, if not always an entire assent. Second, the promotion, if not the creation, of a precious spirit of toleration among churchmen of all orthodox schools towards each other, not by the compromise of principle, but by the generousness of charity, by listening as well as by contradicting; by accepting common ground against a united foe, as well as declining to keep back honest differences; by refusing to magnify trifles into essentials, and by doing his best never to permit the truth he loved, and we love, to be watered down by weak surrender or compromised by a sour narrowness.

B.A. CANTAB.

Art. VI.—CATHEDRAL REFORM.

THE appointment of a Royal Commission for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the conditions of cathedrals, and the manner in which that measure has been taken up by the Church and country generally, is sufficient to indicate that no common importance is attached to that inquiry, and no common amount of expectation created as to the result of the Commission's deliberations. It is true that, in the first instance, when the subject was introduced into the House of Lords, all that was apparently contemplated was the propriety of investing cathedrals of the new foundation with the same powers of revising and altering their statutes which is possessed by those of the old. But the significant observation of the then Premier, "that he intended the Commission to go much further than that," shadows forth a much larger field of investigation, and perhaps recommendation, than that originally contemplated, and, from the manner in which the suggestion has been taken up by the clerical circles, it seems clear that general desire on the subject of cathedral reform will not be by any means satisfied by any recommendatory results confined to so narrow a limit as that specified by the Prelate whose notice raised the debate. Nor is it possible to suppose, in reference to the spirit of the times in which we live, that such an opportunity for passing the question of cathedral reform through the crucible of public opinion should be overlooked and unused. It is the character of our age to reconsider all questions and all conditions, to bring all institutions to the test of practical utility, and to bring them into better accord with modern tastes and surrounding fitness. Nothing can shelter itself from the stern criticism of rigid inquiry under the mere plea of long established custom, or resist demands for alteration by an appeal to venerable antiquity. All things are now tried on the ground of their merits, and cannot evade that trial by setting up the defence of sentiment, or long usage, or even the sacredness of prescription.

In the presence of such an expectation the authority of great names will not count for much, nor will even the necessity which justified the retention of an order of things in former times be admitted as being equally stringent in our own. The political concession made to Romanists and Dissenters, the relaxation of prohibitions which appeared to be opposed to religious liberty, the disestablishment of the Church in the sister island—nay, even the bringing of the prerogative of the monarch into more supposed harmony with the Constitution of the country—these, and many other instances, show that no institution can expect to remain unassailed by the voice of criticism, or to bid defiance to, or stand untouched by, the general action of reform.

From such movements cathedral institutions cannot hope to remain excepted. The very prominence and dignity which attach to them, appear almost to invite them. They are "cities set on a hill which cannot be hid." We can entertain no doubt that the whole Establishment of the Church of England is destined, and that at no distant period, to be rudely assailed. Liberationists are marshalling their forces, preparing their implements of assault, sounding their notes of warning, and declaring themselves determined to fight to the knife for what they style religious equality. The connection of Church and State, the senatorial dignity of our prelates, the endowments of the parochial clergy, the necessity for the Sovereign being a member of the National Church, these and others are by-and-by to be resolutely dragged into the field of conflict. Is it possible that cathedrals standing in the exceptional position of wealth and dignity can remain unassailed? Nor, in the presence of signs around us is it likely that the cry for cathedral changes will be confined to the avowed opponents of the Church? Among ourselves are men speaking, if not perverse, at least hostile things. From many a Diocesan Conference and many a Ruridecanal Chapter are Royal Commissions receiving, if not judicious, at all events ingenious suggestions, which, if they do not exhibit a perfect acquaintance with the points on which they undertake to offer advice, show at least a charitable desire to instruct the Commissioners in their duty. It may, therefore, not be out of place to consider, as briefly as our space will admit of, the subject which is in these several ways brought before the public mind.

It may be assumed, from the detailed and minute questions submitted by the Royal Commissioners to the several Cathedral Chapters, that their inquiries will embrace a very wide field of examination, including not only that of the statutes by which cathedrals are governed, but every thing relating to the administration of the cathedral, the nature and duties of the several offices, revenues, services, music, choristers, education, residence, the relation of the Visitor to the chapter, and the part taken by the several members of the chapter in the government and conduct of the cathedral. And no doubt a large amount of information upon these and other points will be obtained by the Commissioners, enabling all who are curious in such matters to understand more of the constitution and management of a cathedral than at present they appear to do; and from it in general the public will learn this, that a cathedral is a peculiarly complicated institution, requiring a great deal more of thought, of care, of anxiety, of accuracy, than persons for the most part conceive. The regulation of the services, the selection of the music, the enforcement of rules for church efficiency, the education of the

choristers, the maintenance of a system which provides for the due appearance and fulfilment of their functions of all the officiators of all ranks, and for the observance of that order, decency, and propriety due to the sacredness of Divine worship and to the place in which it is conducted, the (ofttimes difficult) adjustment of the respect due to the diversity of views and opinions entertained by the members of a chapter, where all are equally potential, the necessity of deference to individual judgment in points of "doubtful disputation," these and many more which might be mentioned may help to warn the advocates for cathedral reform that they may, by suggesting alterations which, if adopted, may be found injurious to, if not destructive of, the value of an intricate machinery which has cost much wisdom in former times to construct, and no small measure of care to preserve in efficiency, damage that which they hope to improve. The truth is that few outside the working of a cathedral know how delicate and arduous the task is to maintain discipline without awakening insubordination, to obtain regularity without despotism, and to effect improvement without departure from all observed custom, and a disregard to statutes which men are sworn to obey. Nor can outsiders fully understand the delicacy and patience which are required to secure that an oligarchy of equals shall unite harmoniously without the surrender of individual right or the assumption of disproportioned power. The theory of cathedral administration is that of an equality of power conjoined to an equality of labour, not of an equality of power apart from that of labour.

The question of the utility of cathedrals has often been presented to the public, and is very likely to be repeated in our days with increased emphasis. It is, therefore, well to weigh the force of the argument by which that utility is maintained. For if everything now is measured by its use, it will become cathedrals to show to the satisfaction or at least to the reduction of the vehemence of those who question it, what may be said in its favour. One argument on the side of their retention is a popular one—viz., that they serve as retiring-places of dignity and emolument for those who have done good service to religion, either by contributions to literature, or ability in the pulpit, or hard work as parochial ministers. And it does seem hard that the Church should not have such means of rewarding men who have served her faithfully and efficiently, especially when we recollect how disadvantageously the clergy of the Church are placed in this respect as compared with other professions. The soldier and the sailor have their half-pay; the hard-working barrister, if he does not ascend to the bench, has, because he has been hard-working, accumulated a fortune; the successful physician can retire with at least a competence.

The Church (except in the few instances where infirmity and incapacity are taken into account) has no retiring pension to offer to her worn-out or zealous labourers. Is there not a sort of reason in this that she should have a few?—and they are but few—places of ease and competency to offer them, especially when we remember that they who are thus promoted do not retire to be idle or unoccupied, but to work on still after a different fashion. The clergy of the Established Church are computed at 23,000, and of deans and canons we have but 162. The proportion is modest enough, and the duties to which they pass are no sinecures. The dean must reside eight months in the year at his post, and the canon takes part in the daily services for ninety days. We may much question whether, if the point were put in this form before the public, many hands would be raised up in condemnation of it. It may be that the murmur of dissent would not rise against the abstract, but the concrete, arrangement; not against such places being existent for eminent or laborious men, but for men neither eminent or laborious. That is a question not as to the provision, but the application of the provision, and consequently the reform would lie not in the destruction, but in rectification.

A second doubt about the utility of cathedrals takes the form of objection to the unnecessary number of men employed in services which might be conveniently discharged by fewer—that is, that a dean and one or two canons might fulfil the offices performed by double or treble the number. Part of that objection has been already met by the plea of having these canonries for the reward of former services. Yet, in candour, it must be confessed that nine months' non-residence does open a wide breach for attack in "the walls of our Sion," and that we can hardly afford to furnish such facilities for attack. Were a year, or a very considerable portion of it, spent in the cathedral town, the canon adding importance to the services by his habitual presence, taking his part in the cathedral management, in its promotion of religious objects, in lending help by advice and co-operation to institutions, boards, &c. &c., half, if not all, the objections would vanish. It is true that it does not follow that where a canon is non-resident for nine months he is eating the bread of idleness, for he is not unfrequently found in his parish discharging parochial duties. Yet at that point the rejoinder arises as to why such a plurality should exist? That, however, is a question of use or abuse of patronage which belongs not to our present subject, except in so far as it opens the question as to the expediency or otherwise of a cathedral canon being at the same time one of the parochial clergy of the diocese—a point this which may arise with another topic of our general subject.

A third objection assumes a form economical. It grudges

the emoluments consumed by cathedrals, and recommends their application to the augmentation of the income of small livings, or the formation of additional parishes. As to the propriety of either of these objects in themselves, there cannot be a second opinion. The incomes of a very large number of our parochial clergy are painfully small; and no one who notices the rapid growth of our population and the rapid growth of infidelity and irreligion will have a doubt that parishes need to be divided, and the number of ministers increased. But one questions the propriety and advantage of attempting to effect that object by the means suggested. We say nothing of the unseemliness or the irreverence of doing away with the cathedral services of the Church of England, of the offence it would offer to the national feeling, of the disgust which would be universally excited in the extinction of one of the great features of the religious services of our country. We say nothing of this, because the suggestion meets us rather in an economical than ecclesiastical form, and, because so regarded, the objection answers itself. The salaries of the dean and canons of the Church of England amount but to a sum (£142,494 a year) which if divided among the many thousands of underpaid clergy would add not materially to their incomes; while withdrawn from its present application it would leave those stately edifices, and their no less stately services, reduced to the mere condition of parish churches. A great blow would be inflicted on the most imposing order of our ceremonial worship, a great doubt would be inspired as to the stability of institutions which owe so much to the faith and piety, the truth and munificence, of men of other days, while a very insignificant advantage would be afforded by the transfer of the emoluments of the mother church to her parochial children. Nor should it be forgotten that the resources which are to be subjected to this rude reform come not from national endowments, but the religious generosity of those who gave or bequeathed manors and estates for the very express purpose of supporting the cathedral establishment. In commercial justice the act would be an unfair one, and in economical adjustment it would be but the bestowal of a very trifling gain effected by the disturbance of a long existent order of things, and a serious encroachment on the efficiency of a high and appreciated orderly worship.

It has been urged as an objection to the religious efficiency of the cathedral system that it does not admit of the exercise of the pastoral relation between the minister and the people, that congregations come to listen to music, to enjoy a choral service, and to attend (or not) to sermons not having that continuity of doctrine or treatment which is found in our parish churches;

that, in fact, deans and canons are not pastors but ministers There is, no doubt, truth in this, and truth that opens out the question of the comparative advantages of the two systems. But then it must be recollected that cathedral ministrations do not affect to be parochial. They are not meant to be substitutional but supplementary. Welcoming all who come to join in the services, and doing its best to make those services auxiliary to religion and holiness, the cathedral leaves the pastoral care of a congregation drawn from many parishes to the pastorship of their own clergymen. It wishes not to break the tie which binds minister and parishioners to each other, but to help the parish minister by attempting to deepen the religious feeling of his people. It may be that the service it presents may be in some respects more attractive than that of the simplicity of the neighbouring churches, but that it cannot help, for it is part of its constitution that it should be so. Yet surely that should not be charged against her as a defect, which is, after all, but an endeavour to meet the emotions and sympathies of a large number of worshippers. It might be possible, indeed, to convert a cathedral (by making it the centre of a large populous district) into a mere parish church, to strip it of much of the impressiveness which is derived from musical renderings, and the relief found in the conduct of the services by several officiators. But that would be in reality to extinguish a cathedral, and to create a huge parish church instead. We very much question, moreover, having our eyes turned to the many indications which meet us of the increasing desire for ornate in place of bald services, whether such a change would not be viewed as a deliberate and unwise encroachment on the tastes, wishes, and privileges of our people.

In the foregoing remarks we have probably met all the principal arguments or objections advanced against our cathedrals as they stand, and may therefore turn to another side of the subject in the consideration of the benefits which they confer. We have already dealt with one of them in the plea advanced for the fitness of having in the Church positions of dignity and rest for men who may be considered to have earned their reward, and therefore need not reproduce it in the aspect of an advantage. But we may add to the force of that plea by regarding such positions as helps to literary efforts. It often happens that, in the midst of the occupation and the anxieties of pastoral life, a man has little time and mental strength left to him for the prosecution of deep study and the production of works intended to benefit, instruct, and enlighten his fellow-creatures. It is seldom that in the midst of pastoral cares, school superintendence, pulpit preparations, and benevolent offices, a man can command that time and quiet, mental activity, and painful

thought, necessary for the fulfilment of the duties of a student or an author. Such men should be above the pressure of the *Res angusta domi* and the vexations and interruptions of pastoral life; and were such use made of the facilities which the calm retreat of the cloister affords, the world would probably confess that the emoluments are well bestowed which rendered such a result possible. We are not forgetful indeed that many of our most prized literary contributions to the cause of religion have proceeded from the parsonage. But these were gigantic struggles of great minds against great impediments, struggles which might be successful in the quiet of a rural parish, and the small demands on time and anxiety of a small and simple population. It may be laid down as a general truth that the distractions of a large and harassing parochial cure are not favourable to the culture of deep thought and masterly investigations. The critic must be undisturbed, the theologian must be meditative, the historian must be laborious. They must, beyond this, be near sources of scholarly supply, such as are afforded by the city, university, or cathedral libraries, and if such advantages are not within their reach, it is right, at all events, that the Church, as a fostering mother of literature, should be prepared to afford them. We cannot entertain a doubt that however some men (and there will always be such men) have, like David, fought with the shepherd's homely implement, and flung upon the world treasures accumulated in unpropitious obscurity, yet that it were unsafe to trust so sacred a cause to such exceptional contingency. But as to the real worth of such emoluments and accessaries to the cause of sacred literature as cathedrals present, we cannot better express our convictions than by quoting the eloquent language of Chalmers:—

> Doubtless the scholarship has been well employed that rescued from the entanglements of sophistry the precious truth of the Divinity of our Saviour. And well may England rejoice in those lettered ecclesiastics who have put down, as far as argument could do it, the infidelity that decried the truth of His high and heavenly Apostleship. And worthier far than all the revenue of all her colleges, is the return of criticism and of demonstration that they have made in behalf of His great sacrifice and of His unchangeable and ever during Priesthood.

Nor can we be wrong in including among the advantages afforded by cathedrals the facilities for the cultivation of that which deserves to stand side by side with literary effort—the purity and elevation of a devotional spirit. It is something, it is much, in the midst of the cares and excitements, the haste and secularity, of a heartless and irreverent world to find men who live above it in the serene elevation of a heavenward and

sanctified soul—such men as were Andrews and Leighton, Howe and Baxter, and, with all their errors, Fénelon and à-Kempis. They were not of the world even as their Lord was not of the world. No doubt the plant of God's high grace will grow anywhere, and fountains will spring up in the desert. But our Christian poet speaks out the real truth when he said—

> The calm retreat, the silent shade,
> With praise and prayer agree.

And a higher than he spake it out, "When He went up into a mountain and continued all night in prayer." To spirits who humbly copy their Lord, the calm of the cathedral, the oft-repeated service, the cloister walk, the release from entangling cares, offer congenial soil and invigorating atmosphere. It is something, were it but for the force of its example, that such should live and grow to cast the fragrance of sanctity around them. If they do not do much in busy activity for the spread and power of God's truth, they do much in showing what saintship is. And the cloister life of the cathedral is worth something, for such flowers grow there.

We have touched already, in our comparison of the cathedral and parochial systems, on the grandeur of the one and the simplicity of the other. And in that grandeur we see a direct benefit conferred by the cathedral. It exhibits to the diocese, to the nation, what the higher type of service is, suggesting how its example might be imitated and an order of worship more elevating and attractive (not more solemn and spiritual) may be introduced into our parish churches. Without the resources, the emoluments, the history of our cathedrals, this on an equal scale cannot of course be obtained, but *intervallo* it may be imitated. For without intending or assuming to teach the parish churches of the diocese what worship might be, it yet may safely hold on its own course, and leave that to furnish hints or ideas to others. And we doubt not that at such times as the choral festivals of the diocese, or a convenient portion of the diocese, are celebrated in the cathedral, many a village choir returns home with a more accurate idea of the extent to which the conduct of services may be advanced by the more natural and instructed renderings of cathedral music.

We may conjecture from the opinions expressed at diocesan conferences, letters to public prints and ruridecanal meetings, that many have already assumed the office of the Royal Commission, and pronounced upon reforms expected or demanded. It is clear from some of those debates which have reached the public eye that a large amount of ignorance as to the constitution, rules, and principles under which cathedrals are administered prevails. The truth is that no one unconnected

with a cathedral knows much on the points on which men allow themselves to decide so unhesitatingly. Even the Commissioners are feeling their way step by step to the information on which their expected report is to be based; though no doubt they will receive much assistance in their investigations from the advices which have been so considerately and gratuitously tendered to them. But as far as we can ascertain the opinion of these reformers, who yet do not appear to exhibit a remarkable harmony of sentiment among themselves, a broad improvement is expected by which the cathedral should be brought into a closer relation to the diocese. What that relation is it is somewhat difficult to understand, whether it means that the cathedral should open wide her arms and take within her hitherto limited circle the parochial clergy, in whole or in part, or whether the cathedral should, as a sort of theological essence, diffuse itself amongst them, or both. If the former, the cathedral will receive a large increase of ministerial strength, whether auxiliary, reformatory, contradictory, or compliant will remain to be seen. If the latter, the question will deserve consideration how far the fulfilment of diocesan functions is compatible with the offices discharged by the cathedral clergy, or their capacity to fulfil such functions. To this point let us address ourselves.

In some suggestions which have been thrown out on this subject it has been recommended that the appointment of the clergy to prebendal stalls, which in some cathedrals lies entirely in the hands of the bishop, should by him be delegated to clerical election. It is of course for the bishops themselves to determine how far they are justified in resigning a privilege which law and custom have placed in their hands or transferring that privilege into other hands. It is a trust committed to the bishop, and for the execution of which he is responsible. It is a part of the episcopal prerogative which a bishop might be ready to part with, but which his successor might regret that he had parted with, and which possibly he himself might live to be sorry that he had resigned. As matters at present stand, it is a power placed in the hands of the governor of the diocese to mark by a token of distinction his sense of the fitness, character, and services of a clergyman preferred to a prebendal stall; and we cannot avoid thinking that such a mark of commendation would come to its object with more grace and more satisfaction if taken from the hands of its diocesan than out of those of a number of his co-pastors. And if, as has been suggested, the electors are divided into archdeaconries, a certain number of prebendaries growing out of one archdeaconry, it may admit of a question whether the numerical distribution will be throughout the diocese acceptable. At all events, that method of appointing to a vacant stall carries with it the evils and the discords of that

not very harmonious thing, a clerical election. We cannot, certainly, congratulate a diocese or a section of a diocese on the importation into it of such a possible cause of excitment, strife, and contention; nor should we, for a time at least, envy the position of a prebendary living in the midst of neighbours who were, perhaps, strongly opposed to his election. No one can doubt that, in such a body as the clergy of a diocese, any man elected would do honour to the choice which had distinguished him; but it might be that modest sterling worth might not weigh so much in the balance as active bustling pretension. Anyhow, we should be disposed in this case to question whether change be an improvement or reform an advantage.

This, however, bears but indirectly on the question of the relation of the cathedral to the diocese. Other suggestions have met our eye which bring that general idea more prominently into shape and form. We have seen it intimated that it might be for the advantage of both that certain offices, some of them already in other hands, and some only in embryo, should be imposed upon the dignitaries of the cathedral. And there can be but little question that, supposing canons do not hold any other preferment than their canonry, there is ample time at their command for the discharge of suggested duties. A canon, released from cathedral residence at the end of ninety days, has a large residue of unemployed months at his disposal. The difficulty does not lie in that direction, but probably in the aptitude of the canon for the especial duty to be assigned to him. As far as we can learn from the various suggestions by which the Commissioners are likely to be enlightened, the programme runs something after this fashion, to make one of the cathedral staff inspector of schools throughout the diocese, another a diocesan lecturer, a third a sort of organizing secretary for the advancement of religious and charitable associations, a fourth "the precentor," the superintendent of diocesan choirs, and the dean the visitor or superintendent of a theological college. The programme is a comprehensible and somewhat attractive one, and shadows forth, no doubt, a large amount of important work to be imposed on canons supposed to be sighing for occupation. It shall be our business to examine how it is likely to work.

It must be remembered that we have a right to assume that men appointed to canonries should be men who, by long service or peculiar eminence in some branch of the profession, have proved their claim to such distinction. That presumes that they are (except in some very remarkable instances) men of mature age, and past that period of life when a man's flexibility of mind enables him to take up and succeed in hitherto untried spheres. And the question at once arises whether such men are

likely to be competent for the new duties which it will be their province to discharge. And another question arises at the back of that one, whether the selection of a man for a cathedral dignity will not be inconveniently fettered by the special requirement. Let us place before us the office of a Diocesan School Inspector. That is an office requiring very peculiar knowledge, capacity, and penetration, and one to which many a man, otherwise accomplished, might be found palpably unfitted. We think that we could pronounce the names of several men who, for ripe scholarship, pulpit ability, or long patient public service, might fairly expect cathedral rest and position, but who would be signally out of place in conducting the examinations of an elementary or middle-class school, and who, it may be, would decline an honour to which such an inconvenient appendage was attached. Nor are we at all sure that the clergy of the diocese would be contented to surrender their right to appoint the Diocesan Inspector into the hands of the patron of the canonry. The case, no doubt, might be simplified when the appointment to the canonry lay with the bishop, who could take care of both interests. But what if the canonry lay with the Crown or the Lord Chancellor? Are we justified in expecting that the duplicate consideration would be thoughtfully weighed by the patron? and if not what then? Why, that the diocese may have imposed upon it a school inspector quite unsuited to the office, and unable ever to be equal to it. We ought surely to think twice before concluding that a good sculptor must necessarily be an admirable landscape painter.

The same kind of objection does not lie against the office of the lecturer, for a man who can fill a pulpit and instruct a congregation ought to be adequate to the occupation of a lecturer's chair. But it may be somewhat difficult, while looking into the practical realities of the suggestions, to apprehend what he is to lecture about, and to whom he is to lecture. The scene of the lecture would of necessity be about a dozen principal towns of the diocese. Are lectures, in these days of overdone lecturing, so attractive, as that after the novelty of the thing has passed away he may expect to command an audience? If the subject were a line of travels illustrated by diagrams or magic lanterns, or some scientific disquisition made popular and assisted by experiments, it might be that the hall would exhibit, if not a large, yet select circle of listeners. But a cathedral dignitary could scarcely be expected to present such a bill of fare. Learned criticism, Scriptural exposition, sketches of ecclesiastical history (subjects grave and solemn, and properly befitting the visitor), would naturally be the complexion of the lecture. We may be sceptical as to the literary curiosity, or the keen appetite for instruction of such a kind in our provin-

cial towns, but should hail it as a promising symptom of the increase of a thirst for knowledge if lectures of this order in such places were acceptable. We should be surprised if the experience of six vacant months spent in such efforts prove to be so encouraging as to beget a question whether next year it would be wise to repeat them. And if not, what then? Why, that the duty still clings to the canonry, to be discharged lifelessly, hopelessly, a necessary part of an accepted obligation, but a labour that "satisfies not."

The duty proposed for another dignitary, that of promoting the interests of religious and charitable associations, is unquestionably one of much importance; for many of our religious societies are languishing for want of energetic efforts to support them. But the more we examine the functions of this office, the more we find a difficulty of apprehending them. Are they to be different from those of the organizing secretaries of our missionary, Jewish, curates' aid and pastoral aid, seamen's, shipwrecked mariners', idiots', blind, deaf and dumb societies, and a score or two of various agencies for good which appeal to public sympathy and implore public assistance, and whose interests find employment for as many agents as represent them. If this is to be the duty of a cathedral officer in addition to his cathedral functions, we cannot but regard with wonder, the man whose mind and memory are filled by the history and ever-recurring details of these innumerable channels of charity. To master a missionary report of a single year is no small achievement. To master those of a score of them would be almost superhuman. The man who could do it accurately and efficiently must have sat for Goldsmith's portrait—

> and still the wonder grew
> That one small head could carry all he knew.

But if this personification of organized activity should find such duties incompatible with others of the cathedral or pastoral life, what can we say of the office to which the canon precentor is to be called? To superintend the choirs of the diocese, visit them, correct, perhaps discipline them—this requires that the man be an accomplished musician. Accomplished—for if not, his deficiencies will soon be discovered and his advice rejected as worthless; accomplished—for his superior knowledge and judgment must tear down ignorance, insubordination, and musical improprieties. In our days most parishes educate their own choirs and advance step by step in choral efficiency, and not merely in that, but in the acquisition of musical science. And over all this our itinerant Orpheus is to preside. But it may be that the difficulty does not lie so much in the discharge of the duty as in that of finding a man eligible for a cathedral dignity, and at the same time competent for the musical position. That which

distinguishes a man in the latter respect, may not be found united in qualifications for the former. Cathedral inefficiency may be overlooked in order that musical ability may be exalted.

On the whole we cannot but feel that in the attempt to carry out reforms which are to draw the diocese and the cathedral near to each other, or, as the phrase is, to effect relations between them, there is a serious danger that the individuality of the cathedral may be surrendered, and that, just in proportion as she is blended into the diocese, the especial object of her institution may be lost. And that, we conceive, would be a serious encroachment on the symmetry and balance of the Church itself. They are separate institutions, each moving on its own lines, and each to a great degree independent of each other. The prominent marks which divide them are clear and intelligible, and it may not be well to efface or diminish them. The cathedral does not invade the parochial system, nor should that invade the cathedral. On the other hand much may be done, and, we hope, will be done, to meet diocesan expectations without the obliteration of those functions and privileges which make the cathedral a state in itself. There may be too much of cathedral exclusiveness, the result not of arrogance or selfishness, but of honest respect for ancient rules and a due deference for venerable customs. But that exclusiveness, the subject of many a harsh charge and many an unfair insult, admits of much abatement, and will, we think, be regarded with more candid indulgence when its true character is better understood. But in whatever shape reform may come we cannot but trust that it will not trench upon cathedral independence and self-administration, that the diocese may never be merged into the cathedral nor the cathedral evaporated into the diocese. Our bishops have large power and privilege enough in their hands. That power has not long since been considerably augmented by the transfer to them in many instances of appointments to canonries formerly vested in the chapter, and of livings attached to suppressed canonries; and we do not, we confess, desire to see our cathedral dignitaries converted into diocesan officers. If it be found that canons have a superfluity of time on their hands, by all means let "more work be laid upon them," so that it be consistent with a due regard to canonical functions and in accord with the special purpose for which those places of dignified rest have been founded. There are many ways in which they might find ample scope for unused energies without having recourse to offices for which they might be found unsuited, and in the discharge of which they might not be found acceptable to the parochial clergy. And there are many ways by which the diocese and the cathedral might be brought into happier relations without encroaching on the independence of the one or the free action of the other.

A. Boyd.

Art. VII.—COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

1. *The Primate's Visitation Charge.* The *Times,* September 8 and 11, 1880.
2. *The Hibbert Lectures* for 1878 and 1879. Williams and Norgate.
3. *American Addresses.* By Thomas H. Huxley. Macmillan.
4. *Hume.* By Professor Huxley. "English Men of Letters." Macmillan and Co.

THE study of Christian Evidence has formed the main subject of the Charge which has just been delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury. His Grace desires to recommend this study to the clergy of England as a special need of the times. He would have them note that "an acquaintance with the nature of this evidence and some of its principal features is very necessary in these days, when sophistical arguments, adverse to all revelation, are perpetually forced on our attention:—

It is well that from time to time, with a view to be ready to defend ourselves and those whom we can influence, as well as to give us confidence against arrogant and unscrupulous attacks, we should, as it were, take stock of the contents of our well-stored armoury. And this also I would have you note that the reverent and wisely-directed study of such evidence has an elevating and purifying effect. It has two departments, one philosophical, the other historical. I think the man who approaches such subjects in a right spirit will find that the philosophical part of the evidence leads him to dwell with humility and adoring awe on what he knows of God's nature and of his own. And this reverent contemplation of the nature of God and of man must elevate and purify the mind; while the second part of the evidence—the strictly historical—gives us more vivid conceptions of the reality of the recorded facts by which revelation is avouched, introduces us into greater familiarity with the persons and characters whose teaching we study, and, above all, enables us more thoroughly to appreciate that Divine historical picture of God manifest in the flesh—Christ living and dying for His people—around which all sound evidence for revelation revolves. I am one not of those who distrust the study of the evidences for revelation as if they suggested more doubts than they solve. Entered on with suitable preparation and reverently conducted, such study tends, I doubt not, to raise the whole character by bringing the intelligence as well as the devotional feelings, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, more directly into communication with the true God manifested in Jesus Christ."

It would be difficult to find words more wisely chosen and conceived in a better spirit than these. May they have larger influence in leading disputants on both sides to enter on the discussion of the greatest of all questions with a full sense of the

vast issues at stake; with increased willingness to learn from one another whatever they may have to teach, and to make allowance for personal or professional bias. There could be no better examples of the way in which such inquiries ought to be conducted—no better illustrations of the principles so wisely laid down—than those parts of the Primate's Charge in which he deals with the subject of the alleged sufficiency of natural religion.

The following are his Grace's words:—"The first thing to ascertain is, what are the points on which we agree. Most earnest-minded men are in truth very much better than a cold logical statement of their abstract beliefs would represent them." It will be found, however, that in many instances these men have not taken the trouble to read the arguments which they undertake to answer, nor to look at the question from a Christian point of view. They are thus unable to judge of the Christian records with such knowledge and impartiality as any form of belief may fairly claim from its critics.

The books of the Old and New Testament are the only books in criticizing which men think that they are justified in disregarding any accepted canon of historical interpretation, and in regard to which it is not thought necessary to learn the purpose of the author, the modes of expression prevalent at the time, or the moral standard of the age. Every one is not equally competent to judge of all these things, and it is not too much to expect that those eminent men, whose large and frequently well-deserved influence is thrown into the scale against the Christian religion, would at least pay to the belief of their countrymen the compliment of examining what is said in its behalf, and showing that they comprehend and can appreciate the reasons why it commends itself to men who are not inferior to themselves in any intellectual or moral gifts. One cannot read Mill's essay on "Nature" without feeling that so obvious a misrepresentation of the Christian belief could never have been written by any one who had seen Bishop Butler's famous sermons on the same subject.

Some knowledge of both sides is necessary to every one who ventures to pronounce judgment in any controversy. Else, how can we know whether we have decided rightly? The principles which we have adopted on sufficient evidence, and of the truth of which we have no doubt whatever, may not after all be at variance with truths of a different kind, which seem to us at first sight irreconcilable with them. Many objections are brought against Christianity which it is not necessary to answer at all. It is sufficient to show that the statement on which the objection is based may be admitted without weakening in the least degree the cause against which it has been directed. Men have hastily and illogically supposed that their acceptance of some deduction of science compels them to reject revelation.

One of the foremost and most successful explorers in the field of science, whose expositions of his favourite subject are always listened to with admiration and appreciative sympathy on both sides of the Atlantic, has lately alluded to the Christian belief in a Creator of the world in the following words :—"Cautious men will admit that such a change in the order of Nature may have been possible, just as every candid thinker will admit that there may be a world in which two and two do not make four, and in which two straight lines do enclose a space."[1]

The candour of this avowal is more conspicuous than its caution. The highest of all kinds of evidence is mathematical demonstration. None but those with whom no sensible man could argue, would deny it, or ask it to be repeated. We cannot imagine any world, or any period of time, in which two and two do not make four, or in which two straight lines do enclose a space. To compare with such an impossible supposition a belief which the great majority of Englishmen shared with Newton, Brewster, and Faraday, is a strange introduction to the discussion of an important scientific question. "*Suspended judgment*" is the verdict of other distinguished men of science in their argument against the popular creed of Christendom. Agnosticism is the furthest limit of the antagonism of others. But Professor Huxley has gone as far beyond Agnosticism on the one side as Agnosticism has gone beyond fanatical superstition on the other. He assumes not only that the theory of Evolution is capable of demonstration, but also that his theory is irreconcilable with belief in a Creator and Governor of the world. But Mr. Darwin, who ought to know something of Evolution, has adopted as his own the definition of Bishop Butler—that the only right meaning of the word "natural" is *stated, fixed, settled;* and that what is natural as much requires and "pre-supposes an intelligent mind to render it so, that is, to effect it continually or at stated times, as what is supernatural or miraculous does to effect it for once." We must distinguish, therefore, between the Evolutionism of Mr. Darwin and the ultra-Evolutionism of some of his followers. It can scarcely be maintained that a belief which Mr. Darwin has declared not to be incompatible with the Evolution which he taught, is to be compared with a denial of the rules of arithmetic and the axioms of Euclid.

It is to be hoped that no exponent of Christian evidence will speak so disparagingly of "scientific" opinions from which he dissents, or will ever proclaim an irreconcilable and interminable

[1] "Lectures on Evolution, delivered in New York," by Professor Huxley. Macmillan. (P. 3.)

hostility between scientific discovery and religious belief. The interests of truth will not be promoted by the assumption of a scientific or of an ecclesiastical infallibility. In another of Professor Huxley's writings[1] he applies the ultra-Evolutionist theory to the origin of religion. In the history of religion there is a body of natural facts to be investigated scientifically. Hume saw this requirement, and tried to meet it in an essay called "The Natural History of Religion." Hume possessed no special knowledge of this subject. In his day there were no materials for writing such a history. He knew nothing of the religious books, the religious beliefs, and the religious observances of the non-Christian races of the world. He argues from what he thinks savage races would have done. He tries to place himself in the position of a savage—an attempt as satisfactory as if he had shut his eyes or gone into a dark chamber, and then proceeded to write a treatise on the sensations of the blind and their notions of distance. Commenting on Hume's conclusions, Professor Huxley says:—"He anticipated the results of modern investigation in declaring Fetishism and Polytheism to be the form in which savage and ignorant men naturally clothe their ideas of the unknown influences which govern their destiny."

Now, modern investigation has dealt with this subject, and the results have been given to the world in the two first volumes of the Hibbert Lectures, by Professor Max Müller and M. Renouf, the former treating of the origin and growth of religion in India and in some other parts of the world, the latter in Egypt.

The conjectures of Hume, which subsequent scholars have accepted, and which have been expanded into the four stages through which it was supposed that all the religions must necessarily pass—Fetishism, Polytheism, Monotheism, and Positivism—have been tested by actual examination of the religions of the most ancient nations of the world—the religions of India and of Egypt. If the universe and everything which it contains are to be developed from protoplasm, through an ascending series of animals up to man, religion also (which for good or for evil has held so large a space in the history of mankind from the earliest times) must be traced by slowly descending stages from the higher religions of civilized men down to the ruder forms which this theory believes it to have assumed at the first dawn of the rational life of mankind. Thus, as Monotheism (destined, as we are told, to pass into Positivism) is the highest form of the religion of the civilized races, so Fetishism and Polytheism must have been the forms in which the religious instinct of the earliest races clothed themselves at the beginning. Such is the theory and such the purpose for which it

[1] Essay on Hume.

was contrived. But neither in the pages of Hume nor of his accomplished commentator has it any foundation of fact on which to rest. In no sense can it be called a chapter of history, natural or political or religious. The sacred books of India have been translated and compared, the hieroglyphics of Egypt have been deciphered, the records of Buddhism and Confucianism have appeared in English dress, and the greatest of Oriental scholars have devoted their lives to the task of illustrating and explaining the newly-discovered treasures. In the department of religious history we have the opportunity of bringing the ultra-Evolutionist theory to the test of actual fact. We shall see whether it ought to be compared with axioms of geometry.

The Hibbert trustees have resolved to invite eminent men, "united in a common desire for a really capable and honest treatment of unsettled problems in theology, to work together, in the belief that the disinterested pursuit of truth would be no less fruitful in religious than in social and physical ideas." This proposal seems to be tolerant and impartial, and in the case of the first two lectures, at least, it will be found to have contributed valuable results. At the same time it was evidently conceived in a spirit unfriendly to revelation. It is unfair to those who believe in the inspiration of the Bible, since it assumes that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have had no higher origin than the Vedas or the Koran. However, we do not object to compare our religion with the other religions of the world. If the comparison be fairly carried out, it can only result in showing the incomparable excellence of that which is divine. No work of God can suffer from being compared with the works of man, least of all if we compare the glorious Gospel of the grace of God with the devices of man's imagination.

But the excellences of the Gospel are peculiar to the Gospel; they are characteristic of the Gospel; they had no counterpart anywhere else. This scheme is like comparing man with one of the lower animals or with lifeless matter. We are obliged to go down to the lowest residuum, to throw aside all that is noblest, truest, and best in human nature, before we can institute the comparison at all. So all the highest civilized races have much in common with the lowest savage; but it is only in that part of their humanity which both share with the brutes, or which comes nearest to the brutes. You must lop off everything distinctive before you begin your task.

But this method of comparison by degradation is unfair to Christianity for other reasons besides. It forbids us to appeal to the history of religion in the world, and to the influence of the Christian religion in promoting the welfare and happiness

of mankind. The Christian Scriptures are distinguished in various respects from the sacred writings of other creeds, but in no respect more than in their object and their method. From the earliest period of Old Testament history down to the last chapter of the New Testament, their mutual relation is intimate and indissoluble. The writers of the Bible proposed to themselves the most difficult of all problems—to write beforehand the religious history of the world, and to write it in such a way that the most ineffaceable of all conceivable distinctions—namely, the distinction between the past and the future—should be forgotten, forgotten so completely that the future should be present to the writers of the earliest books, while the latest books should be regarded as the fulfilment and completion of all that had gone before. The book of Revelation brings us back to Genesis, and takes its illustrations and types from the primitive record. The curse is taken away, and all the tears which it had caused to flow. The Lamb is the light of the new city, the light of the ceremonial law, the light to reveal the purposes of God in His dealing with the chosen people, the light to illumine the dark places of prophecy, the light which shone clearest in the darkest hour of human misery, increased in brilliancy and power as time went on, lit up the highest peaks, gilded the far horizon, and at length suffused the clouds from one end of heaven to the other, from the home of the sages of the East to the seven-hilled city in the West, when the Desire of all nations came in the glory of the Divine Manhood.

The history contained in the Old and New Testament, as well as the history of Christendom since the canon of Scripture was completed, have no parallel, can have no parallel, elsewhere.

The Bible is also distinctively historical. This element is totally wanting in the sacred books of India. "Need we wonder," asks M. Max Müller, "that the whole nation—I mean the old Hindus—simply despised history in the ordinary sense of the word?" The Hindu Scriptures *despised* history. Our Scriptures give the earliest examples of history; their history, moreover, was not the history of a family, of a clan, or of a single nation, but it set forth the grandest ideal of all history, and carried out this ideal through a long line of independent and unconnected historians, through a period of hundreds of years. A well-known historian writes: "History was born on the day when the children of Israel went out of Egypt." This event itself was not isolated in the inspired record, but is regarded as the fulfilment of an earlier promise made to the father of the Jewish race, and the people are commanded to hand down the memory of it to all generations of their descendants: "This day shall be the beginning of the year to you."

In this, the earliest of all histories, we find in wonderful harmony the three leading ideas of all history—unity, harmony, and progress. These ideas were present to all the writers of the Bible. They are applied on the largest scale through cycles of centuries and to the whole race of men. The writers of the Old Testament, who followed the great father of Jewish history, have added page after page to the first record, writing under different circumstances, for different purposes, in different characters and at different times, yet harmonizing their various utterances into one great drama of the ages; and in these successive utterances of the one spirit we find an ever-growing progress and fuller enlightenment, until the fulfilment of all. Surely the initiation and progress, the unity and harmony of all history, sacred and profane, which may be said to form *the central idea* of the Bible, which challenges inquirers of every age, which touches so many departments of human inquiry, and is the common centre of so many converging circles, is a point of view which is not to be forgotten, because it finds no counterpart in any books, or in all the other books with which the Bible can be compared.

But while we thus point to the defects of this whole method of inquiry, we shall find that the investigation has brought us some most valuable results.

M. Max Müller's lectures on the religions of India bring prominently forward the extent and the power of the religious sentiment of mankind. He quotes Herder's testimony: "Our earth owes the seeds of all higher culture to religious tradition, whether literary or oral." He also sums up the result of his own investigations with these words: "Whether we descend to the lowest roots of our own intellectual growth, or ascend to the loftiest heights of modern speculation, everywhere we find religion as a power that conquers, and conquers even those who think that they have conquered it" (p. 5).

We are reminded of the various and conflicting meanings which have been given to the word "religion." No word has ever been used in so many senses, and stood for so many, and so opposite, ideas. It may mean "religious dogma," "religious faith," and "religious acts." Kant teaches that religion is morality: "Religion looks on all moral duties as divine commands." Fichte, Kant's immediate successor, takes the opposite view; religion he supposes to mean "knowledge." It gives a man a clear insight into himself, and answers the highest questions; but it is not practical, and was never intended to influence life. For this morality is sufficient. Schleiermacher defines religion as "a consciousness of dependence." Hegel, on the other hand, teaches that religion is "freedom." Comte and Feuerbach make man himself both the subject and the object of religious worship.

The most valuable portion of M. Max Müller's essay is his

clear and complete refutation of the popular notion that the earliest forms of all religion have been *Fetishism and Polytheism.* Professor Huxley, as we have seen, lays it down as a truth no more to be questioned than the axioms of geometry, that the origin and growth of all things is to be found in Evolution. Elsewhere he announces it as an axiom, not to be proved, but to be taken for granted, that the history of religion itself is to be traced back to *Fetishism.* He does not profess to have investigated this subject for himself, nor that Hume had investigated it when he wrote what is called a "Natural History of Religion," but inasmuch as it seemed to follow from the application of the ultra-Evolutionist theory to religion, it needed no other proof. But, after all, it is difficult to write a *history of religion,* whether natural or supernatural, without some acquaintance with the facts. For the facts we refer our friends to the first volumes of the Hibbert Lectures, by M. Max Müller. No higher authority in this special department of knowledge is to be found in Europe. No man has so large an acquaintance with all the various forms of primitive religion. He lays before us his facts, his witnesses, and his conclusions. His principles, indeed, are not the principles of this Review; for, he writes, "the only revelation which we claim is history, or, as it is now called, 'historical Evolution.'" But this is very different from the *ultra-Evolutionism* which asks us to accept a history of religion, not because it can be proved by any appeal to facts, but because it is consistent with a theory whose principles are compared with the axioms of Euclid. The following is the judgment of M. Max Müller on the attempt to evolve all forms of religion from Fetishism :—

> My position, then, is simply this. It seems to me that those who believe in a primordial Fetishism have taken that for granted which has to be proved. They have taken for granted that every human being was miraculously endowed with the concept of what forms the predicate of every fetish, call it power, spirit, or God. They have taken for granted that casual objects, such as stones, shells, the tail of a lion, a tangle of hair, or any such rubbish, possess in themselves a theogonic or God-producing character; while the fact that all people, when they have risen to the suspicion of something supersensuous, infinite, or divine, have perceived its presence afterwards in merely casual and insignificant objects, has been entirely overlooked. They have taken for granted that there exists at present, or that there existed at any time, a religion entirely made up of Fetishism, or that, on the other hand, there is any religion which has kept itself entirely free from Fetishism. My last and most serious objection, however, is, that those who believe in Fetishism as a primitive and universal form of religion, have often depended on evidence which no scholar nor historian would feel justified to accept.

Elsewhere (p. 96) he ascribes the philosophical theory which

would develop all religions from African *Fetishism* to ignorance and superstition. "This very theory has become a kind of scientific fetish, which it will be difficult to eradicate from the textbooks of history." To disbelieve such *scientific fetishes* is scarcely so unreasonable as to doubt the rules of arithmetic. The learned lecturer has also shown that the second step in the romance of ultra-Evolution has no foundation in actual history. *Polytheism* was not developed from *Fetishism*. The earliest form of Vedic religion he calls *Henotheism*. This he defines to be "a worship of single gods, which must be carefully distinguished both from Monotheism, or the worship of one God, involving a distinct denial of all other gods; and from Polytheism, the worship of many deities, which together form one divine polity under the control of one supreme God" (p. 289).

That which M. Max Müller has done for India M. Renouf has done for Egypt. His researches have led him to the same conclusion. The religion of Egypt was originally a pure Theism. The symbols of a religion are very often mistaken by strangers for its essential parts. This was the error of Heredotus. Hence it came to be believed that a low kind of *Fetishism* was the religion of Egypt. This was a corruption, not the primitive faith. M. Renouf shows also (in opposition to well-known writers on the supposed development of religion) that the worship of deceased ancestors was no part of the earliest religion of Egypt. His judgment is (p. 179), that in no case can it be proved that the propitiation of departed ancestors preceded the belief in a divinity of some other kind.

Such may be called the *negative* results of the two first volumes of this series of lectures. They have put to the test of actual observation the theories of *ultra-Evolutionism*. They have shown that the conjectured progress of the natural history of religion has taken for granted what should have been proved. The first religions have not begun with *Fetishism*, and passed on through the following stage of Polytheism. For this judgment we are thankful.

The *positive* results we may also accept without apprehension. They have shown that the notions of law and of sin have formed an essential part of the early religions of the world:—

This feeling has found expression in various ways among the early philosophers of Greece and Rome. What did Herakleitos mean when he said: "The sun or Helios will not overstep the bounds" (*τὰ μέτρα*), *i.e.*, the path measured out for him; and what if he said the Erinnys (the helpers of right) would find him out, if he did? Nothing can show more clearly that he recognized *a law* pervading all the works of Nature, *a law* which even Helios, be he the sun or a solar deity, must obey. Cicero said that men were intended not only to con-

template the order of the heavenly bodies, but also to imitate it in the order and constancy of their lives; exactly what we shall see the poets of the Veda tried to express in their own simple language (p. 236).

In these volumes we see manifold proofs of the goodness of God in revealing so much of Himself to mankind by the works of creation, by the law of conscience, by the instinct of reverence, by the craving for authority, by the feeling of dependence. We see how deep and how universal has been the foundation of religion. The argument from general consent has been strengthened by these books; has been shown to exclude many unworthy conceptions which were once believed to be universal, and to include many other religious ideas besides the existence of God. We have the best and latest commentary on the well-known line from the Odyssey:—

πάντες δὲ θεῶν χατέουσ' ἄνθρωποι.

As M. Max Müller translates the words, "All men gape for gods as young birds gape for their food from the parent bird." We owe them much. The dreams of theorists who have spun natural histories of religion out of the cobwebs of their own brains have been rudely brushed away, and shown to be at variance with the customs and beliefs of the primitive races of civilized as well as of savage men. This is no slight gain, when we remember the great names which have been paraded in support of the famous theory of the four stages in the history of religion. These theorists have been playing the foolish game of shutting their eyes in order to describe the sensations of the blind. Their sensations appeared very "natural" to themselves and to their hearers, *because they had not been born blind.* Not being able to discover in the record of the rocks or in the tales of travellers the missing link between man and the brute creation, they imagined the lowest kind of religion, and ascribed it to the savage races, and called it by the name which the Portuguese sailors gave to the worship of the negroes. The plausible theory has collapsed when confronted with the facts. So far from religion having passed through a series of changes for the better, the earliest stages have been the purest, and the history of religion has been almost universally a history of degradation, demoralization, and corruption. The religion of the Portuguese sailors was no less disfigured by *fetishes* than that of the negroes whom they pitied.

But when we come from the so-called natural, but really unnatural, because unhistorical, history of religions, what do we find? We find only one religion in the world which possesses the recuperative power of throwing off the degradations of Fetishism, Polytheism, and immorality, and recovering its primitive purity and grandeur without losing the spiritual

power and moral dignity of its earliest days. Other religions have possessed sacred books far more numerous than ours, which have been preserved and transmitted with equal fidelity; but the Christian religion alone possesses in its sacred books historical truth, moral perfection, irresistible authority, immaculate example, and undecaying recuperative power. In mediæval times the Christian religion had, through a large portion of Christendom, degenerated into a worship of *fetishes*, and in this way Strauss argued that, because there is less of "*crossing*" and of attending mass in our days, there is also less of religion. And certainly, if our religion had run the same downward course as all the other religions of the world, it also would never have recovered from the condition of degrading externalism. But it possesses an inner life which all the superincumbent mass of superstition could never completely stifle. So that here also, as well as in its satisfying the highest needs of man's moral nature, and in its distinctively historical character, our difficulty in comparing Christianity with other faiths arises from its unapproachable superiority and from the uniqueness of its claims. We thankfully accept the testimony which these treatises have furnished to the strength and universality of the sentiment to which religion appeals, as well as to the comparative purity of the earlier religions of India and of Egypt. In these facts we see nothing to oppose, but much to confirm many well-known passages of Scripture.

We ask our scientific *ultra-Evolution* friends to follow with us the course of that religion whose first beginning and earliest history is to be found in the Old and New Testaments. We ask them to trace with us the progress of revealed truth in the world, the preparation in earlier times, the dawning light of prophecy, until the full disclosure of Revelation, when Life and Immortality were brought to light in the Gospel of Christ. We remind them that the teaching of Christ contains not only the germ from which every distinctive tenet and practice of Christianity has emerged, but also the divinely appointed tests whereby His religion is for ever to be distinguished from the debasing tendencies of corrupt human nature. Though he gave to His disciples few formulæ, His principles have been shown to be capable of assuming an almost endless variety of adaptations, so as to satisfy everywhere and at all times the various cravings of the soul, "those gapings of the young bird for the food necessary to support its tiny life." Think, for instance, of the various and apparently conflicting definitions which have been given to the word *religion*—"the feeling of absolute dependence," "liberty," "the apprehension of the infinite." How comes it that the same thing has presented itself to various minds under aspects so different, and that each part

has commended itself to some thinkers as if it were the whole? Obviously because the thought is too large, too many-sided, to be grasped by any definition, or to satisfy any of our conceptions. Religion is the reflection of the Almighty on the mirror of man's mind and heart and conscience. We look on it in various lights, and every successive ray seems so beautiful that we fancy it to be the best, to be the whole. Every other religion, as it came nearer to the true light, borrowed a part of this light. Separated from the central sun, they began to fade away, or they served rather to mislead than to direct. Each of them presented some features in common with *the truth*, or revealed some want which *the truth* supplied. They were fragments of the broken mirror reflecting, or perhaps refracting, at various angles some of the blended glories of the Gospel. The more we contemplate the immeasurable differences which separate our religion from all that have gone before it, the better we shall see what is the essence of Christianity, its unchangeable, imperishable, and incommunicable greatness.

The treatises which we have been considering may be said rather to clear the ground on which to build the structure of religion, than to show the plan of the structure or the wisdom of the Architect. This is the province of revelation, and with actual revelation they profess to have no concern. But men need to be reminded that Christianity is something more, something higher than a department of science. It has not been evolved out of pre-existing elements. It is the revelation of a series of facts, in no wise contrary to Nature, but above Nature, situated on a higher plane, moving in a different orbit, providing for the sickness of the soul (which was one of the earliest notions of religion itself), and based on the testimony of witnesses to the life, the death, the resurrection, and the ascension of its Divine Founder. The highest glory of Christianity is its *truth*. Christianity is the only religion which addresses the *mind* of man, giving the highest of all objects for the contemplation of his reason, as well as the Person most worthy of his affections, and the almighty strength of the Holy Spirit to help his feeble will. In the comprehensiveness of its appeal to every part of man's complex nature Christianity stands alone. Nor can we consent, in the interest of humanity, no less than in the interest of religion, to ask the mind of man to give up the highest and greatest of all subjects of contemplation, whether the demand be made in the name of an infallible science or of an infallible religion. We cannot listen to those who would say—"We claim the exclusive right to all the *mind* of man. There is no corner of the wide domain of truth over which the writ of science does not run. Be satisfied with this compromise. We shall give up to religion control over the *emotions*, provided

you encroach not on *our* province, which is the investigation of *truth*. *Emotion* belongs to religion. Morality is self-interest in a form more or less refined. Affection has nothing to do with religion, for affection fixes itself on a person, and we do not believe in a personal God."

To these terms the Christian cannot consent. A religion which never has spoken, and never will speak to man, which never has acted and never will act in the affairs of men, is so little different from the religion of Epicurus that we cannot accept it, though it may praise the Sermon on the Mount and acknowledge the nobility of the character of the great Eponym of Christianity.

But the history of Christianity has taught us another lesson which we shall do well to remember when we compare it with the other religions of the world. Ours is not the only religion which has exercised vast influence on the development of the human mind and on the character of its adherents. We have a right to compare it with other faiths in its tendencies as well as in its results. Nineteen hundred years is a fair trial. We shall be better able to understand the claims of Christianity as a divine revelation if we contrast its fitness for all forms and conditions of life with the immobility, the stagnation, and decay of all other faiths. The Vedic and Egyptian and Buddhist religions began with noble ideas and a comparatively pure morality, but as they flowed down through the centuries, they have carried with them the impurities of the soil through which they passed, and are now fallen into the dry and barren sands. There was also a time when Christianity seemed to have lost its early force and its noble character. But she alone has always held within herself a recuperative energy, the power of self-recovery and self-purification. Her course has been guided by an unseen hand and watched by the All-seeing eye.

When the river which flows from beneath the throne of God emerged from the overhanging rocks and gloomy passages whose shadows darkened and concealed it for so many centuries, its early freshness and power returned, and it became again the chief civilizing, ennobling, purifying element in all the thoughts and works of men. "Darkened by shadows of earth, but reflecting the image of heaven."

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

Reviews.

Twenty Years in the Wild West; or, Life in Connaught. By Mrs. Houstoun. Pp. 288. Murray.

THE present condition of Ireland is of the most intensely painful interest. There is no use in attempting to disguise that there is a strong feeling of nervous irritation among the Irish peasantry against the Imperial Government of England; but it is very difficult to satisfy ourselves as to how far the noisy clamour of the discontented few overpowers the expression of the better judgment of the law-abiding and the loyal. The late Prime Minister, not very long ago, uttered the aphorism that Ireland was in a state of "veiled rebellion," and the present Premier gave expression to a similar sentiment when he said that there was in Ireland "a measurable distance" between us and civil war. Though there is, we trust, no immediate prospect of this "measurable distance" being lessened, yet the aspect of affairs in Ireland is undoubtedly very grave. The excitable disposition of a naturally warm and volatile race is being irritated by the exaggerated appeals, and by the semi-treasonous harangues of irresponsible men who, in what Mr. Forster has justly characterized a wicked and cowardly manner, take advantage of the popular feeling regarding the complicated questions relating to land, to incite them not only against the landlords but also against the English Government.

The book before us is most deeply interesting at the present juncture. It gives an animated account of the principal events during a residence of more than twenty years in one of the remotest and wildest corners of Ireland, and an estimate from the authoress' point of view of the character of the people by whom she was surrounded. It must, however, be borne in mind that her description applies only to her own locality, and that she does not profess to speak of the character of the people at large.

Circumstances led the husband of the authoress to rent an estate, consisting of "bog, lake, mountain, rock, and river, to the extent of somewhat under ninety square miles," in the south-west of county Mayo. Her future home was situated amidst the gloomy, but beautiful scenery surrounding Dhulough, or the "Black Lake," and under the shadow of Milrea, "the monarch of mountains." To the south it was cut off from Connemara by the exquisitely lovely bay of the Killeries, and it was separated from the outside world by wild tracts of bog and moor. Both the authoress and her husband went there fully impressed with the idea that absenteeism was the one great evil of Ireland, and that it was the bounden duty of the occupants of land, not only to dwell among the people, but to employ the people themselves. They made a brave attempt to accomplish this object; but it proved an absolute failure. Immediately after their arrival "denunciation from the altar began;" the people were exhorted "to take the law into their own hands against the new settlers," and "to kill, *desthroy*, and 'smash up' with ruthless hand the Saxon invader of their rights;" their "sheep were hurled over precipices, worried by dogs, and stolen and devoured by the enemy who were in league against them;" and, in fact, war seems to have been at once proclaimed between them and the priests and people. Their first manager was a rascal and a thief, with blarney on his tongue and falseness in his heart. They were nearly ruined by him. Another courageous attempt was made—this time with a Scotch manager, and with Scotch herdsmen. Evidently with success, so far as remuneration was concerned; but at

the price of the deeper hatred and more determined opposition on the part of the priests and people. The enmity against the new comers appears soon to have culminated in wild attempts at destruction and revenge. Very early during their occupation, even before "The Lodge," as their house was subsequently called, was completed, the attempt to murder them was made, which is vividly described in the following extract:—

Perhaps never were four individuals more surely marked for destruction than were those who composed an unsuspecting quartette of Saxons travelling one moonlight night in October, along a Connaught mountain road. The party consisted of "the Captain" [as the authoress' husband was invariably called] and myself, our son, aged ten, and an English groom. The short twilight was drawing to a close ere we set out on our return. The road, however, to the foot of the mountain was tolerably good, and for the rest—well, whilst descending on the far side, it only required care and patient driving. To "feel our way," was, as a matter of course, requisite, and impediments on the rock side had to be carefully shunned; nevertheless, to "hug" it in places where the defending wall existed not, and where there was only just space sufficient to admit of our phaeton passing, was absolutely necessary. Unfortunately, there chanced to exist, precisely at the spot where the valley below was steepest, and the bulwark above absolutely *nil*—a few yards of nearly level road, on which horses, eager for home and not carefully held in hand, might be excused breaking into a trot, the which our steeds, stimulated thereto by a very peculiar noise, audible in the stillness of the now utterly dark night, incontinently did; but the gentle amble in which they had indulged scarcely lasted for ten seconds, for, to our surprise, without touch of bridle, they came to a sudden stand. "The Captain," who brooked neither delay nor disturbance, was about to urge them with the whip, when the groom, who had been walking behind, called out excitedly as he made his way with difficulty to the horses' heads;—

"Don't touch 'em, sir! Some one has been and put big stones all across the road, and it's a mercy we were not all in kingdom come this night!"

And such in very truth was the case. On examination we found that a low barricade had been carefully built right across the road by would-be-murderers—for by what other name can the perpetrators of such a deed be called, seeing that, had the horses swerved but a few inches, a certain and fearful death to all must have ensued? The place was well chosen for the purpose; in fact, it could not have been more artfully devised. The stones were all carefully, even skilfully arranged, precluding the possibility of their having fallen accidentally from the mountain side.

Not long after this another desperate attempt to "desthroy" them was made in a similar ingenious and deadly fashion:—

It was but little past mid-day when we reached the top of the pass, and commenced our descent on the other side. The sun was blazing brightly, and a fresh mild wind was stirring the long grass. Suddenly our ears were startled by an unaccustomed and strangely rushing sound, one that appeared to sweep along the ground, and was clearly advancing in our direction. What could it be? For a few moments we remained lost in wonder, and then the crackling as of burning sticks, and the floating away of some sparks which even the blaze of the sun was powerless to conceal, revealed to us the truth, namely, that the mountains were on fire, and that the flames were advancing with the swiftness of an eagle's flight on either side the narrow road! Would they be swept across it, and thus render our advance difficult, if not impossible, or was the worst evil we had to dread that of the horses taking fright at the approaching flames, and becoming unmanageable in their terror? Before we had time to take more than a troubled note of the situation, we saw, to our relief, running briskly towards us, some of our own staff of Highland shepherds, and they, armed with long sticks and sickles, were actively employed in endeavouring to stop the progress of the fire. This they did by making, after the fashion of American woodsmen, clearances in the track of the flames, which, finding no fuel to feed on, could spread no further. From the Scotchmen we heard that in several other portions of the land the grass had been simultaneously fired,

and that other detachments of their body were busily engaged in preventing the sheep from being burnt alive upon the land, that being their evidently intended fate. By great exertion, and equal readiness of resource, the men at last got the flames under, whilst the number of animals which fell victims to priestly hatred and the blind obedience of the people was, as I rejoiced to hear, but small.

The authoress adds in a note, that "strong suspicion, afterwards fully confirmed, that the fires were not accidental, was at once aroused by this widely-spread conflagration."

The secret of this determined opposition lay in the fact which is not brought prominently forward, but which is alluded to in a subordinate clause of a sentence—they were "new occupiers of land from which its former holders had been ejected." In these circumstances it is not surprising that a tone of sadness, and even of bitterness, pervades the book. The private history of the authoress likewise adds to this sombre effect. Early during her residence in Ireland, she had an accident which lamed her for life; endowed with a clear intellect and literary tastes, she was shut out from congenial society, and fretted at the seclusion; and domestic sorrow and trial befell her, as well as social warfare and persecution. Her estimate of the character of the people must, consequently, be taken with a large quantity of salt, though there is a terrible substratum of reality and truth in all she has written. We miss the joyousness, the wit, and the rollicking fun which, in the hardest times, characterize the Irish peasantry. There is not a solitary flash of humour throughout the book.

Though her life among the mountains was evidently most irksome to her, Mrs. Houstoun honestly endeavoured to suppress her dislike to the people, and to do her duty towards them; but she was unhappily unsuccessful in winning their affections. "My visits," she says, "to the wretched cabins in which our retainers, together with more than one description of domestic animal, resided, were as unwelcome to them as they were distasteful to me." She consequently contracted a dislike to the people, which makes itself very evident in her description of their character. She considers them untruthful:—

I have listened to more than one hypothesis as regards the remarkable and world-known fact, that the Irish are, far and away, one of the most "lying" people on the face of the earth; and I see no reason to deviate from my own notions formed long ago on the subject.

Cowardly:—

A more cowardly people, whether in "small" health or in real sickness, than were my patients, it would be difficult to conceive. The men—no uncommon physiological fact—far exceeded the women, both in impatience and bodily pain, and in the fear of what, "after death," the "clairgy" might do, or cause to be done unto them.

Revengeful. Several sheep were stolen from time to time; but, though tracked to the cabins of the marauders, a conviction against the offenders was only once obtained:—

Early next morning the dire news spread that poisoned "mate" had been forced between the bars of the kennel, and that every dog therein was dead. That this wholesale slaughter was an act of revenge for the incarceration of the convicted sheep-stealers no one for a moment doubted; but all attempts to obtain proof against the doers of the deed proved futile.

Lawless:—

From long experience of the Irish character, I think myself justified in saying that the majority of the people take a positive pleasure in the mere act of concealing crime, and thus defying laws which it is their nature (simply because they *are* laws) to hate.

Ungrateful :—

Grieved was I, yet not surprised, that those who had been ready, in the days of my *power* to aid them, to fawn upon and to flatter, should, when only the *will* to serve remained, have met me with cold ingratitude, ay, even with contumely and insult.

The bright side of the Celtic character is entirely wanting, and the only good quality put to its credit is strong family affection.

The authoress is very severe on the priests. She regards them, and justly regards them, as the principal cause of Ireland's woes. The real source of discontent in Ireland is the Romish faith, and the consequent withholding the Word of God from the people :—

However difficult [she writes] poor Paddy may find it to make both ends meet, believe me, that the last to suffer from his impecuniosity will be the father who holds in his hands—according to the fixed belief of these benighted people—the power to bind and to unloose, to doom to eternal tortures or to make happy for ever, the souls of his wretched flock.

Again :—

Of the faith which has so greatly tended to make them what they are, these poor blind followers of an interested priesthood have no opportunity of seeing or hearing the lovely, the softening, and the ennobling side. Only on the debasing side of human nature can their mental vision dwell, and only on the lowest of the passions, *fear*, do their remorseless tyrants work. That "honour" should be to them a thing utterly unknown, and "keeping faith" with their neighbours an unacknowledged duty, is far from surprising when we reflect that in their priests' own catechism these words are found :—"A promise need not be kept, if, after making it, circumstances arise which make it inconvenient to fulfil its provisions." The hope held out in the Bible of a blessing on the man who "sweareth to a neighbour and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance," differs in this, as in many other instances, so entirely from priestly teaching, that the keeping of the Holy Scriptures as sealed books from their flocks seems "the most natural thing in life."

On the other hand, our authoress has not a good word to say for the honest and successful attempt made by the Irish Church Missions to change this state of things in her immediate neighbourhood. She speaks against one of the mission clergy as "a young zealot," who "aired his eloquence in violent tirades against the religion he detested."

Can we wonder [she says] that, when the gauntlet was thus violently thrown down—when strewed by the road-side were frequently found printed papers containing the bitterest abuse and ridicule of the priests—when Scripture readers, mission-sent, forced themselves into the cabins, and *obliged* the inmates, however adverse to the infliction, to listen to the Word of God ;—can we wonder, I repeat, that, under such and other provocations to wrath, the "clairgy" should have accepted the challenge, and done on their side fierce battle in their cause.

We should have thought that, on calm reflection, she would have found she was mistaken in her estimate of the manner in which these missions were conducted. If any individual spoke in the way she describes, he violated the foundation-principle of the Society, which is "to speak the truth in love ;" and we are confident that nothing was said in any hand-bill reflecting personally on the priests themselves, and nothing so bitter against them as she herself has written. One would imagine that the authoress would have appreciated even the temporal prosperity and neatness which in the following extract she describes, with evident approval, as characterizing a Protestant village in those parts ; and that she would have done all that lay in her power to help and cheer those who, amid much difficulty and opposition, such as the recent unprovoked attack on the Rev. H. Nevile Sherbrooke and Mr. Pakenham Law has

prominently brought to notice, were faithfully endeavouring to promote the religion which led to such beneficent results:—

Our course led us through a clean, prosperous, and almost English-looking village—not a pretty one, it is true, for Nature, as well as the art architectural, which is at a low ebb in Mayo, alike forbade that it should be so, but the small houses were both externally and internally clean and neat; more than one boasted of a small flower garden in front of the windows, which were of a fair size, and—no common occurrence in this land—capable of being opened. Take it altogether, no greater contrast could possibly present itself than that which was noticeable between this village, with its small church and white parsonage, its tidy children, and its general look of well-to-do-ness, and the typical Irish village with its clusters of hovels, grimy with the dirt of generations. The sole reason for the amazing contrast is simply this, that it is Protestant, and has been so, as the saying here is, "evermore."

The greater part of this book refers to the period antecedent to the passing of the Irish Church Act. The authoress remained in Ireland, however, some little time after it had been passed, and she speaks of it in the strongest terms of reprobation:—

Without entering at all into either the political or clerical merits of the question [she writes], it is sufficient to say that the Act was passed at a time when it *appeared* to the Roman Catholic hierarchy that fear of *them* and of what *they* might, in the way of mischief, be able to effect, lay at the bottom of the movement. The "people" themselves never felt the existence of the Protestant State Church, in their country, as a grievance, till they were hounded on to the fray by the priests, and eventually, by that pugnacious, ever restless body, were taught to believe that England found it necessary for her own safety to conciliate and grant benefits to Ireland.

The Church question is, however, confessedly secondary to the Land question, and towards the solution of this Mrs. Houstoun really offers no suggestion. Absenteeism is, in her eyes, the grand defect. Undoubtedly it is; but until the happy time comes when Irish landlords shall, as a rule, reside the greater part of the year among their own people, and the peasantry shall, of their own accord, throw off the priestly yoke, every attempt should be made to win them to the side of loyalty and order. One thing ought never to be done, and that is, to give way to fear. This Mrs. Houstoun strongly condemns; and yet this is the key to the sadness of the whole of her book. Very early in the narrative she and her husband went to an election with a pistol on the cushion of their phaeton; and, during the winter of 1870, "our weapons were ever either in our hands, or on the dining-table, on our beds, or on the 'car' cushions." "The sense of fear," she says a little further on, "one which in truth had latterly rarely slept within me, was stirred by the sounds I heard." She evidently lived in a chronic state of armed distrust and fear. This, we are convinced, is not the right state of feeling in which to live among an excitable and impulsive people like the Irish, who can be bright and brave, true and affectionate, loyal and devoted, when they are sincerely loved and thoroughly trusted.

Christ bearing Witness to Himself. The Donnellan Lectures for 1878–9. By the Rev. GEORGE A. CHADWICK, D.D., Chaplain to his Grace the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, Prebendary of Armagh Cathedral, and Rector of Armagh. Second Edition. Pp. 180. Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co.

ONE of the many interesting notes in this volnme gives a criticism on a certain anti-Christian poem, and at the conclusion of the note we observed the remark: "A poet, perhaps, needs not to be logical, but in that case he ought not to be theological." This remark occurred to us as we

read and read again some striking and suggestive passages in Dr. Chadwick's work. Dr. Chadwick combines the imagination and tenderness of a poet with the research, grip, and judgment of a theologian: he is eloquent, but he is logical, and at the same time deeply devout. There is a freshness in the style and treatment which attracts attention; and not a page will be found either commonplace or dull.

The work thoroughly corresponds to its title, and its argument is ably written from beginning to end. "There is no truth in Christianity," writes Dr. Chadwick, "unless the person of its Founder is great enough to be distinguished from all others, and his words and deeds as far above imitation as the Sermon on the Mount is above the Epistle to Abgarus. The present volume is an attempt to show that the same great Personality is visible in all the Gospels, and is self-consistent throughout every part of them. It assumes the amazing loftiness of the conception (for that is beyond question), and it proceeds to argue that this lofty conception is throughout so manifest and so vital, that ordinary culture and unbiassed judgment should everywhere identify the conception, and be conscious of the life in it." Again: "The four Gospels," writes Dr. Chadwick, "exhibit one coherent and vital conception, one and the same individuality, which is entirely and beautifully human, even when its works are supernatural." Again: "The minutest details of this life, confessedly so noble, are verified by delicate consistencies, exquisite unities, and harmonies of bearing." Miracles, parables, teaching, actions, all the events recorded, bring before us not only the loving-kindness of the Lord, not only "perfect goodness, but its refined methods—the subtle intuitions, the unerring sympathies, the small attentions," in short, a beautiful union of quick sympathy with sharp intelligence, resulting in perfect tact.

In illustration, Dr. Chadwick writes:—

When the paralytic lies before Him, Jesus understanding his gloomy memories and sense that his anguish is retributive, says "Thy sins are forgiven," before saying "Arise and walk."

When the woman with an issue of blood seeks a stealthy blessing, Jesus compels her to be frank; but, when she kneels trembling, He "instantly" reassures her with the tender words, "Daughter, be of good comfort."

When they tell Jairus that his daughter is dead, Jesus "straightway" on hearing the word spoken, says, "Be not afraid, only believe." Nor will He exclude the father and the mother from the chamber, though most of His own disciples may not enter; and when the wonder is wrought, it is He who remembers that her vitality, now active, has long been unsustained, and bids that something be given her to eat . . . . .

The feeding of the four thousand is inspired by thoughtfulness equal to its compassion, because they might faint by the way, since many came from far. And his tact provides against a dangerous rush by making the strong and rude men sit down by fifties on the grass, so that those are easily counted, while we know not the number of the women and children.

He sighs deeply while He says, "Ephphatha" to the dumb man.

He will not snatch away His bound hands to heal Malchus without the gentle courtesy "Suffer ye thus far," so that the only indulgence which He ever asks of his persecutors was indulgence in beneficence to themselves. When M. Renan pronounces this miracle to be "extremely useless" (p. 521) he betrays the failure of all his sentiment to instruct him that a miracle has other purposes than demonstration, and such as no syllogism could replace. Malchus would not have agreed with him.

But the most marvellous exhibition of Christ's power, we read, is the crowning evidence of His sensibility:—

The tenderest of all the Greeks, "Euripides the human," drew no fairer picture than the restoration by Heracles of the wife of Admetos from the grave. Yet the demigod spices for himself, with a little cruelty, the tamer bliss of his beneficence, forcing Alkestis unrecognized, and almost, as they

complain, by violence, into the house of mourning, telling her bereaved husband that the longing for a new bridal will relieve his woe, and playing so roughly with the wound he means to heal, that at last the cry is wrenched from the sufferer —"Silence! What have you said? I would not have believed it of you."

Contrast this Heracles, inwardly exulting in his secret, with Jesus, when the sisters weep for Lazarus. He weeps with them such tears as legend never invented; tears which myriads of mourners know to be most consolatory, most human, most divine. Twice he groans, and the word points to some consciousness of a hostile power to be confronted and overcome. His confident prayer arouses their despondent hearts, and He enlists their co-operation by commanding them to roll away the stone.

And when the great deed is done, when the loved and lost one is restored, at the point when the mighty art of Greece could find no better word for the lips of Heracles than the stupid, yet very natural, boast, "Thou wilt say, sometime, that the son of Jove is an admirable guest to entertain," then the guest of the house of Simon retains His calmness, scarcely seeming to think His miracle an exploit, but quick to observe the restraint and discomfort of the trammelled man, and to recall the bystanders from amazement and surmise to the little services of daily life: "Loose him and let him go."

Can it be that a story thus alive with genuine character, throbbing all over with human sympathies, was "a little of what we now call fraud," and that Jesus, for His part, "blended with it some small complaisance?" (Renan, p. 510).

There are many pungent criticisms on M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*. We had marked some of these for quotation; but we must content ourselves with the remark that to Renan, as to Strauss and Schenkel, Dr. Chadwick's "Christ bearing witness to Himself" is an admirable reply.

Short Notices.

Metlakahtla, and the North Pacific Mission of the Church Missionary Society. With a Map. Pp. 130. Seeley. 1880.

We heartily recommend this little book, a welcome addition to our store of missionary works. Three chapters are substantially a reprint of a pamphlet "Metlakahtla," published by the Church Missionary Society in the year 1868; almost all the rest is new matter. The narrative of a visit two years ago by Admiral Prevost, the beloved and revered originator of the Mission, is deeply interesting. Such narratives, we are persuaded, are the best answer to the majority of cavils and complaints.

The Possibility of Admitting the Laity to Confer with Convocation "Without any Disturbance of its Ancient Constitution." A Paper read at a Ruridecanal Conference of Clergy and Laity in the Council Chamber of the Guildhall, Bath, June 8th, 1880. By Prebendary Wood, Christ Church, Bath, Rural Dean. Pp. 16. Rivingtons. 1880.

An interesting Paper. The petition agreed upon at this Conference will be found in the Churchman, vol. ii. p. 396.

A Sermon preached in the Chapel of St. David's College, Lampeter, on the 24th June, 1880, when the Chapel was re-opened after it had been enlarged and beautified, in commemoration of the Jubilee of the College, which was celebrated on the 28th June, 1877, by Alfred Ollivant, D.D., Bishop of Llandaff, and formerly Vice-Principal of the College. Pp. 26. Rivingtons. 1880.

We have read this Sermon with interest and satisfaction. Fifty-three years ago, as we learn from a prefatory note, Dr. Ollivant preached at the consecration of the College Chapel; and the present sermon, printed at the request of the Principal and Professors of St. David's, opens thus:—

On the twenty-third day of August, 1827, a large assembly was gathered within these *walls*—I can no longer say within this *chapel*—to celebrate the consummation of a work which for many years had been a matter of anxious solicitude to the bishop, the clergy, and the laity of this diocese. On the first day of March, St. David's College had entered upon its important duties, and it will remain, we trust, for many centuries to come, a monument of the fatherly care and far-seeing wisdom of the venerable prelate to whom the diocese and the Church are mainly indebted for its existence.[1]

In speaking of the great advance which the Church has made of late years in many parts of Wales, the venerable Bishop quotes from an Article in THE CHURCHMAN on "The Church in Wales," by Canon Powell Jones.[2] The name of the author of the Article, says Bishop Ollivant, is sufficient guarantee for the correctness of his encouraging statements. His Lordship proceeds:—

While Welsh dissent has been giving manifold indications of its becoming rather an organization for the support of political than religious life, the Church has been more and more devoting her energies to the promotion of her Master's cause, and been growing in popularity on account of this increased activity in her proper work. We have still, indeed, a vast arrear of past indifference and carelessness to overcome. But with all this we see that the fields are white for the harvest. The Church is giving manifest proof of her inherent vitality. Zealous and faithful ministrations have succeeded to well-intended, but sometimes unauthorized proceedings, and are everywhere accepted with thankfulness and respect.

The Collects of the Day. An Exposition Critical and Devotional of the Collects appointed at the Communion, with preliminary Essays on their Structure, Sources, and General Character, and Appendices containing Expositions of the Discarded Collects of the First Prayer-Book of 1549, and of the Collects of Morning and Evening Prayer. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Dean of Norwich. Two vols. Rivingtons. 1880.

The characteristics of Dr. Goulburn's writings—especially their suggestiveness, scholarship, and spirituality—are well known. In the two attractive volumes before us every devout and loyal Churchman will find passages full of instruction. The ably-written exposition is devotional as well as critical. Here and there, as we have turned to some particular Collect, we have read with interest and satisfaction the commentary upon it. The pious and learned Dean shows everywhere a supreme reverence for the Word of God; but in his affectionate admiration of the Prayer-Book we are quite at one with him. Of the opening Collect the Latin is worth quoting:—

Deus, cui omne cor patet, et omnis voluntas loquitur, et quem nullum latet secretum; purifica per infusionem Sancti Spiritus cogitationes cordis nostri; ut te perfecte diligere, et digne laudare mereamur. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

The Bible Doctrine of Man. The Seventh Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By JOHN LAIDLAW, M.A., Minister of Free West Church, Aberdeen. Pp. 400. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879.

For those who are desirous of studying Biblical psychology this book will have much interest, probably, whether they agree or disagree with its argument. Mr. Laidlaw says:—

[1] Without the liberal assistance of the laity the topstone would never have been placed upon the building; but the noble sacrifice of the tenth of one year's income, made by himself and his poorly-endowed incumbents in aid of the object, is deserving of special remembrance, and ought never to be forgotten.—*Life of Bishop Burgess*, pp. 231, 312.

[2] THE CHURCHMAN, vol. ii. page 263.

The psychical man is man as Nature now constitutes him, and as sin has infected him. The spiritual man is man as grace has reconstituted him, and as God's Spirit dwells in him. The unrenewed man is "psychical, not having the spirit." [ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, Jude 19.] . . . . The Christian is to be sanctified wholly in his threefold life,—the physical life of the body, the individual life of the soul, the inner life of the spirit; which latter two become again the basis of the natural and of the regenerate life respectively.

The Pauline psychology, says Mr. Laidlaw, is not based upon "any school distinctions, Platonist, Philonian or Stoic." In an interesting appendix, he refers to the Platonic tripartition; τὸ λογοστικόν, τὸ θυμοειδές, τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, the rational, the irascible, and concupiscible; otherwise, ὁ λόγος, ὁ θυμός, αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι; (further, νοῦς, ψυχή, σῶμα). The latest Stoical philosopher, the Emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus, also speaks of body, soul, mind, with senses, affections, assertions (*decreta*). Philo's trichotomy is purely Platonic, says Mr. Laidlaw, and therefore differs essentially from St. Paul's. Concerning Mr. J. B. Heard's book, "The Tripartite Nature of Man," he says that any "value it possesses is lessened by the extravagance of the thesis which it seeks to maintain." Concerning such writers as "Ellicott, Alford, and Liddon, who fully recognise the importance of the trichotomic usage," he says that not one of them "has investigated its real meaning." They "adopt the mistaken interpretation that the distinction between soul and spirit, is that between a lower and a higher soul, and accordingly all of them lean towards the evident result of this theory, which is that Scripture is committed to the theory of a tripartite nature in man."

Truthfulness and Ritualism. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. Pp. 270. Burns & Oates. 1880.

This is a dull book. Mr. Shipley, who at length "went over"—one wondered why he did not go before—finds fault with Ritualists who are not Romanists. In particular, he challenges Dr. Littledale's recently published statements concerning Rome. As in reviewing Dr. Littledale we quoted two lines from Faber (CHURCHMAN, vol. ii. p. 71), we may give Mr. Shipley's reply. A Ritualist stated, in an answer to the Abbé Martin, that "the Roman Church has been deteriorating of late years into gross and puerile superstition, and allowing materialistic cults to be pushed forward by authority." The Ritualist pointed to the "silly heresy" of Father Faber's lines—

> With her babe in her arms, sure Mary will be,
> Sweet spouse of our Lady, our pleader with thee.

These lines were also quoted in Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome." Now, what does Mr. Shipley say? He says the quotation is not correct. Let us see. The hymn, entitled "The Patronage of St. Joseph," we read—

> Presupposes the presence of the author in company with the Blessed Virgin, St. Joseph, and the Holy Child. The poet reminds St. Joseph of the flight into Egypt; and recalls "the long dreary road, when Mary took turns with thee, bearing thy God." And then, by a poetic licence . . . . Faber, in the sixth stanza, sings thus:
>
> Ah! give me thy burden to bear for a while;
> Let me kiss His warm lips, and adore His sweet smile;
> With her babe in *my* arms, *surely* Mary will be,
> Sweet spouse of our Lady! *my* pleader with thee.

Admitting that the Ritualist critic, and Dr. Littledale in his "Plain Reasons," have incorrectly quoted the half-stanza, what then? Is the expression "silly heresy" at all too strong? Is the force of Dr. Littledale's chapter on the shocking cultus of St. Joseph in anywise weakened?

Echoes from a Village Church. By the Rev. FREDERICK HARPER, M.A., Vicar of Shalfleet. With Preface by Lieut.-Gen. Sir ARTHUR COTTON, K.C.S.I. Nisbet & Co.

We are pleased and by no means surprised to see a new, a cheap, edition of Mr. Harper's "Echoes from a Village Church," recently recommended in these columns. Abridged sermons, simple, but suggestive, and containing effective illustrations and apt quotations, they are very readable. A capital little gift-book, suitable for general distribution.

Is it Utopian? A Plea for the Evangelization of the Masses by Voluntary Lay Help. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Pp. 51. *Hand and Heart* Publishing Office.

Reprinted from that timely practical little book "Can Nothing be Done?" Mr. Bullock's "Plea" deserves a very wide circulation, and it will, we hope, stir up many Christian laymen. The spiritual destitution of the masses in our large towns as a rule is deplorable, and it calls for earnest and well-organized efforts. The Lay Diaconate might be—*would* be, we think—of great service; but the work of laymen in many ways is sorely needed. No subject is more important than the one Mr. Bullock brings before the Christian public with becoming zeal.

Flowers from the Garden of God, and other Addresses to Children. By the Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, M.A. Second Edition. Cassell, Petter and Galpin.

We are sorry that this excellent volume has not received an earlier notice in our columns. Seventeen addresses on interesting subjects, admirably worked out, supply a real treat for Sunday reading. Parents, Sunday-school teachers, and all who are specially interested in the religious instruction of children, will find this little book a treasure. The first address is on "The Rose of Sharon, and the Lily of the Valleys."

Memoir of the Hon. Mrs. Hay Paterson, of Mugdrum. By her Sister, CHARLOTTE OLIPHANT. Pp. 104. Hatchards. 1880.

We heartily recommend this little book. The friend of Mrs. Paterson who had promised to write a preface to this Memoir, was the Rev. Thomas Vores, Vicar of St. Mary's, Hastings.

The Witness of God against the Sin of Gathering in the Harvests of the Earth on the Lord's Day. Being a Sermon preached in Holy Trinity Church, Southwell, on Sunday, August 8, 1880, by ARTHUR CHARLES GARBETT, M.A., Incumbent. Southwell: J. Whittingham. 1880.

A thoughtful and vigorous sermon, with many valuable notes. We observe the statement that "Owen at great length (Ex. v. § 18-25), as well as Dwight (Ser. cvii.) and Edwards (Ser. xiv.), more briefly interpret Heb. iv. 9 (marg.) 10 of the weekly Christian Sabbath in its connection with the resurrection of Christ, and not (as is commonly done) of the future rest in heaven, of which from his use of the word 'Sabbatism,' the writer at least considered the earthly Sabbaths a type." The argument, says Mr. Garbett, "well deserves study, and is in part the same as that of the German commentator, Ebrard." We may add that this point was well worked out by Mr. Jenner in THE CHURCHMAN for January.

Evidence on the Closing of Public-Houses on Sunday. By E. WHITWELL, Esq. Pp. 45. Elliot Stock. 1880.

Mr. Whitwell is one of the Hon. Secretaries to the Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday. In the present pamphlet appears his evidence before the Lords' Committee, reprinted, verbatim from the Minutes, and contained in the Fourth Report. It is well worth reading.

In the *Christian Monthly and Family Treasury* (Nelson and Sons) appears a vigorous review, by Canon Clayton, of "a volume just published by certain Presbyterian ministers. The title of the book is "Scotch Sermons." The preface says these productions are a specimen of a style of teaching which increasingly prevails amongst the clergy of the Scottish Church. "If this is the case," says Canon Clayton, "I am very sorry indeed for the Scottish Church, as I am quite sure that such teaching, if universal, will soon drive all real religion out of Scotland. One of these Scotch divines," continues Canon Clayton, "boldly writes (p. 235):— 'Many of the conceptions entertained by the theologians of the past, in regard to the nature of human immortality, may seem to theologians of the present untenable. They may find it, in the light of modern science, impossible to believe in the resuscitation of the material framework of the body.' 'Theologians of the present' indeed!"

Mr. Murby's schoolbooks are well known. With *The Imperial Reader* series we are much pleased. Illustrated; printed in good type; capital readings, and questions. We have also received two copies of *The Young Artist*, a monthly instructor in drawing and design (T. Murby, 32, Bouverie Street, E.C.); wonderfully good and cheap.

THE MONTH.

GENERAL ROBERTS vindicated, as was expected, the supremacy of British rule in India. Leaving Cabul on the 9th of August, Sir Frederick reached Candahar, after a march of 350 miles, on the 31st; and after a day's rest he attacked and routed Ayoob Khan's army. Considering the difficulties, it was a magnificent march, daring, but justified by a brilliant success. The British loss was small. A prisoner, Lieutenant Maclaine, was murdered by his Afghan guard.

It has been once more decided that in England there is to be no Religious Census. The *Guardian*, which has recently published some Papers[1] upon the very imperfect inquiries of 1851, of which the Liberationists and other opponents of the Church have made so much use, remarks—

We are not surprised to see how much fierce indignation was recently expended in Parliament by the champions of Nonconformity over the proposal to add to the next Census paper a simple inquiry as to the reli-

---

[1] In the *Guardian*, Sept. 8, it is stated that of the Wesleyans (original connexion), Baptists, and Independents, the total number of registered chapels is 5,180, while the total number of their ministers fully engaged in pastoral charges is 5,209. "We can scarcely imagine that all other Nonconformist bodies put together could bring the number up to 10,000, while the Church in England and Wales has some 20,000 clergy engaged in active parochial and ministerial work." As to the Wesleyans, some of their leading representatives, with a frankness which does them honour, lately admitted, at the Conference, that the Church is greatly growing in numbers and influence.

gious denomination to which the members of each household professed adhesion—an inquiry which appears to create in other countries no dislike and no difficulty. In fact, it seems to us as if these orators, and especially Mr. Bright, desired to make up by vehemence of denunciation for the singular, and almost ludicrous, weakness of the objections which they had to advance.

Harvest Thanksgiving Services have been characterized, perhaps, with more than usual earnestness. In the Queen's Speech were these words :—

I acknowledge, with thankfulness to the Almighty, the happy continuance, during several weeks, of fine weather for securing a harvest which gives in many places a reasonable promise of abundance. I am thus enabled to anticipate both a further revival of trade and some addition to the revenue of the country for the year.

The Queen's Speech of the 7th, read by the Lord Chancellor, set Parliament free.[1] The Speech referred to the failure of the Porte to execute the plan agreed upon in regard to the Montenegro question, and to carry out provisions of the Berlin treaty. "Some valuable laws" have been added to the Statute-book :—

I refer particularly to your settlement of the long-contested questions relating to the subject of Burials, to the Education Act, and the Act for the better determining the Liability of Employers; and to these I would add the Act relating to Ground Game, the Repeal of the Malt Duty, the Savings Bank Act, and the Post Office Money Orders Act, and the measures for Bettering the Condition of Merchant Seamen and providing for the Safer Carriage of Grain Cargoes.

The action of the Education Department in regard to by-laws will produce, we hope, an excellent effect throughout the country.

Into the existence of corrupt practices in eight cities and boroughs Royal Commissions are to inquire. Mr. Beresford Hope had good grounds for pointing to the effect of the Ballot Act and the "Caucus" system in encouraging corruption.

Of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster many strong Tories, remembering his statesmanlike courage and consistency in regard to religious questions, have spoken with sincere respect. But by Whigs, as well as by Tories, Mr. Forster's remarks on the House of Lords were greatly regretted. Applauded by Radical members, and commended in Radical newspapers, they were afterwards explained by Lord Granville with apologetic grace and frankness.

The Burials Bill,[2] as returned from the House of Commons,

[1] The *Times* says that the session has not developed many new parliamentary reputations on either side. Lord Hartington has risen still further in public esteem for strength, good sense, and moderation.

[2] We gladly call attention to a valuable pamphlet, "The New Burials Act: what it does and what it does not do," by the Rev. A. T. Lee, LL.D., Secretary of the Church Defence Institution. Dr. Lee's conclud-

was accepted by the Upper House on the 3rd. It was understood that the Archbishop of York's and Lord Mount-Edgcumbe's amendments would not be carried; but a division took place upon the Archbishop's. The omission from the Bill of all mention of Convocation was accepted, and probably those who share Canon Trevor's opinion as to the Lower House of Canterbury are glad that upon this point the House of Commons had its way. The *John Bull* remarks:—"The Convocation clause we never cared for; its disappearance takes away all semblance of complicity on the part of the Church." The main substance, however, of the recommendations of Convocation has been adopted; a good step, at all events, in the way of Church Reform. The clause containing a provision as to a "*Christian*" service was maintained in the House of Commons by a large majority; and only by those who admit the asserted civil right of interment can the Act be blamed as illogical.

Concerning the Burials Act, in his recent Charge, the Archbishop of Canterbury said:—"I can scarcely doubt that as a body the Clergy will, on reflection, allow that a measure directly supported by at least one-half of the Episcopal Bench as necessary and right under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, and acquiesced in, however unwillingly, by the great majority of the Bishops as inevitable, cannot be so unwise and bad as some excited spirits have represented it. My own hope is that it will serve to strengthen the Church by removing a most painful cause of controversy, uniting with us more closely in death those whom unfortunate circumstances have alienated in their lifetime from the beneficent ministration of the Church of their fathers."

On the 19th, Bishop Ryle held the first ordination in the new See of Liverpool.

---

ing remarks are excellent:—"However ungrateful to the feelings of many Churchmen the provisions of this Act may be, however great a grievance it may appear to be in the eyes of many, it is earnestly to be hoped that now, notwithstanding many earnest protests, it has become law, Churchmen of all classes, whether clergy or laity, will submit, with patient dignity, to this unwelcome enactment, and not gratify their enemies by an unseemly and unavailing opposition unworthy alike of their duty as Christians and their position as law-abiding Englishmen." The words of the honoured Bishop of Lincoln, in the House of Lords, Sept. 3rd, were wise and weighty. "It was with great regret that he had heard that there was a determination on the part of some clergymen —they were very few in number—to resist the measure. He deeply regretted that such was the case. While a Bill was before the House it was the duty of all who took an interest in it to state their opinions frankly and firmly, but the case was different when the Bill became law, and he would advise the clergy to give to this law a true and loyal obedience."