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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1881.

ART. I.—MINISTERIAL PROGRESS.

"That, by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures, ye may wax riper and stronger in your ministry."—*Service for the Ordination of Priests.*

WE hear much in the present day of ministerial responsibility, ministerial efficiency (or non-efficiency), ministerial success, and the like. Important subjects, all. We believe the Church of God in these lands to be awake, and her officers share in the general awakening. The old race of idle, ignorant, incapable parsons has well nigh died out; specimens may be found here and there (we dare say the bishops could name a few), but they do not force themselves into notice; they probably feel that they are out of harmony with the age, that they ought almost to apologize for existing at all; they are very sorry, but it is too late for them to mend. The younger clergy, and very many we hope who are no longer young, are alive to the responsibilities of the sacred office: they may not always be clear in their doctrine, they may hover at times too wistfully round the fringe of fashionable life; but their conduct is morally blameless, and, in the main, they desire to discharge, according to their lights, the duties of their high calling. Hence the interest taken at ruri-decanal and clerical meetings, Church Congresses, and other gatherings, in subjects bearing upon the spiritual life, and the means of promoting ministerial efficiency and success: hence the higher tone which, largely through the teaching and influence of the clergy, prevails throughout the land.

We cannot be too thankful for these and other "tokens for good." The prophets of evil may tell us that the Church of England is moribund, but we do not believe them: we have heard the cry of "the Church in danger" too often to be much frightened at it; and as long as we can trace on all sides the quickening

pulses of spiritual life, and see clergy and laity combining together, as they have never done before, to stem the tide of evil and spread the message of salvation, we should be worse than cowards if we despaired of the future of our Church, or proved, as Churchmen, unfaithful to our trust.

But there is one aspect of ministerial responsibility which has not, we venture to think, received the attention which it deserves. Progress is recognized as an essential law of the spiritual life. Is it not equally a law of the ministerial life? Is a ministry true and effective if it be not progressive? Can we continually urge upon our people "that they go forward," if we do not go forward ourselves? We have no desire to dogmatize; but feeling deeply the importance of ministerial progress, we offer the following remarks upon it:—

I. First, we may probably take it for granted that some of our people will go forward in the Christian life, whether we do so or not. Inkermann was pre-eminently a soldiers' battle: the suddenness of the attack, the thickness of the atmosphere, the nature of the ground, combined to throw the soldiers upon their own resources; they fought the battle very much after their own fashion and won it. But according to the laws of war the soldier needs generalship and leading; and if in the English army the former sometimes fails him, the latter never. The English soldier is always grandly led.

We ministers of the Gospel are bound to lead our people onwards: but if we fail to do so they will advance by themselves. Our people are not so wholly dependent upon us as we may sometimes imagine. The educated have a large and instructive literature at their command: the uneducated have their Bibles at least; and the fervent oratory of the meeting-house is commonly within their reach. If the Christian is in earnest he will find the means of going forward, whether his pastor lead him in that direction or not. The complaint is sometimes made that the sheep wander; may it not be because they are not fed? They do not find at home the teaching which their souls thirst for, and they seek it elsewhere. The teaching which satisfied the formalist will not satisfy one who has tasted of the grace of God; and the elementary truths which first brought life and light to the soul will hardly afford sufficient nourishment to one who is longing to be made acquainted with "the whole counsel of God."

Some, then, at least of our people, and they the very pick of the flock, will advance in the spiritual life, even though we give them little or no assistance. We may help them forward if we will—they have a right to look for such help at our hands: but if we fail, the channels of grace are not dried up; God will assuredly complete "the work of his own hands."

II. But in what does ministerial progress consist? We believe that the basis of progress must be laid in the pastor's own soul. We assume conversion to have taken place, genuine whole-hearted consecration of heart and life to God. We assume the realization of a present salvation and the conscious enjoyment of God's forgiving love in Christ. We assume, in a word, that the foundations of personal religion have been well and securely laid in him. But if so, the spiritual life needs to be continually deepened and strengthened; the character requires to be built up; and if, as time passes, early convictions lose somewhat of their freshness, they should gain in force and solidity as the apprehension of divine truth becomes more definite and enlarged. "Take heed unto thyself;" "Be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus;" "Follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness"—are amongst the most prominent of St. Paul's counsels to Timothy; and they all point to the deepening of personal piety, and to the cultivation of the life of God in the pastor's own soul.

III. We understand, however, by ministerial progress, not so much that which the pastor shares with other Christians, as that which he should aim at as the Minister of Christ, and more especially in his public teaching.

Revelation itself has been progressive in its character, and the apprehension of revelation has in like manner been progressive. The Apostles themselves were "guided" (led as a traveller along an unknown way) by the Holy Spirit "into all the truth" (John xvi. 13), and it was only by slow degrees that they apprehended the full counsel of God. Nor, we conceive, does a different law prevail now. True we have before us in Scripture the full-orbed revelation of God, but it does not follow that we take in at a glance either its several parts or its harmonious proportions. Grant that there is great variety of doctrine: can each one claim to have made each doctrine his own? Grant that divine truth has been revealed in different proportions: are we sure that we hold each truth in the proportion assigned to it in Scripture? Grant that amidst much diversity there is perfect harmony: have we seized with a firm grasp the key to that harmony, and learned to walk securely through the labyrinth of truth? It requires only to ask such questions as these to convince us that we have much to learn, and that it is only as we advance into fuller and clearer light that we may hope to teach more completely "the counsel of God."

IV. It may be useful to illustrate these general statements by a few examples.

We are persuaded that no Christian minister can ever claim to have arrived at an absolutely perfect method of setting forth the Gospel of Christ and the terms of a sinner's

acceptance with God. We would lay full stress upon the importance of preaching the Law; we believe that as a rule the entrance of the Law is the true preparation for the acceptance of the Gospel: but it is in the preaching of the Gospel that the powers of the minister will be especially called forth. The author of "The Recreations of a Country Parson" has a chapter in one of his works "On the art of putting things;" and in nothing perhaps is this art so greatly needed as in presenting the terms of salvation to our hearers. Consider the variety of minds with which we have to deal—the ignorance, the prejudice, the error which exists amongst them; the natural indisposition of the human heart to receive the message of grace; and the conscious imperfection of the instrument by which that message is conveyed,—and then say whether it is as easy a thing to preach the Gospel as some seem to imagine. We are persuaded—nay, we are more and more persuaded as years roll on—that, whether in preaching to the educated or the uneducated, we need the utmost wisdom and skill in stating the terms of a sinner's acceptance with God, and in expounding the fulness, the freeness, and the all-sufficiency of the Gospel of Christ.

But where, it may be asked, is there room for progress in this department of our work? We answer, everywhere: in our delineation of sin, its nature and results; in our exposition of the eternal love of the Father, the redeeming work of the Son, and the quickening power of the Holy Spirit; in our enforcement of a present salvation, of the means by which the sinner obtains an interest in that salvation, and of the answers by which the objections and difficulties of the unbelieving heart are to be met. This, it may be said, is very old ground. Be it so: it does not follow that the most enlightened may not learn to see fundamental truth more clearly, and thus to make it more intelligible to his hearers. Take the one point of a free, present salvation. Do all who in the main preach the truth of God quite understand what that means? Do they proclaim it fully and fearlessly? Do they not sometimes so hedge it round with safeguards and conditions as virtually to deprive it of its freeness, and make it no present salvation at all? The human mind clings very tenaciously to the principles of legalism; the shadow of Mount Sinai is continually thrusting itself across the pathway of the Gospel,—and the very best men need to be re-established from time to time in the doctrines of grace.[1]

V. But passing from those fundamental doctrines, in our apprehension of which we believe progress to be possible, there

[1] See "Brief Thoughts on the Gospel" (Nisbet's), by an old writer: a short but admirable treatise on the terms of a sinner's acceptance with God.

is obviously a very wide range of truth throughout which progressive enlightenment is to be desired. Take, for example, the doctrine of the Church of Christ, its composition, its privileges, its security, and its end: study carefully such passages as John xvii.; Romans v. and viii.; Ephesians i., ii., and iii.; consider the sober but profound statements of the seventeenth Article of the Church of England; and then ask whether our teaching upon these points is always a faithful transcript of Holy Scripture, or whether there is not room for progress in this department of our work.

Prophecy again, fulfilled and unfulfilled, opens to us a wide field of investigation. Have we ever honestly entered upon it? It is strange to observe with what perfect contentment clergymen will announce that they have never studied prophecy; and almost take credit to themselves for having avoided the subject altogether. But can any portion of the Word of God be systematically neglected with impunity? Can we teach others the whole counsel of God, if we refuse to make ourselves acquainted with a very large portion of that counsel? The difficulty of a subject is no valid excuse for its neglect: God hath spoken, and it is for His ministers to try at least to understand His voice. These are only specimens of subjects in the apprehension and consequent unfolding of which ministerial progress may well be made.

VI. Once more, granting the possession of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of revealed truth, improvement is surely always possible in the method of exhibiting it. We do not now refer to the art of preaching, which is beside our present subject, but rather to the order, the proportions, and the relation to each other of the truths we preach. We assume that Christ and his salvation form the substance of all our teaching: we shall never travel far from that great centre: but whilst we ever keep within sight of the Cross, we have a very wide field of truth open to us, and we are bound to occupy it.

Several questions here suggest themselves to us for consideration. Is our teaching as a whole sufficiently systematic? Do we in the course of (say) a year present to our people a well-considered, well-proportioned body of sacred truth? Are there no serious gaps in our teaching, no undue prominence given to certain favourite truths, to the exclusion of others of equal and perhaps greater importance? Are we scripturally fearless in combining doctrine with practice, and practice with doctrine? do we aim at making our preaching practical? and are we careful to show that high doctrine demands a high and—if we may use the expression—a very minute morality?

Once more, are we skilful in adapting our teaching to the needs and circumstances of our hearers; not, indeed, assuming

that simple truth is not good for the learned, or profound truth beyond the reach of the unlearned; but remembering that a cultivated mind will be repelled by the slightest approach to vulgarity, and that the vocabulary of the uneducated is very limited indeed.

A careful scrutiny will probably reveal many defects in the modes and methods adopted by the most conscientious. The subject is a wide one. We have touched but a fragment of it. We have said, perhaps, enough to establish the truth of our thesis, and to show the value of a progressive ministry.

VII. It only remains to observe that ministerial progress very largely depends upon prayerful, continuous, systematic study of the whole body of revealed truth. It is our function not to reveal, but to expound; the substance of all our teaching is contained within the four corners of the inspired volume: we may travel far and wide for illustration and confirmation of the truth, but the Bible is our one textbook, and it is by "daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures" that we may hope to "wax riper and stronger in our ministry."

Progress is the watchword of the day: its footprints may be seen in every department of human knowledge: its traces are happily not wanting in the study and interpretation of the Word of God. Textual criticism has secured to us an almost perfect text;[1] whilst the labours of our Revisers have given a marvellous impulse to the study of the New Testament. Commentaries abound: and amid much that is so truly valuable, our difficulty lies chiefly in selection. May we venture to suggest that one secret of progress consists in mastering thoroughly whatever we attempt to learn? One Gospel carefully and exhaustively studied, shall yield more lasting fruit to ourselves and to our hearers than the cursory examination of many books. With Professor Westcott's and Mons. Godet's commentaries on St. John's Gospel in our hands, for example, supplemented by the careful compilation of Bishop Ryle, and the condensed exposition of Mr. Plummer, it is our own fault if we do not arrive at an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of that sublime work. It was the favourite motto of a great modern writer, that, "whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing well," a principle most truly applicable to the study of the Word of God. It is by such study that we wax riper and stronger in our ministry, that we are enabled to stand firm

[1] "If comparative trivialities . . . . are set aside, the words, in our opinion, still subject to doubt can hardly amount to more than a thousandth part of the whole New Testament. . . . . In the variety and fullness of the evidence on which it rests, the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachably alone among ancient prose writings."—WESTCOTT'S & HORT'S *New Testament*, p. 561.

ourselves, and to help others to stand firm also; it is by such study that we throw freshness and power into our teaching, the freshness which springs from the acquisition of knowledge, and the power which is derived from a clear apprehension and a vigorous grasp of truth.

E. BAYLEY.

ART. II.—THE CITY CHURCHES.

AMONG the many anomalies which strike the eye of the intelligent foreigner, who makes the manners and customs of English life his study, not the least is our national want of adaptability to a change of circumstances. Having once got into a groove, it seems as if we cannot get out of it. An "institution" remains so, and is regarded almost with veneration, long after the circumstances which called it into existence, and which indeed alone rendered it needful, have passed away. We seem to be somewhat deficient in the faculty which enables us to take note of the march of time; and we cling to the past not merely as a matter of sentiment and of reflection, but to an extent which materially cripples the energies of the present. The result is serious enough when it interferes with the welfare of large bodies of our fellow countrymen, whose interests are systematically sacrificed, because we fail to recognize accomplished facts, and prefer the ostrich-like expedient of wilful blindness, when we are desirous of shutting out an unpleasant object. No one, indeed, will accuse the present age of overmuch reverence for the opinions and habits of thought which characterized those periods which preceded it. Yet, in spite of a general tendency to change, if only for the sake of change, we constantly come across instances of obstinate tenacity, in quarters in which we should least have expected to find them. "Vested interests," of course, have much to do with the problem. But in this latter half of the nineteenth century, vested interests alone could not stay the hand of the reformer, if the whole case were thoroughly realized. It is this want, or rather slowness of perception, which forms part of our national character, and against which we require to be, from time to time, put upon our guard.

The difficulty which is experienced in dealing with the question of City churches is precisely a case in point. Few, but those to whom the subject has come home are aware of the utter waste of power involved in the existing state of things. Yet the abuse, for such it really is, has gone on in all its glaring proportions during the whole lifetime of the present generation.

We propose to give the leading facts of the case, and then to examine its bearings as they affect the interests of the Church in general, and of the metropolitan population in particular. Ample statistics are now at the disposal of any inquirer, drawn partly from the returns of the recent census, and partly from investigations which have been carried on at the instance of a private individual, and tabulated in the *St. James's Gazette*. The state of things which they disclose is not only a scandal in itself, but it is one which ought to be abated at the earliest possible moment.

The present population of the City is in round numbers 53,000. It has fallen to that figure from 76,000 in 1871, being a decrease of about 50 per cent. within the last decade. It may be added that the depletive process is likely to continue, from the same cause which is also steadily thinning the number of residents in Lincoln's Inn and the Temple. Space is becoming so valuable, and rents range so high, in these business localities, that it does not answer to sacrifice to the purposes of residence buildings which are so much more valuable as shops, offices, or warehouses. The time will probably come when the City will be deserted by all but those who are in charge of the valuable property contained within its borders. On Sunday even now it is very doubtful whether anyone who can possibly be spared remains within them, most of those who are still resident preferring other quarters of the town on that particular day, whether their object be that of attendance on public worship, or the less laudable one of simple self-amusement. The provision made by the Church for the spiritual needs of this comparatively scanty population is out of all proportion to its requirements. Within the City boundaries there are still sixty-one churches affording accommodation for 32,455 worshippers. Within the same area there are, including synagogues, twenty-one Nonconformist places of worship, with an estimated accommodation for over 17,000 persons. In other words, taking the places of worship of all denominations, room is provided for about 50,000 individuals out of a population the total of which falls short of 53,000. An ordinary parish is considered to be amply supplied with church accommodation if half its population can be seated. Deducting those who are too young and those who are too old to attend any religious service, the sick, and the requisite caretakers of young children and of houses, this proportion is found in practice to be adequate, even among what is termed a church-going population. Figures, however, prove abundantly that such an epithet would be most inappropriate if applied to the population of the City of London; by a census of the congregations throughout the City, taken on the morning of the 1st of May in the present year, startling facts are revealed. The 32,000 odd

sittings provided by the Church of England were occupied on that day by 6,731 individuals. Of these however 571 were officials and their families, 706 were choristers, and 227 almoners bound to attend the services as a condition of receiving their doles; this leaves a balance of 3,853 as the number of the ordinary worshippers. We may add that this balance would be reduced to 3,000 were school-children present at the service deducted from it. Nor can it be pleaded that an unusually large proportion of the City population are to be found among the attendants at Nonconformist places of worship. Of the congregations at the synagogues no census could of course be taken on a Sunday; the other sixteen places of worship had a total attendance of 4,400, reduced after the deduction of officials, choristers, and children to 3,373. The proportion of those present to the available sittings is undoubtedly larger than that which obtains in the churches. But the sum-total comes to a little over 11,000 souls in a population a little under 53,000. In nine churches the number of the general congregations varied from twenty-five persons in Allhallows, London Wall, to two at St. Nicholas Cole Abbey. Such facts speak for themselves.

Let us now turn to the endowments attached to the incumbencies of the City churches. These amount, if we take the returns of the *Clerical Directory* as our guide, to £41,814, or if we adopt the calculations of the *Clergy List*, to £36,385. It is, perhaps, needless to say that the stipends are often in an inverse ratio to the amount of the work to be done. There are evidences in the returns that exceptionally earnest and exceptionally able ministrations do attract, even within the City, respectable though not overflowing congregations; but there are not many men whose ministrations are of such a character who willingly accept City livings. There are traces, on the other hand, that some at least of the incumbents take a very different view of their duties. Many—we believe we might say, the majority—of them are non-resident; one usually resides at St. Leonard's, another at Canterbury, a third at Bath. Of the Canons of St. Paul's but one resides; a large proportion of the City churches may indeed now be said to be served on Sunday by the Underground Railway. No one can read the returns to which we have called attention without feeling convinced that the present and future spiritual needs of the City of London would be amply provided for by the retention of from six to ten of the existing ecclesiastical fabrics, with endowments amounting to one-fourth the sum now literally squandered upon ministrations to empty benches. The surplus which would thus be applicable to the needs of those who are now "perishing for lack of bread" would be largely increased if the sites of the disused churches could be sold, and the proceeds of the sale carried to the same account,

a point with which we shall have to deal further on. What now stares us in the face is the fact that Church accommodation in the City is at present ridiculously in excess of the requirements, that the number of clergy is also excessive, that many of them are underworked and overpaid, that, as a body, they do not reside among their congregations, and that in some instances they are little better than sinecurists. Nor can it be said that these evils are merely the result of a system of private patronage. There are but six private patrons within the City; the gross value of the preferments at their disposal being under £3,000 a year. Among the public patrons are to be found the names of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Bishop of London, the Deans and Chapters of St. Paul's, Westminster, and Canterbury, the Corporation of London, four of the great City companies, five colleges, and various bodies of trustees. Any defect accordingly in the system does not arise from that fertile source of evil, the barter of a cure of souls for a pecuniary consideration.

Let us turn now to the obverse side of the picture. North, south, and east of the City, with its numerous churches and ample endowments, lie districts covering many square miles of brick and mortar, inhabited by a population already dense, and becoming, in many instances, denser day by day, with scanty church accommodation, with no endowments worthy of the name, with populations too poor adequately to supply their own spiritual needs, and consequently in a chronic state of spiritual destitution. To what an extent this is the case may be gathered from the fact that there are whole districts at the East end of London in which the census returns do not disclose the name of a single domestic servant. This means that the whole population consists of families dependent upon the weekly earnings of one or more of their members. It is needless to say that under such circumstances they can have but little to spare from the daily household calls made upon such incomes, and certainly nothing that would be adequate to the maintenance of any decent form of religious worship. It must never be forgotten that in this respect a National Church stands, and always must stand, at a pecuniary disadvantage compared with the Nonconformist bodies. It is her special duty and privilege to care for those for whom no one else cares. Nonconformist congregations, although rarely wealthy, are still more rarely indigent. The "waifs and strays" of the population, the "hard bargains" of the ministerial life, the poor in the strictest sense of the word, are, and ought to be, the peculiar province of Church work and Church superintendence. Upon the City such districts as those we have named have a special and an undeniable claim for assistance. Many of the toilers who crowd the alleys which

branch out of the Old Kent Road, who are huddled together in Bethnal Green and Spitalfields, who have populated whole districts at Hackney and Islington, if they do not actually earn their daily bread within the sound of Bow Bells, spend their lives in the production of commodities which find their market in the City of London, or in ministering indirectly to the material wants of those who do spend their lives there. Many of them, again, have actually been driven out of its limited area, in which they could have carried on their humble callings with far greater profit and convenience to themselves, by the ever-increasing exigencies of our modern commerce, which yearly demands the surrender of fresh space at the hands of our labouring poor. Some of them are compelled to go still further afield, and to seek at New Cross or in Shaftesbury Park that suitable and wholesome accommodation which can be obtained nearer to their work only at a cost which their earnings do not allow them to meet. We doubt whether the enormous displacement of the population which has taken place within the last twenty years, has ever been fully estimated by those who have not given special attention to the subject. Certain it is that the managers of the Bishop of London's Fund have found this amongst the most difficult of all the many difficult problems with which they have been called upon to grapple. There is now within the bills of mortality a population of about 3,000,000, increasing, we believe, at an average rate of some 40,000 a year. If this be so, at least ten new churches should be built, and a fresh endowment of £4,000 a year provided, giving to each new district 4,000 parishioners, with the moderate provision of £400 a year to meet the out-goings for spiritual ministrations and for the necessary repairs of the fabrics. We need not say that the greatest difficulty is experienced in keeping the supply abreast of the demand, and that the difficulty is felt most where the line of demarcation is drawn most sharply between districts inhabited by the rich and those which are monopolized perforce by the poor. In the former, even if the endowment be small, a willing congregation can largely supplement it, either by private contributions or by a weekly offertory. In the latter no such means or appliances are available. Indeed, the shoe probably pinches more tightly here than in the matter of raising funds for church-building purposes. There are hundreds of well-meaning persons who will contribute liberally towards the erection of a church, in which, so to speak, they have a visible return for their money, from whom not a sixpence can be extracted towards the permanent support of an incumbent, who cannot live upon air, yet without whose ministrations the church itself is useless. It is one of the foibles of the age that money can almost always be obtained by persistent begging for the

completion of any edifice, however costly and ornate, while solicitations are in vain for the at least equally important object of securing for those who cannot afford to obtain it for themselves the inestimable blessing of a resident and adequately remunerated pastor.

The broad facts of the case are accordingly these. There is within the metropolitan area a large admitted amount of spiritual destitution for which no adequate provision has as yet been made, or, to judge by the urgent appeals constantly made on behalf of the Bishop of London's Fund, seems likely to be speedily made. Meantime, the City, with a population steadily decreasing, possesses sites and endowments which would probably suffice for the ecclesiastical requirements of some fifty new parishes, with an aggregate population of, say, 400,000 souls. Common sense would certainly point out that, under such circumstances, means should be found to redress so glaring an anomaly. Of course, there is something to be said on the other side. There are many worthy people, whose feelings deserve consideration, to whom the removal even of a useless church and the sale of its site seems little less than an act of sacrilege. There are some, even among the City churches, which deserve preservation on the ground of their architectural merits. It is true that few, if any, of them can be proved to have survived the Great Fire of London, and that the majority date from a period not very famous for beauty either of form or shape. But we do not deny the existence of fabrics which, on antiquarian grounds, it would be desirable to preserve, even if their endowments were diverted to other purposes. This, however, is a matter of detail for which it would not be difficult to provide. The main point at issue, as has been well stated by a contemporary, is that "it is clear that the provision now made is far in excess of the requirements; that such excess, like the fatal superabundance of the old City Churches, produces actual mischief; and that, meanwhile, there are districts, for which the Bishop of London's Fund pleads every year, starved in respect of parochial resources." In other words, at present churches are multiplied where they are not needed, congregations are recruited by methods which demoralize those who are thus enlisted, while the officiating clergy are many of them themselves demoralized by want of adequate work, and by the deadening process which always attends the performance of duties of a purely perfunctory character. Value is not, and cannot be, given in return for the stipends received, while within a few miles services are demanded of others for which a mere pittance is offered as an equivalent. *Labor ipse voluptas* is a motto which speaks the language of a noble and ennobling creed. But even if the contrast exercises no deleterious influence upon the exertions of those who are

actually engaged in the work, it is otherwise with the public at large. They, at all events, see clearly the absurdity and unfairness of perpetuating such a state of things, nor are they drawn closer to the Church of England by its continuance.

It was considerations of this character which led to the passing, in the year 1860, of the Act which was intended to facilitate the union of City benefices. That Act has, therefore, now attained its majority, and we venture to hope that rarely indeed has any enactment been so barren of beneficial results. By a return made to the House of Commons in the year 1879, it would appear that ten churches only had then been pulled down under the Union of Benefices Act, to which we believe an eleventh has since been added. Even so the proceeds of the sales of nine only of the sites have amounted to a sum little short of £80,000, giving us a tolerably correct idea of what might have been accomplished had the provisions of the Act been carried out in a more vigorous and comprehensive manner. Of this sum, and of the endowments, a large proportion would appear to have been retained within the boundaries of the City, by appropriation to the purposes of the united benefices, created by the demolition of the old fabric, and the consolidation of the two parishes. What remained would seem to have been appropriated fairly enough to the spiritual needs of destitute parishes. But when we find among the items such figures as that of "£4,000 towards defraying the cost of a vestry and muniment-room for St. Dionis Backchurch," we shall not be at a loss to guess how easily any surplus melts away under the influence of local interests. The difficulties in the working of the Act have been on various occasions brought to the notice of both Houses of Parliament. A Committee of the House of Commons has, we believe, investigated the matter upon more than one occasion. In 1871 the whole question was referred to a Committee of the House of Lords, presided over by the late Lord Chelmsford. Much valuable evidence was taken, that given by the Rev. Michael Gibbs being specially noteworthy for the fulness and clearness of the information conveyed in it. Beyond, however, a report couched in general terms, no practical step resulted from the inquiries made. Later still, in the session which has just ended, a motion was made for the issue of a Royal Commission to take the whole subject into consideration. Many of the figures to which we have referred were quoted in support of that motion, which was ultimately withdrawn by its proposer at the suggestion of the leaders of the House on both sides, that what was really needed was not so much inquiry as further legislation.

It is, indeed, self-evident to anyone who will take the trouble to compare the large provisions of the Act of 1860 with the scant results which have been achieved under it, that this is the

gist of the whole matter. At present, four consents are necessary for every proposal to unite the two benefices—that of the Bishop of the diocese, of the patron, of the incumbent, and last, but by no means least, of the vestries of the two parishes. The result is an almost certain disagreement at the outset between the parties interested, and an amount of preliminary correspondence the bulk of which would startle a novice in such matters. Time is wasted, temper is tried, efforts are made, often to no useful purpose whatsoever. So long as the Act remains of a purely permissive character, it seems likely also to continue nearly a dead letter. The eleven schemes which have been successful represent a very much larger number of failures, owing to the obstacles which have been placed in the way. As matters stand at present, they are practically at a deadlock. No one cares to take the initiative with a certainty before him of endless trouble and vexation, and something more than an uncertainty of a successful issue. The diocesan, who ought to be the mover in such attempts, becomes fairly overwhelmed by a task which interferes so seriously with other legitimate calls upon his attention. The patron cannot be expected to take the labouring oar in a matter in which he is probably the least interested of the four parties concerned. The incumbent naturally shrinks from embroiling himself in the controversy which is sure to arise upon the details of the scheme. Finally, the vestries are only too apt to consult what they regard as their own interests, the conclusion at which they ultimately arrive being usually to throw as many difficulties as possible in the way of any scheme which may be proposed. Meanwhile, the interests of the Church at large grievously suffer.

Quicquid delirant reges, plectuntur achivi.

It is high time that an end should be put to this maze of circumlocution. Lord Granville's suggestion in the House of Lords during the last debate on the subject deserves attention as being at once feasible and practical. He pointed out that the question was one rather within the province of the Episcopal Bench than within that of the Administration. He virtually pledged the Government to the support of any well-considered measure, the object of which should be to deal effectually with approved anomaly. We believe that he hit the right nail upon the head. What is really required is an amendment of the Act of 1860, simplifying the mode of procedure, dispensing under proper limitations with the numerous consents now necessary, and providing a self-adjusting machinery for the carrying out of the Act. Vested interests must of course be respected. Subject to these certain broad principles of action should be laid down which would render consolidation imperative where a waste of

ecclesiastical power was found after due inquiry to exist. We are quite aware that in some quarters such a proposal will be stigmatized as almost revolutionary in its character. That an important change would have been introduced into the present method of dealing with ecclesiastical abuses we freely admit; the question, however, is whether the time has not now come for such a change, and whether it can be much longer delayed without serious injury to the best interests of the Church. "Come over and help us," is the cry which grows louder and louder from the over-taxed and under-paid clergy who are responsible for the spiritual superintendence of the populous suburban parishes. Is the answer to that appeal to be a simple "Non possumus," when the means for responding in a very different manner are actually at hand, if we have but the courage and the will to grasp them? We say nothing of the terrible responsibility involved in depriving those of religious ordinances to whom it is in our power to extend them. That branch of the subject is too fertile a theme for the limits of our present purpose. We put it as a simple question of urgent need upon the one hand, and of wanton, we might almost say, scandalous, waste upon the other. Difficult as the task may be of dealing with an abuse of long-standing, it is seldom that a reformer has to face an evil at once so notorious and of which the remedy is so self-apparent. We have endeavoured to point out the extent of the mischief, the effects of it upon the interest of the Church at large, the injuries which it inflicts alike upon clergy and congregations, the difficulties which at present stand in the way of a cure, and the mode in which those difficulties may be removed. We believe that an effort should be made to deal with them, and that such an effort, if well directed, would be successful. At all events, it ought to be made, and it cannot be made too early. Little favourable as the present times may seem to be for projects of Church Reform, it is hardly credible that Parliament would refuse the powers necessary to put an end to a state of things which while indefensible on its merits, offers no reasonable battle-ground for a contest between Churchmen and Nonconformists. The facts of the case are only too fully before us. They need neither further investigation nor a protracted discussion; all that is required is the simplification of an existing Act of Parliament, and the moulding of its provisions so as to render them compulsory, rather than permissive, in their operation.

MIDLETON.

ART. III.—CHURCHMEN AND THE OPIUM TRADE.

SUCH was (in effect) the subject discussed at the Newcastle Church Congress last month. Many doubted the wisdom of introducing such a subject before such an audience. They feared that it would hardly be considered at present a burning question by Churchmen; although on the other hand the fear could not be suppressed that if England and the Church of England fail to make it speedily a burning question, the fair fame of England and the very energies of the Church itself may be withered by the smouldering plague.

The event proved that the Subjects Committee had acted wisely in venturing on the experiment. There were counter-attractions, many and strong, at the very hour fixed for the Anti-Opium Meeting. The great Town Hall Meeting to discuss Church work in the Durham Diocese compelled the absence from the Anti-Opium discussion of that warm advocate of the cause, Bishop Lightfoot. Nevertheless, the Section-room was well filled by a large number of attentive and sympathetic listeners when the hour arrived. The name of Sir Bartle Frere ("one of the best of men," as Lord Shaftesbury so truly and fearlessly calls him) doubtless attracted many; and some left the room when Sir Bartle's unavoidable absence was announced; but the interest of the subject itself sufficed to keep together the greater proportion of the audience to the very close.

The effect produced by Sir Bartle Frere's paper (read in his absence by Canon Martin) was shown by the prominent notice taken of this discussion the next morning by most of the daily papers. It was a striking phenomenon, which could not be ignored, to find that a distinguished statesman, ruler, and financier, like Sir Bartle Frere, should, with the calm though sad confidence of truth, charge England with all the shame and all the crime in this opium business that the most perfervid opponents of the trade have ever ventured to allege. "We have repeatedly gone to war, and caused enormous damage to the Chinese nation; . . . . and, as victors in these wars, we have failed in our duty, as of one nation towards another, in our dealings with the Chinese as to this matter of opium." It was equally striking to find that Sir Bartle Frere refused to be appalled by the finance panic; believing that the Indian Government might "speedily withdraw from all direct connection with the manufacture and sale of opium, without real financial risk."

Not less phenomenal was the meeting held at the Mansion House a fortnight later. The Indo-Chinese opium trade seemed condemned and doomed as well when four such men as the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Mayor of London, the Earl

of Shaftesbury, and Cardinal Manning, stood side by side, and, with consentient voices, denounced this trade.

And the conclusion is a fair one—that a question which unites such different elements in so unanimous a protest cannot possibly be dismissed with a mere sneer at "sentimental morality."[1] There *must* be some grievous wrong-doing to account for the phenomenon. It was this consideration, no doubt, which led the Rev. H. Scott Holland, in the opening sentences of his very thoughtful and elaborate paper, to deny, almost with scorn, the necessity for an examination into the merits of the question. "We are no longer discussing and disputing, attacking and apologizing; we are facing what we *know* to be a dismal tale of perilous injustice." But unfortunately everyone is not so well informed as Mr. Scott Holland; and great numbers of Churchmen know nothing at all of the subject. Denunciation, based upon assumption, even when assumption in the mind of the denouncer is based on facts, will not carry much weight with the critical and ill-informed listener, because a counter-assumption is possible for such a critic, and he may argue thus: "If it be assumed that the loud protest now raised against the opium trade proves from its unanimity and fervour that the trade must be bad and immoral, on the other hand it may be equally fair to assume that the very fact of the long life of the trade under the English flag seems to suggest that there *must* be another side to the question, and that some justification for the traffic must exist or have existed." The remark with which the discussion at Newcastle was opened may be accepted, therefore, as correct—namely, "that those who have studied the history of the opium trade, and are acquainted with the arguments urged in its defence, can alone join intelligently in the attack which is now daily gathering force in England." And the practical suggestions with which the first paper closed were surely pertinent—namely (1), that the clergy should master this subject for themselves; and (2) that they should carefully and persistently draw the attention of their people to the subject.

An historical review cannot be attempted within the limits of this brief paper; but we may point out a few landmarks in the dismal tale, the intervals between which may be filled in by examination of the now considerable anti-opium literature.

I. It is well to remember that 120 years ago the opium trade with China, at that time in the hands of the Portuguese, was insignificant, and sufficient only for medicinal purposes, consisting of 200 chests annually, instead of the 80,000 of the present day.

[1] See "Report of the Debate in the House of Commons, April 29, 1881," p. 20; published for the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade.

II. For at least sixty years—viz., from 1799–1860, it was a distinctly *illegal traffic:* and was carried on (though known to be such) under the control and direct superintendence of the East India Company. The flag of England floated over contraband goods, and the thunder of her guns was ready to awake in protection of smugglers.

III. In the year 1860, after two disastrous wars, opium was legalized by China, and admitted under the new tariff rules.

IV. For twenty-one years now the trade has been expanding, and the growth of the poppy in China has been rapidly extending. But the Chinese Government have shown unmistakably their continued hostility to the trade on at least four important and critical occasions since the Treaty of T'ientsin, October 24, 1865.

As a brief summary of the positions taken up by the defenders of the trade, we may mention :—

I. That the *honesty* of the Chinese has been doubted from the very first. Forty years ago, when Lord Shaftesbury raised that protest which, from the same lips is ringing still against the trade, Lord Palmerston made light of the Chinese wish for a "poppy monopoly." But if such a protectionist idea were truly the cause of their opposition, one is inclined to ask why the Chinese have never gone to war in defence of Chinese cotton fabrics against the invasion of Manchester goods? Why have they never declared lucifer matches contraband in jealous anxiety for the old trade in flints? Why not ensure by all the force at their command the junk interest against the inroads of steam? The fact is that no Chinese statesman could afford to ignore the moral sense of the nation, which condemns opium smoking as a vice and a crime; a point of the first importance in this discussion, and one which Bishop Burdon tersely expressed in his forcible summing-up of the debate at Newcastle. "A Chinaman," he said, "never touches his opium pipe without shame." The only Chinese advocate, so far as I am aware, who has ever defended the trade in opium, was the well-known Heu Nai-tsze, President of the Sacrificial Court, who in the year 1837 memorialized his Imperial Master in favour of the legalization of the Opium Traffic, on the very ground adopted by many English advocates of the present day—namely, that many luxuries are deadly in the excess, but that because of that excess it would be wrong to deprive the temperate of their enjoyment. Yet even he denounces the practice of opium-smoking as "*a bad practice; a path leading to the utter waste of time and destruction of property*"; and he petitioned that the ruling classes—the *literati*, that is—and the army, "be absolutely prohibited from its use."

The leading statesmen who were contemporary with Heu

Nai-tsze, almost unanimously recommended *death* as the punishment for persistent opium-smoking.

Further, supposing that the evidence with reference to the cultivation of the poppy and the smoking of opium in Western China for many centuries should turn out after all to be correct, yet, even so, Chinese honesty would not be seriously damaged. For Western China is not Eastern China; and surely a charitable, if not an obvious, conclusion from these facts would be that the Emperor Tao Kwang, knowing something of the injury wrought in his western dominions by opium, desired to protect the eastern seaboard from the plague, a desire in which he was thwarted by the action of Christian England. Mr. James Cropper, M.P. for Kendal, did good service at the Congress in drawing attention to the action of the British Government in Burmah, where, yielding to the earnest petition of influential natives, they have closed two-thirds of the opium shops. And the charge of dishonesty against China comes with ill grace from the lips of English statesmen, who, whilst admitting that opium is "*almost an unmitigated misfortune*" everywhere but in China, refuse to believe Chinese protestations that it is an unmitigated misfortune in their own borders, and for fiscal reasons catch at any despairing argument in defence of the trade.

II. We are told that it is now *too late* to attempt any remedy for an acknowledged evil: (1) Because (in Mr. Scott Holland's words) "the habits that we have fostered in the Chinese have become ineradicable." (2) Because the Chinese find already poppy-cultivation too lucrative to be given up; and will feel this all the more if England withholds the Indian supply. (3) Because the revenues from opium sale and taxation are too profitable for both the Indian and Chinese exchequers to be abandoned without serious financial collapse.

But, in reply, I may remark (*a*) that the great object of England and of English Churchmen should be not so much to cure the Chinese of the vice of opium smoking as to rid Christian England of the long shame of pandering to this vice. And though the path of penitence and reformation is (as Mr. Scott Holland forcibly pointed out) hard to traverse, yet a distinct national return to uprightness and morality may, "by the pitifulness of God's great mercy," aid the Chinese in the contest with this moral plague, although, alas! our hundred years of wrong-doing have assisted to "tie and bind them with the chains" of the sin. (*b*) Should the Indian trade be formally abolished, or gradually diminished, it will be only fair to ask the Chinese Government to enter into a stipulation such as that suggested in 1839 by Commissioner Lin. "We," said he in his celebrated letter to the Queen, "We in this land will forbid the use" (and now must be added, the cultivation) "of opium, and

you in the countries under your dominion will forbid its manufacture."[1] (*c*) To touch in a word or two on the Anglo-Indian side only of the financial question: observe, *first*, that if the Indian Government adopt Sir Bartle Frere's suggestion, and, abandoning the monopoly, "assimilate the practice in Eastern India, to that actually existing in Western and Central India;" taxing, that is, the opium of private speculators, but not engaging in the trade as an eager principal, then, in all probability, there will be no great loss to the Indian exchequer for some time to come. *Secondly*, that the 700,000 acres now monopolized by the poppy will not be turned into desert land if that crop be uprooted. Sugar cane is said to clear sometimes eighty rupees per beegah as compared with the twenty rupees cleared on an average by opium. The tree mallow also has been suggested as a profitable substitute. And, *thirdly*, should the opium trade be *suppressed* (and we must confess to a feeling of strong sympathy with Cardinal Manning in his dread of governmental surrender of the monopoly if that implies the uncontrolled license given to private speculators to push the trade)[2] —if it be suppressed and opium smoking in China be eradicated, it will imply the setting free of some £25,000,000 now spent on opium, foreign and native,[3] for the purchase of foreign manufactures and the general development of trade. And, *lastly*, observe (in Mr. Holland's words) that "to get rid of the poison we must lose something; we must risk some damage." "Who ever expected that penitence for an old sin would be an easy affair?" And if England must provide £60,000,000 to enable India to bear the strain, it will not be more, in proportion to her present wealth, than the £20,000,000 given fifty years ago to abolish the slave trade.

The people of England, no doubt, must be *educated* before such self-sacrifice can be even suggested. And this task of awakening the conscience of the nation is committed, by God's providence, largely to the hands of the clergy of the Church of England.

Is there no reparation to be offered to China for the wrongs which Lord Elgin (who knew, if any man knew, the subject he wrote on) deplored in his letters with almost passionate indignation? "I am sure," he writes, "that in our relations with these Chinese we have acted *scandalously*." "This *abominable* East; abominable, I mean, because strewed all over with the records of our violence and fraud, and disregard of right."

---

[1] *Chinese Repository*, vol. viii. pp. 11 and 497–593, quoted in "The Opium Question," a pamphlet published by the Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade. See also Sir Bartle Frere's Paper.

[2] See Sir Edward Fry's warning on this subject, *Friend of China* for November, p. 407.

[3] *Friend of China*, October, p. 394.

Lastly, shall not Churchmen be strongly swayed by the Archbishop of Canterbury's words, "I have, after very serious consideration, come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when we ought most distinctly to state our opinion that the course at present pursued by the Government in relation to this matter is one which ought to be abandoned at *all costs?*"

A. E. MOULE.

ART. IV.—THE PRESENT ASPECT OF THE RITUAL STRUGGLE.

IT is proverbially hard for the actual combatants to gain any general notion of the battle in which they are engaged. Whether or not we consider ourselves combatants in the hot contest now raging around us, we cannot avoid being involved more or less in its confusion. We cannot choose but hear the noise of the strife dinning in our ears, and, as Churchmen, there are few of us who can withhold the keen interest which the gravity of the crisis is worthy to inspire. But what is near always seems great, as compared with what is far off, and so the very height of the prevailing excitement only makes it more difficult to stand quietly aside, and, viewing the *mêlée*, as it were from without, to endeavour to compare the past with the present, to note the changes which late events have made, and to strive to ascertain whither the tide of battle is sweeping us. But although it may be hard, there is surely no more useful or needful work for each of us individually to perform, if we would restrain ourselves from being betrayed into an extravagance not less hurtful to our own souls than to the Church of which we are members. History will supply many instances of contests undertaken perhaps for the sake of great principles, but so conducted that the real issue has been soon forgotten. Men and parties who began to contend for the truth have been found in the end to be only fighting for victory, and so nothing but loss and sorrow has ensued to the cause sought to be defended. It is with the hope of preventing any such disaster amongst those who are now contending for the principles of the Reformation, that an attempt to grasp the present situation is recommended. Let us consider some of its leading features.

The first thing that strikes us is *the fact of a crisis.* If we look back for a little more than twelve months we shall perceive an entire change in this respect. No doubt the relations of different parties in the Church towards one another were strained, and the attitude of the Ritualistic clergy was extremely embarrassing to the Bishops, but still matters could not be

called urgent. The result of the appeal to the law on the questions at issue between the Ritualists and Protestant Churchmen was pretty clearly appreciated on both sides. The Ecclesiastical Courts had on the whole decided against Ritualism, and the Ritualists had as a body decided against the Ecclesiastical Courts—that is, they had elected to retain their peculiarities of ceremonial, notwithstanding their illegality, and in defiance of the Courts. Men shook their heads, and said it was too bad; but meanwhile what used ten years ago to be regarded as astounding innovations were becoming established in every large town and in many country neighbourhoods, and gradually Ritualism was gliding into a position where it could claim the prescriptive rights which come of long possession. So little did affairs seem to be approaching an acute stage that some of the wisest amongst our spiritual rulers could speak of things as "settling down." The Archbishop of Canterbury, for instance, in his last Visitation, held in August, 1880, thus expressed himself:—

> I am thankful to say that I believe the agitations of the past years are subsiding, and that our Church may now soon be allowed to brace itself with undivided energy to the great conflict of these latter days. . . . I trust we are coming, *if we have not already come*, to the end of our late unhappy divisions within our own Church.

We do not quote these words for the ungracious purpose of exposing an error in foresight, but to show what, in the opinion of a very sagacious observer with admirable opportunities of ascertaining the truth, was the tendency of events a year ago. For our own part, we feel confident that had no new force intervened to push the ritual question into a new channel, the extreme party would have speedily turned a position already strong into one quite impregnable. But a new force did intervene. On the 30th of October, 1880, the Rev. T. Pelham Dale was committed to prison for his contempt of the Court of Arches, in disregarding the monition and inhibition of Lord Penzance. It would be foreign to our purpose to discuss the policy which prompted this step. We neither impugn it nor defend it. We merely chronicle the event as the beginning of a new phase of the ritual controversy. It was closely followed by the imprisonment, for similar reasons, of the Rev. R. W. Enraght, and the initiation of the proceedings which, a few months later, culminated in the Rev. S. F. Green's confinement in Lancaster Castle. The circumstances, which were much the same in all these cases, should be borne in mind. In each the suit was of long standing; in each the accused clergyman had, after trial, been found guilty of the use of the Mass vestments and the employment of certain ceremonies which had likewise been declared illegal by the Judicial

Committee. With the solitary exception of Mr. Tooth, whose imprisonment was but short, and ultimately led to his retirement from his living, no clergyman who had been the subject of a ritual prosecution had experienced this extreme result of contumacy. Some, like Mr. Ridsdale, had, after a stout opposition, surrendered; while others, like Mr. Mackonochie, successfully defied the sentences of the spiritual courts. It was principally the spectacle of triumphant lawlessness presented by the latter clergyman, and the failure of an attempt to deal with him by deprivation, which raised a considerable clamour amongst the supporters of the Church Association that the prosecutors should not any longer suffer themselves to be "played with" by the other side. Accordingly the Council suddenly adopted what seemed to outsiders a new policy. It cannot be condemned for want of vigour. Two clergymen were promptly lodged in prison, a third was launched on the road thither, and a fourth was sentenced to deprivation. At once a change passed over the surface of Church affairs. The Ritualistic party were up in arms. The English Church Union plied every means at its disposal to foment agitation. The *Church Times* rang with furious denunciations of its enemies, while, in its largest type, it invoked the prayers of its readers for the clergy "in prison for conscience' sake." It was natural that in such quarters the imprisoned clergy should be regarded as martyrs, and the Church Association as their cruel, malicious persecutors; and it was equally natural that the leaders of the party should seek to turn to its advantage events in many respects so suitable for their purpose. All parties were profoundly moved by an occurrence so startling in the nineteenth century, though it would have been considered exceedingly commonplace in the sixteenth. The secular press discussed the matter with lively interest, and the *Times* kept a special column for the details of Mr. Dale's prison diet and occupations. In a word, we had arrived at a crisis of no small urgency. Every one turned to the bishops. English Churchmen have for centuries exercised a peculiar right with regard to the bishops. If anything goes wrong in the streets of London, if a horse runs away with a cart, or a thief with a pocket-handkerchief, or a fire breaks out, or a passer-by chances to fall into a fit, we all of us indignantly ask one another, "Where are the police?" So in Church matters. It is a settled practice that in ordinary times the bishops should be blamed for whatever is amiss, while in a crisis they are not only held responsible for its occurrence, but are expected to devise a remedy and, harder still, to procure its adoption. In this instance a mild palliative, a dilatory remedy, was the only one ready to hand, and the bishops—first in Convocation and then in Parliament—asked for a Royal Commission to consider the constitution and working

of the Ecclesiastical Courts under the Reformation statutes. Meanwhile Messrs. Dale and Enraght were released from prison, owing to the omission of a formal step in the proceedings. Mr. Green had not yet arrived at Lancaster Castle.

All sides on the whole concurred in the appointment of the Commission. It had been loudly and confidently asserted by the extreme High Church clergy that the present Church courts were founded in open and utter contravention of the principles which guided the Reformers. Hundreds of honest and earnest men conscientiously believed this. The question is not one the answer to which is patent and obvious; it depends upon historical facts and inferences, not particularly familiar to most of us. It is surely worth while then to have all the light which the deliberations and investigations of such a body as a Royal Commission can throw upon the subject. The action of the Bishops, therefore, approved itself to the public mind. It had another result, which, it is not too much to say, was intended. It tided over the crisis, and postponed the taking of any definite step to a future time which at any rate *may* be a calmer one. *An attitude of waiting* was thus produced which seems to be another of the peculiar features of the present state of things. It is conceded that no change ought to be made until the Commission has reported (1) as to the constitutional status of the Courts, and (2) as to the working of their procedure. But there is still a general feeling that, when the Commission has reported, something must be done. The crisis which the imprisonment of Mr. Dale created a year ago has not subsided. It can scarcely be said to be in abeyance, for the temporary tranquillity which might perhaps have been the result of the pendency of the Commission has been prevented by the imprisonment of Mr. Green. It is then to the future that it will be well to turn our attention. What is the inclination of public opinion as to Ritualism? It is hardly necessary to say that this disposition, whatever it be, supposing it to continue, will greatly influence, if it does not altogether control, the policy of our rulers. Barren speculation as to future legislation would be plainly outside our subject—the present aspect of the Ritual struggle; but the bent of public opinion is as plainly within it, and its influence on legislation is therefore referred to, to remind the reader of the extraordinary importance of taking due account of this factor of the problem.

There are two matters which, because they are, as it were, for the moment in the same line of vision, one behind the other, it is easy to confound, so as to regard them as one and the same. Yet they are widely different. The status of the Courts and the toleration of Ritualism have only an accidental and, so to speak, an apparent connection. This is a fact which ought to be

very clearly perceived by Protestant Churchmen. There is a considerable and important section of public opinion strongly opposed to the attack of the Ritualistic clergy upon the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts, which would yet favour such a change of the law as would render it unnecessary for these clergymen to indulge in contumacy. The position that the law must, at all hazards, be upheld, is perfectly consistent with an inclination so to alter the law as to render conflict with it unlikely. It is true that the present phase of the struggle with Ritualism is as to the status of the Courts; but in measuring the strength and noticing the direction of the forces in action around us, we may dismiss this part of the question with but slight notice. The subject of the Courts is being carefully sifted by the Royal Commission, and it may well be left for the present in their hands. Without venturing to prophesy, we may be permitted to express a tolerably firm conviction that the outcome of the inquiry will be the vindication of the *constitution*, and the condemnation of the *working* of the Ecclesiastical Courts. History is, after all, a book open to all men alike. It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that the results to which many impartial minds have been separately led, indicate with general correctness the direction in which the collective judgment of the Commissioners, employing the same materials, will tend.

But while historical research seems to vindicate the constitutional status of the Church Courts, it requires nothing more than a memory reaching back a few years to demonstrate the futility of their procedure. It would be foreign to our object to enter into detail on this subject, but we advert to it for the purpose of referring to another symptom of the present crisis. The assiduity with which the extreme party have plied the advantages they possessed by being subject to a system effete and worn out in every part, has been carried too far. No doubt they occupied an advantage of considerable tactical value when they were able to say to the Church Association, "You must either leave us alone, or put us in prison!" But when they found that their opponents were resolved on the latter course, they pushed one clergyman after another into a position of reckless contumacy, until they overshot their mark. Intent on exciting popular sympathy, they have raised a feeling of disgust that it should be possible to use the law so as to discredit it. The consequence is that, while it is certain the Commission will report that the system of ecclesiastical penalties needs reform, *public opinion has anticipated it, and has already by its voice substituted for the clumsy expedient of endless imprisonment, what Dr. Pusey, filled with wrath, calls the "guillotine of deprivation."* Lord Beauchamp's Bill, which last session passed the

House of Lords, will, probably, next year become law. This, at any rate, is a practical improvement which the imprisonments are likely to occasion.

But a graver issue lies behind. As we have said, the real issue is not the status of the Courts, but the toleration of Ritualism. Now, as to this the imprisonments have had an important bearing. They have not only given an urgency to the matter, which it did not previously possess, but they have defined and narrowed the issue, so that it is possible to indicate with confidence the crucial point of the contest. The key of the ritual position is the ceremonial of the Mass. The subtleties of language and the numberless shades of divergence in theological opinion have made it wellnigh impossible to meet the Ritualistic clergy, as a party, on the question of Eucharistic doctrine. But the Mass vestments and their accessories are things obvious, distinct, and tangible. There is a sharp line of distinction between these vestments and the plain robes which the English clergy have used for three centuries. On the other hand, the similarity of the revived vestments to the vestments of the Romish Church is a matter of eyesight as to which argument is simply out of place. To most persons alb, chasuble, tunicle, and cope are mere words conveying no picture to the mind, but let any who are not personally familiar with the appearance of Ritualistic clergymen when celebrating the Eucharist, convince themselves of the truth of what we say by turning to recent numbers of the *Graphic*,[1] where accurate illustrations will be found of these dresses. Now, the bare and simple question which recent events have forced us to face, and the answer to which is, we may depend on it, being silently formulated in the public mind while we await the Report of the Commission, is just this:—Whether we shall make a great change in the basis of the Church of England, and admit the Mass vestments together with what they mean, or whether we shall stand firm on the old restricted anti-Romish basis and risk the dangers of a large secession from our Communion. We have said that toleration of the vestments means admission of what they symbolize, and we say this deliberately, without forgetting the earnest and, no doubt, sincere disclaimers of many who now, for the sake of peace, are clamouring for toleration. We hear, indeed, of various ingenious, almost feminine, schemes for giving and withholding at the same time. "Let us," says one, "allow the Edwardian vestments, but put a notice in the Prayer Book to say that we mean nothing by them." "Let us," says another, "have a Eucharistic vestment, but not any of the present ones, so that the connection with mediæval superstition may, at any rate, be

[1] March 5, 1881. March 12, 1881.

severed." We may envy the simplicity, but we cannot in honesty commend the common sense, of those who advocate such lame makeshifts. Suppose you permit the Mass vestments. They have a history of nine or ten centuries. Their symbolical meaning is stamped and burnt into the mind of the civilized world in such a manner that it cannot be wiped out. The Church of Rome still uses them and proclaims their symbolism, and those who have introduced them amongst us equally avow their symbolical character as the proper accompaniment of the Mass. Is it to be believed that the weekly and daily presentation of a gorgeous ritual especially framed to teach to the eye the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, will be neutralized and counteracted by the deft insertion in some corner of our Prayer Book of an italicized rubric full of Protestant professions! We may judge of the reasonableness of this proposal by imagining the President of the French Republic adopting the crown and sceptre of royalty, and all the other trappings which the world associates with monarchy, and asking the people to consent to these outward changes on the strength of his promise, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, to remain true to the Republic. We leave our readers to conjecture the measure of "toleration" which would be accorded to such a project.

Again, it is most difficult to see how the invention of some new garment, which neither Protestants nor Ritualists desire or approve—the former because they want no vestments, the latter because they want their own and none others—can satisfy either party. Moreover, the adoption of a special vestment of any kind for the Eucharist will be regarded by very many as an innovation so serious as to imply a practical surrender of the Protestant theory of the Lord's Supper. Let us, at any rate, be candid. If the vestments are to be admitted, we shall thereby so widen the limits of the Church of England as to make it clear that henceforth the Romish doctrine, with its appropriate ritual, and (to put the case strongly) the Zwinglian doctrine, with its appropriate ritual, will occupy an equally acknowledged place within our Communion. We do not say that such a state of things is inconceivable, but it is idle to conceal the fact that its inauguration will mark a change in the constitution of the Church far graver and deeper than any which has passed over her since the Reformation. It is scarcely accurate to say that such a revolution would undo the Reformation. The work of the Reformers would still exist, but under new conditions. Before the Reformation, the Church of England was Romish and anathematized Protestantism. After the Reformation, until now, the Church of England has been Protestant and has anathematized Romanism. It is now proposed that the Church should cease

to anathematize either religion, and that all, whether Protestants or Romanists, who care to remain in her fold, shall be free to do so. We have entered rather more fully into the meaning of toleration than the symmetry of this paper would warrant, because we desire to make clear what is comprehended in this word as applied to the present state of things. We now return to our task of noting the prominent features of the time. We are dealing with public opinion.

It would be affectation to deny that the pressure of the imprisonments has brought into prominence, if it has not created a *considerable feeling in favour of toleration amongst the High Church clergy.* It is very noticeable that the Five Deans' memorial, which boldly asked for a *modus vivendi* for Ritualism, received more than 4,000 signatures. Over and above the Ritualistic clergy it must be admitted that many names appeared in that document which would not have been found there ten or even five years ago. Again, the marked increase of clerical support which the English Church Union has recently received is a fact not to be lost sight of. Altogether there would seem to be a decided tendency on the part of the High Church clergy to lend a helping hand to the extreme party. But even more ominous are the utterances of some of the rulers of the Church. Thus, the Dean of Durham (one of the Church Courts Commissioners) at the Newcastle Church Congress defended the permissive use of Eucharistic vestments on the ground that a cope is required by the canons to be worn in cathedrals when Holy Communion is administered. He considered this an admission that the Church intended to mark with special dignity this sacrament. We will not stop to inquire into the merits of the argument. The cope has never been a Eucharistic, but a Choral vestment, implying authority, and its use being confined to cathedrals, would seem to show that it was intended to mark the dignity of these central churches rather than to add to the solemnity of a service which is surely equally sacred wherever celebrated. The point, however, for notice is, that the subject being the "Permissible Limits of Ritual," the Dean considered the Mass vestments within those limits. Again, the Bishop of Winchester, in a letter in which his Lordship declined to be present at a meeting to express sympathy with Mr. Green, thus wrote :—

I certainly do most deeply deplore the imprisonment of Mr. Green, and disapprove, moreover, of the prosecution of clergymen for ritual offences—at all events, except in the most extreme cases; for I think that the National Church, being a true portion of the Church Catholic, ought to be wide in its comprehension and tolerant of much diversity in thought and practice.

It is true, the Bishop goes on to state his disapproval of Mr. Green's contumacy, as distinguished from his Ritualism; but, having regard to the occasion that called forth these words, it is difficult to read them otherwise than as a declaration in favour of toleration of the Mass vestments. That such expressions are novel in Episcopal utterances will be apparent to those who will take the trouble to examine documents. Compare, for instance, this letter with the words used by Archbishop Longley in February, 1866 (in reply to a memorial from the English Church Union) :—

> I cannot but feel that those who have violated a compromise and settlement which has existed for 300 years, and are introducing vestments and ceremonies of very doubtful legality, are really, though I am quite sure unconsciously, doing the work of the worst enemies of the Church.

The contrast is all the stronger when we remember that Archbishop Longley wrote thus before the Purchas and Ridsdale judgments had declared the vestments to be illegal. We are quite aware that this is but one side of the picture. We have not forgotten that, if five deans and 4,000 clergy pleaded for toleration of the Mass vestments, ten deans and nearly 4,000 clergy petitioned against it. Bishops, too, have spoken out manfully and firmly against Romish innovations. For an example we need only refer to the primary Charge of the Bishop of Liverpool, which has recently excited so much attention. Such of the Diocesan Conferences as have been held have not, viewed as a whole, been favourable to the claims of the Ritualistic clergy; and the same may be said of the Newcastle Church Congress. Yet, after making all due allowance for these contrary symptoms, there remains an impression that the tendency to tolerate the high Ritual of the Romanizing party is more openly expressed, if not more widely diffused, than formerly, amongst the clergy of all orders. With regard to the great body of the laity, there is but little evidence to guide us. The efforts to release the imprisoned clergymen are no safe guide, because sympathy with suffering will account for much of the support given. Yet, even taking the memorials, petitions, and meetings got up for the purpose of securing the release of Mr. Dale, and now of Mr. Green, as a criterion, they seem to show that the Ritualistic party have failed to enlist the laity on the side of Ritual toleration. Those who sign the petitions and attend the meetings are, it is plain, for the most part already enthusiastic supporters of the cause, and their numbers are the reverse of imposing.

It is, no doubt, the fear of wholesale secession which inclines so many towards toleration. The Ritualistic clergy are bent on

fighting their battle with absolute recklessness of consequences. They will have toleration or disruption. Many seem willing to escape the latter by conceding the former. But it must not be lost sight of, that the Evangelical party, both clergy and laity, feel very strongly in this matter of Ritual toleration. Holding the views which they have always held as to the deadly character of Romish error, they cannot do otherwise. At present, they have shown unshaken loyalty to the Church of England, and it may be regarded as certain that they will continue to do so as long as she retains her sound exclusive Protestant foundation. But it would be hazardous to attempt to speculate what would be the effect upon earnest Protestant Churchmen of the legalization of the Mass vestments and all which they imply. In proof that there is already *a murmur which, if the tendency to toleration should develop itself, will undoubtedly rise into a cry of portentous power*, we quote words used by one of the speakers at the late Church Association Conference:—

> They must tell the Episcopal Bench that the time had arrived when they must make their choice between two opposing systems; that if they wished to have the Mass, they must give up the Gospel; and if they wished to have the Gospel, they must give up the Mass. In other words, if they wished to retain the sons of the Reformation in the Church of England, they must give up the enemies of the Reformation; and if they wished to keep the friends of the Church of Rome, they must give up the friends of the Reformation.

We note this as a nascent, not a prominent, feature of the present time. It is as yet but the little cloud, the size of a man's hand; but it is none the less certain that, under conceivable circumstances, it might become a great storm.

To sum up what has been said. The present position of things seems to be one of crisis, which, however, is deferred for a short time while the Royal Commission is deliberating. But when this interval has elapsed it will have to be decided whether a *quasi*-Romish Ritual shall be admitted or expelled from the Church of England. There can be little doubt that the public mind is gradually being made up on some aspects of this momentous issue. While as to the *status* of the Courts, the public awaits the guidance of the Commission, it has already wellnigh determined that obstinate disobedience to the Queen's Ecclesiastical Courts *de facto* must be visited with a total exclusion from preferment, instead of a penalty so incongruous as imprisonment. But, on the main question of Ritual toleration, there would appear to be in some quarters a strong inclination to escape the evils of a violent conflict by the still heavier disaster of concession to Romish superstition. To what extent this tendency will prevail, we cannot tell; but when we look around, and try to measure the strength

of the defences which still guard the Protestant purity of our Church, it is not a little alarming to notice how comparatively few and weak those defences are. The Protestant prejudices of the multitude may be cajoled and overcome; the anti-Romish instinct of the House of Commons may give way before the self-will of a powerful Minister; accumulated difficulties may drive the bishops into a false step, and so one after another of the fortifications may crumble and fall. But there still remains one buttress—the great body of Evangelical clergy and laity—on which, as we trust, reliance may be placed. Upon their staunch fidelity to the principles which gave them their party name, and upon the wisdom and unanimity of their combined action, depend in no slight degree the safety of our Reformed Church and her unscathed deliverance from the fierce ordeal which it has pleased the Great Head of the Church that she should undergo.

LEWIS T. DIBDIN.

ART. V.—"HER MAJESTY'S PRISONS."

Her Majesty's Prisons: their Effects and Defects. By ONE WHO HAS TRIED THEM. Two vols. Sampson Low & Co.

IN writing this narrative, says the Preface, the author has been desirous of exposing the ill-treatment and petty tyranny existing in some of our prisons, and, at the same time, of pointing out what appeared to him the weak points in the present system of conducting local prisons. Putting all personal considerations on one side, he has desired to set down "the simple and *exact* truth." It will be admitted, without question, that he has "spoken out plainly." To admit that his allegations are well-founded is another matter.[1]

Why, where, or for what he was arrested, he says, "matters not to the reader." Having been committed for trial, he was sent to the county gaol; and there he stayed for some three weeks.

All the arrangements for unconvicted men, he states, are infinitely worse than for the duly convicted prisoners. Now, inasmuch as about twenty per cent. of the men sent for trial are

[1] Some of his stories are serious in the extreme. He charges certain prison officials with dishonesty, gross neglect of duty, and brutal ill-treatment. His language about magistrates seems to us rash as well as rough.

The narrative relates only to two of "Her Majesty's Prisons," county gaols. It differs materially, therefore, from such books as "Five Years' Penal Servitude."

acquitted, this condition of things, taking for granted that his statements are correct, is very hard on the twenty per cent. To take, in illustration, a single point. The exercising of the men awaiting trial, he says, "consisted of a daily march of from a quarter of an hour to twenty minutes round the wretched little airing-ground." Talking was not permitted.

The author describes his first walk and his introduction to the chaplain in the following words :—

In about a quarter of an hour Johns told me it was time to go in, as he had work to do; so up I went to my cell again, looking in at the various cell doors as I passed with curiosity. Each door had a card, fitted into a little tin frame in the centre of the door, containing the prisoner's age, name, trade, and religion, and sentence, and above it a larger card, showing what work he was employed on and the number of marks he had earned since his conviction. My dinner to-day consisted of three-quarters of a pint of a thick kind of pea-soup, with one small lump of fat and several strips of cabbage leaf floating about in it (it was not so nasty as it looked, and I managed to eat some of it); six ounces of potatoes, consisting of one fair-sized potato and a half; and a tiny roll of sawdust bread. The soup was served in a small circular pint tin, and this was covered by a larger oblong-shaped tin, which fitted down into it, keeping the soup hot, and preventing it being spilled—the upper tin serving also as a receptacle for the potatoes and bread. I had read my paper through and through, and was considering what on earth I could do to kill the time, when my door was jumped open in the usual sudden manner, and the warder said, "The chaplain come to visit you."

I got up, and as I did so the chaplain entered. He was a short, slight, gentlemanly looking man, apparently between fifty and sixty years of age, his clean-shaved, deeply-lined face giving him a priestly and, at first sight, rather unpleasant appearance; but when one had time to study his face a little, and saw the kind, earnest eye, and the broad, clever forehead, and felt all the fascination of the sweet smile that would at times play round the mobile mouth and light up the whole face, all idea of its being a disagreeable countenance quickly passed away, and one felt irresistibly drawn to this good old man. And he was in every sense of the word a good man, far older than he appeared (he was, I believe, over seventy), with twenty-five years' experience of prisons and prisoners and, what was of far greater importance, a thorough knowledge of the world. Many a man looks back with heartfelt gratitude to the earnest, kindly sympathy of the good old chaplain. An extremely High Churchman, he had the misfortune to be placed where Dissent was rife, and the majority of the civil prisoners Nonconformists of some sect or the other, the consequence being that he was far too much inclined to preach up forms and ceremonies than simple faith in Christ, Dissent being to him like a red rag to a bull. It was the one great mistake he made, and caused many to pay far less attention to his teaching and advice than they otherwise would have done. He had also an unhappy knack of think-

ing that every prisoner committed for trial was guilty of the offence with which he was charged; and I well remember how, on his first visit to me, he stirred up everything that was bad in my nature, and left me thoroughly irritated and annoyed with him and everybody else, kind and courteous though he was in everything that he said and did during the interview. I mention this, as it was the first and last time that the chaplain ever did annoy me. In all his future visits he cheered and helped me more than words can tell, and I consider it a great proof of his wonderful knowledge of character and fitness for his post that this should have been the case. He came into my cell with a quick, nervous step, and, prison-cell though it was, doffed his hat with a quiet, unostentatious courtesy that I thoroughly appreciated.

"I have to visit all persons sent here for trial," he said. "I regret exceedingly to see a man in your position in such a place as this."

As he said this he laid a large book on my little table, and, producing a pen and ink, informed me that he should have to trouble me to tell him my Christian name, age, profession, &c., in fact, all information that I had already supplied to "Old Bob," as the Government, for some unknown reason, requires the chaplain to keep this special register, and obtain all this information for himself, when, if the necessary orders were only given, it might all be obtained from the prison register, and copied in for the chaplain by the schoolmaster. This would be in every respect a far better arrangement, as the chaplain would then know, before going to visit a man, something of his past life, and be able to consider what line of argument to use with him. A prison chaplain has a great deal to do, and if he does his work conscientiously, more even than he can well make time for, and this, I believe, is the principal reason why the Commissioners insist upon the chaplains keeping these registers for themselves; for it is a well-known fact that the more a man has to do in the prison service, the more he will be given to do.

Our interview lasted some twenty minutes, and, before leaving, the chaplain informed me that I was entitled to the use of any books in the prison library, and promised to send me up the catalogue, so that I might choose what books I should like. "You will, however," he continued, "find our library a very, very poor one, and I am afraid it mostly consists of elementary reading-books and childish stories; but if there are any books in my private library that you would like to have, I shall be happy to lend them to you."

I thanked him heartily for this offer, and, after a few more earnest, kindly words, he left, and I was once more thrown upon my own resources. The chaplain was as good as his word, and shortly after his departure a warder told me that if I would put a pencil-mark against the names of the books I should like to have, the chaplain would see they were sent up to me. I soon found that the chaplain's description of the library was, alas! too true, the library consisting of only some 120 volumes, and far the greater number of these were the most awful rubbish. The only readable books in it seemed to be the *People's Magazine* (four volumes), White's "Natural History of Selborne," Paley's "Christian Evidences," "Robinson Crusoe,"

Lord's "Physiology," and three or four elementary scientific works by Tomlinson. However, it was Hobson's choice, and the only thing was to get what I could out of what there was. I eventually obtained a volume of the *People's Magazine*, and so got on pretty well, as I found it contained a good deal of interesting reading and a clever serial story. It seemed to me to be admirably suited for a prison library, as it was evidently written with a view of better educating the middle and lower classes; but it was not, I believe, sufficiently High Church in its views to suit the chaplain, and he would not allow any more volumes to be added to the library. They were really the only readable books in the library, and I afterwards discovered that they were in tremendous request.

At the second visit the chaplain brought some books from his private library. "He stopped and chatted with me," says our author, "for some time; and very mild and kindly he spoke." Again. "The chaplain frequently visited me during the three weeks I passed here, and long and seriously did the good old man speak to me on more than one occasion; it is with deep and earnest gratitude that I look back and remember his many kindnesses."

While Z—— prison, we read, was in the hands of the county authorities, it was about as bad as it could be. Now that the prison had come into the hands of the Government, a fresh governor had been appointed and a large number of new officers. To Z—— prison our author was sent from Xshire to await his trial at the assizes. With the governor he was much pleased. The governor "did his work in a quiet, gentlemanly way that won the respect of all:" he was strict, but kind, and just. There "was a wonderful difference in the discipline and general morale of the two prisons."[1] In the Xshire Prison the governor left "the supervision to his inferiors."

Sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour, the author was dressed in prison clothes and made subject to all the regulations for convicted prisoners. Of these rules he complains that some are vague, while others—binding on the officials—are disregarded.

Concerning punishment, which may be inflicted either with a cat-o'-nine-tails or a birch, as the magistrates may direct, he writes thus:—

---

[1] The chaplain in the Z—— gaol came drifting into my cell with a helpless kind of air, and after considerable hesitation asked, "What is your name?" I told him.

"You belong to the Church of England?"

"Yes," I answered.

"You will be defended, I presume?"

"Oh, yes," I said; though what on earth this had to do with his previous question, I could not make out. . . . . He was not, however, the regular chaplain.

Flogging ought, I am sure, only to be used as a last resource, and I think strict orders ought to be sent round to the different visiting committees to be exceedingly chary of inflicting this punishment. There are, no doubt, some brutes in human shape to whom you can appeal in no other way, but it is very rarely that you find them ir prisons; they usually go to the penal establishments, having previously graduated in various gaols till they are reduced to the brutalized state I have mentioned above. In stating this I am not speaking rashly or thoughtlessly, but because I know that in the present prison system there are many rules and regulations—or, rather, I should say that there are many abuses, the results of the manner in which the present regulations are carried out—that simply tend to crush all hope and better feelings out of the man, and until this is seen and appreciated by the higher authorities, all hopes of reforming the criminal are useless.

Much depends upon the warders:[1]—

The reformation of the criminal is now theoretically, and ought to (and must in future) be in reality, the one great object of our prison system. Men come into our prisons, as a rule, young in years and still more generally young in vice, and there is the opportunity of scotching at the outset the rank, pernicious growth of evil, and sowing the good seed that shall hereafter bear fruit an hundred-fold. The prison chaplain is, of course, a great power for good or evil in this way; but greater, far greater, in reality, is the power of the individual warder under whose care the man is placed. If the warder works with the chaplain, the latter can do an immensity of good; if he pulls against him, the chaplain can do little or nothing. By the warder working with the chaplain, I mean if he treats the prisoner kindly, patiently, and straightforwardly, and speaks when he has the opportunity a quiet word in season; and there ought to be special permission given to every one to do this, as otherwise some chaplains get cranky and order the warders "to mind their own business, and let them mind theirs."

There are at present in some of our prisons warders performing their daily duties, and quietly and unostentatiously doing an amount of good of which it is impossible to foresee results—of which we shall never see the result—till that last day when God shall reward "every man according to his works." If, on the contrary, a warder bullies, swears, and illtreats the prisoners, all the worst passions are brought into play, the man becomes reckless and desperate, and all the efforts of the chaplain naturally fail; for remember the warder sees the man every day, and all day, while the chaplain sees him perhaps once in two months.[2]

[1] Under the Government scale the pay of chief warder has been considerably increased. At the first-class prisons the chief warders get £150 per annum, and a house and uniform. At Xshire Prison (rated as second class) the salary begins at £100.

[2] There are various ways in which prisoners are imposed upon, he says, that might be entirely prevented if the authorities would plainly state in the regulations what the prisoner's punishment was to consist

About the services on Sunday in the gaol chapel, the writer of the work before us makes some sensible suggestions. When there is no organized choir, he says, the singing will be chiefly noticeable for its noise and the determined manner in which time and tune are alike disregarded. "Imagine between three and four hundred men and some fifty or sixty women shut up day by day, week after week, and forbidden, under the severest pains and penalties, to open their lips, and then, twice every seventh day, being permitted to shout as loud as they please for some five or six minutes: you can then form some conception of the noise that was made and the temptation there was to make it." "With a good choir the shouting tendency could be kept within bounds."

The deputy-chaplain, previously described as inoffensive-looking and unfitted for such a post, preached what must have been, if the description be at all exact, a singularly odd and inappropriate discourse:—

He read it from a little blue-covered tract (let it be mentioned in his favour that he made not the slightest attempt at concealment). . . . . It commenced with a weird description of a gloomy church and snow-covered grave-yard, with a realistic picture of glistening tombstones, skulls, and cross-bones. This opened the way for the appearance of a fearful ghost. . . . . There was no attempt at showing how the past might be redeemed—no hopes held out to the sorrowing penitent—all God's righteous judgment against persistent, impenitent sin was set forth in its coldest and most merciless light, while His attributes of love and the infinite mercy that forgives unto "seventy times seven" were never even hinted at. . . . . Fancy, then, the effect such a sermon was likely to have upon those to whom it was addressed; some of them in prison for the first time, and with broken, contrite hearts, touched to the quick with the terrible result of hasty impulses uncontrolled, sudden temptation weakly yielded to, and whose aching spirits longed and quivered for some message of loving mercy, some gentle, kindly word of encouragement for the future. Think what it was to those grown hardened in sin, and of the utter recklessness it would produce. Think what it was to those who had never before heard of God—and there were some to whom the Bible was an unknown book—and then wonder, as I did.

The chaplain of a prison, it is truly said, "wields an enormous power for good or evil." "The authorities ought to spare neither trouble nor expense in endeavouring to obtain competent men."[1]

---

of. At present the prisoner "is entirely at the mercy of any unscrupulous warder." The instance the author gives is, a warder keeping one particular man on the wheel longer than anybody else: when the ordinary change takes place, if the warder does not call out that man's number he has to stay on the wheel.

[1] "The remuneration, in such cases," says the author, "is exceedingly small, considering the nature of the work to be done. . . . . Here, at the

A "clever, earnest" man, doing his Master's work quietly, patiently, and in a spirit of self-sacrifice, "striving by all means in his power to win souls to God," may do great things.[1]

Sent back again to Xshire, the author describes his journey and reception :—

Once more I found myself in front of the gloomy portals of the Xshire Prison, and after the usual preliminary bell-ringing and parleying we were admitted by the gate porter. . . . . The schoolmaster produced the key of our handcuffs, and after opening them handed us formally over to the custody of the chief warder. . . . . Tired out by the journeying, I seated myself on the stool, and resting my arms upon the table wearily laid my head upon them, and tried vainly to conjecture how I should get through the twelve long months that lay before me. I had already done eight days of my sentence, for the time is calculated from the day the assizes commence, not from the day you are convicted. . . . . Still there were 358 days more to do (it was leap-year), and oh, what a time it seemed to look forward to! My meditations were interrupted by the sharp click of the trap-door, and turning round I saw a grinning face stuck in the aperture, while the small portion of red and grey cap that I was enabled to see told me that it was one of the prisoners who had managed somehow or other to unfasten my trap-door. After another introductory grin, the fellow said in a hurried whisper,—

"Hie, governor, have you got a bit of baccy?"

"I have not got any," I replied.

"Oh, all right," he answered; and after a moment's hesitation was commencing to ask me some further questions when, I suppose, the sound of some approaching footsteps warned him somebody was coming, for he hastily closed my trap and disappeared.

Old Bob was very kind to me that night. . . . . A little later on, Bob bustled into me again, and after placing a large mess-tin full of tea, and a huge piece of cake on the cell-shelf, turned towards me and after sundry winks, nods, and various expressive jerkings of his thumb over his shoulder towards the tea, hurried out. . . . . Feeling naturally very grateful to him, I commenced to put my gratitude into words, but I no sooner began to speak than he put up his hands in horror, and with a most impressive "hush—sh—sh" muttered, "Only going to forget them here by accident; swallow them up as quick as you can," and darted out of the door.

About seven o'clock the doctor arrived, and . . . was shown into my cell by Old Bob.

Z—— prison, I do not know what the salary was; but at the Xshire prison it was £225 per annum, and a house and garden. . . . . The best part of his mornings and afternoons were fully employed."

[1] "The Church chaplains," it is asserted, "are too much given to trying to proselytize Nonconformist prisoners." The "one weak point" of the Xshire prison chaplain, "an ultra-High Churchman," was his intolerance where Dissenters were concerned.

The doctor had evidently dined, and I fancied a slight unsteadiness of gait was perceptible as he entered the cell.

"Well, how are you getting on?" he asked.

"I am not very well, thank you," I answered.

"Oh, ah! to be sure—to be sure. Well, I shall be able to exempt you from first-class hard labour, as the state of your heart and chest precludes your being engaged in hard bodily labour. . . . . By the way," he continued, "Did they exempt you from first-class labour at Z——?"

"Why, certainly, sir," I replied. "Didn't you see from my medical papers that I had been exempted from hard labour, and ordered my bed, and milk and white bread?"

I could see from his face that he had never looked at my medical papers at all; but he said, "to be sure, to be sure. Well, you must try and get along as well as you can." And with this parting injunction he pulled himself together and shambled off.

Shortly after eight o'clock the bell rang for going to bed:—

A plank boarding, some six feet long by two feet and a half wide, raised about six inches from the ground by wooden trestles, was lying sideways across the wall, and brought home to my mind the unpleasant fact that the doctor had not after all made any order about my bed, and that I should be obliged to pass the night as best I could on this plank abomination . . . . I set to work to try and make the best bed I could with the sheets and blankets, retaining one blanket and the quilt as bedclothes, and making the best mattress I could out of the rest. There was a round wooden ledge at one end of the plank to do duty as a bolster, the government pillow, stuffed with cocoanut fibre, and about the size of a pincushion, being placed on this somewhat slippery shelf . . . The attempts at sleep were unavailing.

According to the county regulation, it seems, only men who have been previously convicted were obliged to sleep on a plank for the first twenty-eight days; a man in prison for the first time got his bed at once. Other sensible reforms introduced by the county authorities have been abolished by the Government.

One instruction given to the author by his warder was to keep his cell clean and tidy:[1]—

"The governor goes round every morning after breakfast to inspect the men and their cells, to see that everything is in its place at that time; and be sure you have your stock on, and your cap off, as the governor is very particular on these points . . . "You'll soon

[1] The Governor's pet inquiry was made the subject of the following doggerel, which was repeated to each new-comer by prisoners:—

"Your cell may be dirty, and ragged your suit,
Just stand to attention and salute;
Then if your stock you don, and your cap you doff,
The Governor 'll easily let you off."

manage right enough . . . Are you well?" he continued, after looking fixedly at me.

"No," I replied, "I'm not in good health."

"Oh, very well; I'll move you over to the other side of the corridor, it's the sunny side."

Easy work was given to the prisoner; cocoa-nut fibre cord was to be "picked." The labour was purely mechanical, but it served to occupy his attention, and take his mind from "bitter, burning, regretful thoughts:"—

"Unbidden and unwished for," he says, "the pale spectres of the past would come trooping into the lonely cell; and the life that might have been, lay stretched before my eyes with an intensity of plainness that was wellnigh maddening. I have often wondered since how I managed to retain my senses; and if it had not been for the kindness of the chaplain, who visited me almost daily at this time, I should have gone out of my mind without a doubt. Why Government cannot allow men convicted for the first time the use of library books at once instead of making them go without for the first eight weeks of their sentence, I cannot make out. . . . The Sundays were fearfully long; there was nothing on earth to do, and once afternoon chapel was over, one was shut up for five mortal hours ere the welcome bell at eight o'clock rang out permission to go to bed. One is allowed no exercise for the first twenty-eight days."

After the first three months were over, the prisoner was "eligible for employment of trust" in the gaol; and he was eventually employed in office-work. This gave him opportunities for an insight into the management of the prison.

Art. VI.—NORTHERN PALESTINE.

1. *HADRIANI RELANDI Palæstina ex Monumentis veteribu illustrata.* Tom. i. et ii. Trajecti Batavorum. 1714.
2. *Le Pays d'Israël, collection de cent vues prises d'après Nature dans la Syrie et la Palestine.* Par C. W. M. Van de Velde, Ancien Officier de la Marine des Pays Bas, Chevalier de la Legion d'Honneur, etc., pendant son voyage d'exploration scientifique en 1851 et 1852. Paris. 1857.
3. *Map of Western Palestine, from Surveys conducted for the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund.* By Lieutenants C. R. Conder and H. H. Kitchener, R.E. London: Stanford. 1881.

"FROM Dan to Bethel"—this historic phrase (a phrase very full of a sad and serious meaning) may serve to define the range of country which is to be included here under the descrip-

tion of Northern Palestine. Again, as on a previous occasion, a division is adopted which is not strictly accurate, but simply convenient. It is needless to remark that this range of country, viewed in the aspect of New Testament times, corresponds on the whole with Galilee added to Samaria. In this short essay, however, the division of the land among the old Jewish tribes will be taken as the basis of description, with such references to later times as naturally suggest themselves. These tribes are Asher, Naphtali, and Zebulon in the north, Manasseh and Ephraim in the south, with Issachar between. It will hardly be possible, in conclusion, to avoid some reference to the tribe of Benjamin, which has Bethel on the border-line separating it from the tribe of Ephraim. Thus we shall, in the end, move towards Jerusalem from the north, as we have moved towards it before from the south-west and south-east.

Geographically, the region which is to be brought under our review can be described, with sufficient accuracy, in a very few words. The whole is forcibly intersected by a broad valley, running at a low level from east to west. This plain of Esdraelon is one of the most characteristic features of the Holy Land. It strikes across its whole breadth, from the sea near Mount Carmel to the Jordan near Bethshan, dilating also, especially in its middle part, for a considerable space, from north to south. Thus it separates the beautiful and sub-alpine scenery of Galilee from the central table-land of Samaria. To this general statement of the contour of the country we must add the fact that we have two sections, and two very strongly contrasted sections, of coast line to consider in this brief survey. These are the Phœnician shore of the Mediterranean, so far as it belongs to the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, and the west shore of the Lake of Gennesareth, where were the towns of Bethsaida, Capernaum, and Tiberias. These few sentences may suffice as a geographical introduction to what is before us. It may be worth while to add, for the sake of adjusting our view, and of keeping our proportions correct, that the thirty-fifth line of east longitude enters the Holy Land at the point of Carmel, and that the thirty-third and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude intersect the Jordan between the Waters of Merom and the Lake of Gennesareth, and between the Lake of Gennesareth and the Dead Sea, respectively.

Now, just as certain prominent names are commonly associated with toasts on public occasions, so in the present instance three authorities shall be named, well deserving to be accepted as guides in our pursuit of sacred topography. The first of these is an old Latin book, which, when it can conveniently be purchased, ought always to find a place on the shelves of the biblical scholar. Reland, whose work is marked by the utmost

completeness, the most conscientious care and the most systematic arrangement, was, like Vitringa, one of the great old school of Dutch theology, to whom the Church owes so much. How well in his preface he anticipates those exact principles of modern physical geography which have produced a wholesome revolution in our maps! "*Montes et campos accuratè distinguere studui, quod inde locorum situs plurimum dependeat . . . . Omninò oportebat in mappis Palæstinæ singula hæc accuratius oculis exhibita fuisse, nec montes et valles per universam Palæstinam temere sparsos, quod plurimi fecerunt.*" Next must be named the Chevalier Van de Velde, who, like Da Costa, may be said to belong to a modern Dutch school which has given loving care to the illustration of the Holy Scriptures. At the head of this article is placed the "Pays d'Israël," which is a series of beautiful views in Syria and Palestine, with illustrative letterpress in French. These views are said to have the merit of peculiar truthfulness, not only in delineation, but in colouring; and thus they are in one respect superior to the charming drawings of David Roberts, though they may be less perfect as works of art. But this is by no means all that the Chevalier Van de Velde has done for us. He has given in two volumes the "Journal" of his careful tour through the Holy Land. It is a book written in a most devout spirit. Perhaps some might find fault with it for its too great profuseness of personal religious sentiment; but it must be remembered that the "Journal" consists of letters to a private friend. Above all, we owe to this naval officer the best map of the Holy Land which had appeared before the results of the Palestine Exploration Fund were ready. This map is accompanied by a most useful "Memoir," containing a list of geographical positions, with elevations, routes, and distances, and a summary of the identifications of ancient names, up to the date of publication (1858). On the whole, if we add together all that this traveller and geographer has done, it becomes difficult to estimate the high value of his topographical illustrations of the Holy Land; and they ought to be carefully treasured, as a precious part of that progressive elucidation of the Bible, every step of which should be recorded and remembered. Even now, those who wish to travel intelligently through the Holy Land without leaving their own home (and all ought to do this who cannot actually visit Palestine) could not adopt a better plan than to use these materials. We come now to the "Map of Western Palestine," published on the reduced scale, within the last few weeks, under the auspices of the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund. It is a great gift to the biblical student; and we cannot be too grateful for it. True to the scrupulous military law of such surveys, it leaves all beyond a boundary line a little to the northward of

Tyre and Baneas, and all to the southward beyond Beersheba, utterly blank; and it strictly follows the right bank of the Jordan and the western shore of the three lakes that belong to this river. But within these limits all is minutely and carefully laid down, with every place named, and the rise and fall of the ground everywhere indicated to the eye, just as if we were examining a result of the Ordnance Survey of our English counties.

The territory of the tribe of ASHER may be correctly and sufficiently described as a strip of the coast of the Mediterranean, about the place where the lofty range of Lebanon fades down into the sub-alpine country of the Holy Land. It is the first of those two shore regions which were named above. Jerome, who knew the land well, gives in his commentary on Ezekiel the range of this tribe in a short, compact sentence, thus: "*Aser usque ad montem Carmelum, qui imminet Mari Magno, Tyrumque et Sidonem.*" To these two historic cities we must add a third as being within the territory of this tribe, namely, Acre, which, though ancient under the same designation, was known in the Apostolic age under the name of Ptolemaïs, and did not become famous under its old title until long after Jerome's day. Tyre and Sidon were the great maritime doors for all the enterprise and commerce of the West. This, however, is part of the history of the Phœnicians, rather than of the Jews. Tyre and Sidon were never Hebrew cities, but, on the contrary, cities of the Gentiles. It is difficult to understand the position of the Jews of this tribe in relation to the Phœnician power, which was so strong between the mountains and the shore. Probably they were always weak and subordinate, and disposed to peace for the sake of safety. Certain it is that the tribe of Asher is never conspicuous in any part of the Jewish annals for heroism or influence.

It is in the New Testament, not in the Old, that this tribe is for a moment made conspicuous, and this in a manner thoroughly consonant with the gentle and modest beginning of the Gospel. When the Infant Christ was presented in the Temple, there were two who received Him with joyful and adoring welcome. One was Simeon, whose *Nunc Dimittis* has become a liturgical hymn for all the Christian ages. The other was "Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher." It is said that she was "a widow, of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the Temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day; and she, coming in that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of Him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." Is not this true to the Spirit of the Gospel? Of the two who first welcomed Christ in His temple, one was simply a

widow, perhaps one of the most despised persons in Jerusalem. "Not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty." It is especially to be noted that the language of this simple story is in harmony with that tender and respectful feeling towards widows which marks the New Testament, and is peculiarly prominent in St. Luke. And one thing more should be carefully observed. Anna had waited for Christ; and now, when she knew that He was come, she immediately proceeded to proclaim Him to those who shared her expectation in the Holy City. It may be truly asserted that she was the very first preacher of the Gospel in Jerusalem. It is said in one of the Epistles that God gave to His Church "Prophets and Evangelists." Anna, in fact, was both. Thus this tribe does come forth from the sacred annals, with great distinctness, before the Christian mind, teaching lessons of humility, patience, devotion and zeal; and with justice it has, in the Apocalypse, a position equal with the rest. "Of the tribe of Asher were sealed twelve thousand."

In other ways too this coast region of the Holy Land, though not in any connection with the thought of the Hebrew Tribes, is made conspicuous in the New Testament. It was here that the Lord Jesus elicited from the Syrophœnician woman that powerful reasoning of an earnest faith which has been a wonder and an example ever since. On this coast were the two great heathen cities, which, speaking on the shore of the inland Galilean Sea, at no great distance, He named, in order to point the fearful rebuke of Chorazin and Bethsaida. In both cases it might be said that the skirts of His holy garment were prophetically touching the Gentile world. Again, the reconciliation of the first Herod Agrippa, through the intervention of Blastus, with the Tyrians and Sidonians, "because their country was fed by the king's country," illustrates as vividly the mercantile relations of the Phœnician coast with the inland parts of Judæa as do certain passages in the life of Solomon. Once more it is remarkable that St. Paul, in the course of his missionary voyages, is expressly and very pointedly stated to have been at each of the three above-named and noted Phœnician ports. He was at Tyre and at Ptolemais on his return from the Third Missionary Circuit; and Sidon was the first place at which he touched on his way to Melita and Rome. In this circumstance, too, we seem to have, on this shore, anticipatory hints of the future spread of the Gospel throughout the world.

We cannot be surprised if Asher too willingly stayed "in his creeks" on this mercantile coast, when the tribes were rallied by Deborah to their hard patriotic struggle in the time of the Judges. The case was very different with the two neighbouring tribes of

the north. "Zebulon and Naphtali were a people that jeoparded their lives unto the death in the high places of the "field." It is especially to Kedesh in NAPHTALI that our thoughts are turned, when this campaign is mentioned. This was the rallying place of the tribes, the place of the tent of Jael and the death of Sisera. The name still identifies the spot which is only a short distance from the customary road between Safed and Baneas, which is traversed by so many English travellers on the way from Tiberias to Damascus. It should be added that this Kedesh was also a Levitical city, and a city of refuge for the north, and that near it was fought the great decisive final battle of Joshua with the Canaanites. Van de Velde visited the place; and a few sentences of his description are worth quoting:—

"A wide space of ground expands between the Jordan and the mountains of Naphtali; and upon this plain to the south-west of the Lake Huleh, I suppose, the great battle took place between Joshua and the five united kings; for the plain to the north of the lake is nothing better than a series of pools and marshes, which it is perfectly impossible to penetrate, much less to be used as a battle-field. The Mahometans have no knowledge of the Bible narrative of this battle. Joshua, however, is not only familiar to them, but they have even erected a *weli* to his honour, at the upper end of a narrow pass, by which we ascend to the north-west of the lake to Kedesh. This *weli* is called Nabi-Yûsha . . . . I reached Kedesh when the sun was nearly setting, weary and anxious for rest, just as, I fancy, in days of old, many a persecuted debtor must have arrived here when Kedesh was a city of refuge of Naphtali. What an excellent central position—exactly what was wanted for a City of Refuge for the north part of the land! At present Kedesh is only a miserable hamlet. It lies upon a *tell* at the south-west extremity of a well-cultivated mountain plain, and displays still a good many remains of the days of old. . . . At the foot of the *tell* is a splendid fountain. When we passed it on our way up to the village, it was surrounded by a group of women who had come hither to fetch water. The prospect from Kedesh is on all sides wide and extensive, except towards the west."—*Narrative*, vol. ii. pp. 416–418.

Chevalier Van de Velde describes his morning ride from this place, "through the cool mountain air" as refreshing and delightful. The landscape offered the most charming scenery in great variety. Conspicuous in the view was "Hermon's broad summit, still adorned with its cover of snow," while the lower parts of Lebanon were "covered with all the magnificence of fresh greening wood."

The eastern limit of the Tribe of Naphtali runs down the course of the Jordan, and follows some portion of the shore of Lake of Gennesareth; but it is more true to the facts of the case to associate this sacred inland sea with the Tribe of ZEBULON. That passage of the Evangelic history which is found in

St. Matthew, and in St. Matthew alone, is, though not without its difficulties, a most precious link between the New Testament and the old. "Leaving Nazareth He came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the seacoast, in the borders of Zebulon and Nephthalim, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, the land of Zebulon, and the land of Nephthalim by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people which sat in darkness saw great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up." It would seem as though a future blessing had brooded over this region from the time of Tiglath Pileser. This blessing was fulfilled in the Gospel day. The territory of Zebulon may be correctly said to have formed the heart of Galilee, and in Galilee the Lord's ministrations were chiefly exercised. A tribe which had within its limits Nazareth, Cana, and Capernaum, and probably the Mount of the Beatitudes, has a high and permanent honour. It was said in scorn that "no prophet came out of Galilee." Even literally, in the lower sense, this was not true: for Jonah was of the tribe of Zebulon. "A greater, however, than Jonah was here."

But the reminiscences of the tribe which is now before our thoughts, go backward from point to point of the sacred history to the earliest moment of national Hebrew life, and beyond. "The princes of Zebulon," with "the princes of Naphtali," are conspicuous in the Psalms. At the memorable keeping of the Passover by Hezekiah, we find this tribe, to a considerable extent, loyal to Jerusalem, when "the posts passed from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, even to Zebulon." When David set up his first throne at Hebron, and the tribes gathered round him, it is said that of Zebulon there came "such as went forth to battle, expert in war, with all instruments of war, fifty thousand, such as keep rank;" and it is specially added that "they were not of double heart." Reverting to the song of Deborah, we find that "out of Zebulon" there came to the war "they that handled the pen of the writer." Whether we understand this to mean, as we should say in modern language, that civilians went to the war and became soldiers—"gownmen turned swordmen, clerks became captains, changing their penknives into swords"—or whether, as seems more likely, we are to understand the meaning to have reference to those who kept the register of the soldiers in the war—the passage is alike creditable to the character of the Tribe of Zebulon.

In curious harmony with the fact that Jonah was the prophet of Zebulon, is the peculiarly maritime character of the notices of this tribe. Josephus says that it stretched across from the coast of the Mediterranean, near Carmel, to the Sea of Tiberias. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to determine the boundaries

of Asher and Zebulon on the West; but certainly this latter tribe had there the outlet of the open sea. On the other hand, the famous fisheries of the Lake of Gennesareth belonged to the same clan. Century after century much of their life must have been connected with the boats on that sea. In apocryphal writings, professing to record Old Testament history, Zebulon is said to have been a skilled fisherman and the first to navigate a boat. The "way of the sea" is probably the great road which connected the Phœnician Coast with Damascus, and which passed through this territory. Fuller, in his comical way, concludes his notice of Zebulon by giving his arms in true heraldic fashion—*argent, a Ship, with Mast and Tackling sable*—adding that this reminded him of the arms of a certain Polish nobleman, except that in his case "the ship is without sails," with the motto, *Deus dabit Vela*, whereas Zebulon's ship is "accomplished with all the accoutrements thereof."

Moses said, when he looked from Mount Nebo over the promised land which he was not to enter:—"Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy going out, and Isaachar, in thy tents." The contrast is very striking, especially if we view the "going out" to mean a free and customary outlet to the commerce of the sea. And the same old English writer, alluding to the combined blessing which follows, lays down the contrast in one of his most amusing sentences:—"Though these two tribes be made partners, and joint sharers in marine interests, and are promised equal profit thereby, yet ISSACHAR, it seems, loved land and a home-life best, imploying his canvas rather for tents than sails, whilst the sea and *going out* in long voyages was rather Zebulon's delight. So have I seen chickens and ducklings hatched under the same hen, no sooner unhoused out of their shells, but presently the one falls to pecking on the ground, the other a padling in the water." The great geographical fact to be stated regarding Issachar is this, that his territory almost exactly coincided with the Plain of Esdraelon. This circumstance in a large measure determined the character of his descendants, and their part in Hebrew history, which was not an eminent part. Here it is, in this place of marked separation, that the most convenient and natural pause is made in this sketch of the history and topography of northern, or rather of northern with central Palestine.

J. S. HOWSON.

Reviews.

Ritual Conformity. Interpretations of the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, agreed upon by a Conference held at All Saints, Margaret Street, 1880–1881. Parker & Co. 1881.

THIS pamphlet is the result of forty-eight conferences, spread over a year and a half, in which some of the leading Ritualists give their interpretation of all the rubrics in the Prayer Book. It shows signs of care and of compromise, and it is quite outspoken as to its recommendations. Though put forth unofficially, it will probably be accepted by numbers of Ritualists as their guide, philosopher, and friend.

In commenting upon this interesting pamphlet, the writer claims to be nothing more than a student of the Prayer Book and of the documents (historical and otherwise) which throw light on its composition; he is neither a lawyer nor legislator, neither doctor nor proctor, but simply an inquirer and searcher after Liturgical Truth.

It is proposed first to criticise certain interpretations which this pamphlet sets forth, and secondly to touch upon the thorny question of the "Ornaments Note;" and, as the pamphlet proceeds in a very business-like style, the criticisms of it will be conducted, as far as possible, after the same method.

Passing by the reference to "obeisance" prescribed as an "ancient and devout usage" for the minister to follow on entering the church, but certainly not to be found in the rubrics, we arrive at the beginning of Morning Prayer, where the minister is to "read with a loud voice" one or more sentences. This order, one would think, hardly needed interpretation; but we are are told that to "read" may mean a musical recital, and that as to "say" strictly means a monotone, "read" includes "some other mode of reciting the sentences, such as singing," &c. This method of interpretation does not at first sight tend to give one confidence in the interpreters; for if to read means to sing, then English words have lost their meaning, and black means white. But there is method in the interpreters' madness. The reason for their affirming that reading includes singing is that, in the older Prayer Books, there was a rubric authorising that "in such places where they do sing, shall the lessons be sung in a plain tune after the manner of distinct reading." Thus in old days and in singing places (*i.e.*, cathedrals, &c.), the lessons (with the Epistle and Gospel) were to be brought as near to distinct reading as possible, whilst in other places they were to be read. In the last revision the liberty of singing was altogether done away with; and it cannot be said, with any pretention to accuracy, that reading includes or means singing.

As to posture, the Bishops are quoted as having said, in the Savoy Conference, that where the minister speaks to the people, as in the lessons, it is convenient that he turn to them. The interpreters allow that the Sentences and Exhortation come under this head, but proceed, somewhat illogically, to the conclusion that the minister should not turn to the people, but should stand stall-wise—*i.e.*, sideways!

We now pass to the rubric which prescribes that the Absolution "is to be pronounced by the priest alone." The interpreters do not state what the word "alone" indicates—viz., that the people who had been joining in the General Confession are to keep silence during the Absolution. We are told, however, that "a deacon officiating in the absence of a priest may not use this Absolution as a prayer." It certainly is not a prayer,

but a declaration, followed by an exhortation or bidding. Custom has ordered that the deacon shall never use the Absolution, but propriety only demands that he should not use it if a presbyter be present. It is the opinion of high authorities that the words priest and minister are used indifferently through the Prayer Book, the word presbyter having intervened in the Scotch Liturgy. "Minister" was the word used in the rubric now under discussion from the time this part of the service was introduced (1552) until 1604; and "minister" is the word still used in some very important rubrics—*e.g.*, at the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. If the word priest implies that a deacon is under all circumstances excluded, what would be the consequence? The *Gloria Patri* that follows the Lord's Prayer could not be uttered by the deacon, nor the versicles before the collect for the day, nor the Lord's Prayer and versicles after the Litany, nor certain portions of the Baptismal and Marriage Services. It seems plain that, generally speaking, the word priest or presbyter signifies officiating minister. When, however, a long-established custom prevails giving it a more limited signification, as in the case before us, it should not be broken through without the sanction of the Ordinary. It is curious that the rubric before the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of Evening Service had the word "priest" until 1662, when it was turned to "minister." In the canons the word "minister" generally means priest or presbyter, as distinct from deacon.

As to the *Amen* to be answered after prayers, the interpreters have omitted to mention that it is sometimes printed in italics and sometimes in Roman letters. There is a difference of opinion as to the reason, but a high authority has laid down, that in our present Prayer Book, where the Amen follows the Lord's Prayer in Roman letters, ministers and people say the whole Prayer together. This is certainly true in most cases, and probably in all. If so, it would decide against the common custom that the priest should say the Lord's Prayer and Amen alone at the beginning of the Communion. In fact, the rubric before the Lord's Prayer where it first occurs in Morning Service seems to be decisive on this point. In the 1604 Prayer Book the Amen was generally printed in Roman letters at the end of the Collects.

The interpreters have not commented on the fact that the rubric gives us permission to sing the *Benedictus*. In 1549 it was to be "used;" in the Prayer Books of 1552, 1559, and 1604 it was to be "used and said;" and so in the Scotch Prayer Book; but in 1664 these words were dropped. It would be well at certain seasons to follow the old rule.

It may be noted in passing, that there is no direction for turning in any special direction at the recitation of the Creed; but there are two important additions to the rubric here, one of which the interpreters might have pointed out—viz., the permission to *sing* the Creed, taken (as also in the case of the Nicene) from the Scotch Liturgy.

Custom must evidently have its way in such matters, as turning to the East in the Creed, the method of responding in the Psalms and Litany, and in the sole or congregational utterance of the General Thanksgiving. That this was not expected to be uttered by all the people is plain, first, from the absence of a rubric to that effect, and, secondly, from the absence of initial capitals at the beginning of short sentences, such as can be seen in the General Confession, the Creeds, and the Lord's Prayer (including that in the beginning of the Communion Service). It would be strange, however, if the united voices of the congregation should be silenced in those churches where the custom has sprung up.

Custom again may be allowed to rule in the Glory and the Thanks before and after the Gospel, the former having been ordered in 1549, and the

latter in the Scotch Liturgy, 1637, though there is no order for the outbursts of praise in our present Prayer Book.

Could the reintroduction of the sign of the Cross in the baptismal font be similarly justified? The interpreters say yes; affirming that it is admissible, because the words "Sanctify this water," introduced in 1662, answer to "Sanctify this fountain of Baptism," in the 1549 Prayer Book, when the cross was ordered to be made. But the use of the cross has been a bitterly contested ceremony, and therefore should not be reintroduced anywhere, without specific directions. Besides, the interpreters have hardly given due weight to the facts before them. In 1549 it was ordered that the water in the font should be changed every month, and a special service was provided for sanctifying the water. A considerable portion of this service was afterwards made use of in the prayers before Baptism, as we have them now, and the form for sanctifying the water was done away with. In the Scotch Prayer Book a sentence for the special sanctification of the water (when freshly put into the font) was reintroduced with rubrical directions, by Laud; but the sign of the cross was not added. The revisers of 1662 ignored Laud's formula altogether.

The interpreters rightly point out that the font should be filled with water "immediately before the Baptism." The directions of the rubric are, indeed, as explicit on this point as in the case of the Bread and Wine. The font is *then* (*i.e.*, when the priest comes to it) to be filled; and the Bread and Wine are *then* (*i.e.*, before the Church militant) to be placed on the table; and if the former rubric allows that the water should be poured in before the congregation assembles, the latter would grant the same liberty in the case of the Bread and Wine.

In the rubric before the Three Collects, in Morning Prayer, we find the words *all kneeling*. The interpreters (p. 18) think that this expression applies to the congregation only, and not to the minister. But this is not a natural interpretation, inasmuch as the people were already kneeling, and it is plain that the words "all devoutly kneeling" three rubrics earlier, include the minister; and the same is the case with the words "all kneeling" before the General Confession.

In 1549 there was a rubric ordering the priest to stand up before saying the Three Collects. This was afterwards done away with, and the words "all kneeling" were added at the last revision, in order to specify the posture then thought most suitable for the minister in prayer.

There is a slight inaccuracy on p. 28, where we read that "the practice of the people sitting during the reading of the Epistle, though not prescribed in the rubric, may be justified by ancient English custom." Though not prescribed, it is certainly implied, because all are directed to stand up before the Gospel begins, and it can hardly be supposed that they would remain on their knees during the reading of the Epistle.

The blunder on p. 31 is more serious. The statement runs thus:—"It seems reasonable that the (offertory) sentences may be sung as of old, and as was prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549. 'When there be clerks they shall sing one or many of the sentences above written, according to the length or shortness of the time that the people be offering.'" But how strange that the extract from the rubric of 1549 should thus suddenly be brought to a close by the interpreters, for it goes on in these words:—"or else one of them to be said by the minister immediately before the offering." Moreover, the restriction to "saying" was not introduced at the last revision, but has been ordered in the Prayer Books of 1552, 1559, and 1604.

In discussing the rubric before the Confession in the Communion Service, it is suggested that the words "one of the ministers" do not absolutely exclude "a lay-clerk" from leading. If other rubrics might

be thus dealt with, there would be a good deal more for laymen to do than seems to be allowed. In this case, as in so many others, the Scotch Liturgy supplies an important link between the rubric of 1604 and that of 1662, giving the words "the Presbyter himself, or the Deacon," instead of the old words "either by one of them (*i.e.*, one of the people) or else by one of the ministers, or by the priest himself."

With regard to what is commonly called the "sanctus," we are told that a comparison with the books of 1549 and 1552 shows that the time at which the people should join in is at the words "Holy, &c." But the student will look in vain for the ground of this observation, unless it be that a new paragraph is introduced at the word "Holy" in the old Prayer Books. There is absolutely nothing in the rubric to justify it. So if it leans on anything it must be on custom.

On p. 37 we read:—

> The custom of elevating the consecrated Elements . . . . . was expressly prohibited in the Prayer Book of 1549. This prohibition, however, was withdrawn in 1552. The elevation cannot, therefore, be unlawful, though certainly it is not obligatory.[1]

Many will be thankful for this last small mercy; but is the statement of the case here exactly correct? We are told that the prohibition was withdrawn, but we are not told the circumstances under which the reference to elevation dropped out of the Prayer Book. Yet it ought to be told. In 1549, immediately after the Consecration, came a note, saying: "These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar, *without any elevation*, or showing the sacrament to the people." Then, without further rubric, came the prayer of memorial and presentation of themselves on the part of the congregation. In 1552 the word altar was struck out of the Prayer Book, and this prayer was removed from its old position and introduced after the Lord's Prayer, with slight alterations, being preceded by a new rubric. There can be little doubt that in removing the prayer the early rubric which intervened between it and the preceding prayer also dropped out. But does this justify the reintroduction of elevation? Will not the moral sense of the community affirm that, in the case of a ceremony of this character, and to which so much importance is attached, nothing but a direct order would justify its reintroduction? The Scotch Service here reverts to the old arrangement of 1549, but says not a word about elevation. In matters of *minutiæ*, lack of direction may be supplied by common sense; a minister, for example, is not directed to hand back a baptized child to the god-parents; and it needs no rubric to decide whether he is to carry the infant in his arms for the rest of his natural life. But in matters of ceremonial, where doctrine is involved, men of candid judgment will allow that Omission must be taken as Prohibition.

In the remarks on the rubric concerning the reception of the communion we read—"This rubric with the 21st Canon obliges the celebrant to receive the communion every time that he celebrates." This is true, and the same has been the case in all the Reformed Prayer-books. But now for the reason. "He does so as a part of the sacrificial action, which is not complete unless a portion of the sacrifice is consumed by the offering Priest. For this reason he communicates himself, standing, as distinct from the congregation, and completing the essentials of the Sacrifice in his priestly character." Now, in the first place there is no direction for the minister to retain a standing posture when partaking of

[1] One might as well say that the omission of the words "in English," given before the Lord's Prayer (next after the creed), makes it now legal to say the prayer in Latin.

the Lord's Supper, either in our Prayer Book or in any of its predecessors; and in all of them the minister is said to "receive the communion," not to "communicate himself," in other words he is identified with the recipients in the act, and therefore he ought to occupy the posture of the recipients. Concerning this posture the "black rubric" at the end of the service is very clear. If the minister had been an exception to the rule as to receiving the communion in a kneeling posture the fact would probably have been mentioned. It may be replied that no direction is given for him to kneel, but the rejoinder is unassailable that no direction is given for him to abstain from kneeling, and the recipients as such are described at the end of the rubric as "all meekly kneeling." If, therefore, this note on the rubric is wrong as to the fact, it need hardly be worth while to inquire into the grounds advanced, but it is noteworthy that the ambiguous word priest, which is supposed by some to cover the idea of sacerdotalism, is not used in the rubric with reference to the celebrant. In 1549 we read "Then shall the priest first receive, &c.;" in 1552 it was turned to "minister" and so remained in 1559 and 1604: in 1637 the Scotch Liturgy substituted "Then shall the Bishop if he be present, or else the Presbyter that celebrateth;" and in 1662 the word "minister" stood as before. It can thus hardly be "an essential of the sacrifice" that the minister should partake.

On p. 40 we are told that "there seems to be no warrant, in the English use, for making the sign of the cross with the consecrated species, paten, or chalice"—the word "seems" is hardly needful, when there neither is nor has been since the Reformation any such direction. But why do the divines who have drawn up these notes speak on various occasions of the "species" of bread? It is done not once nor twice. Do they suppose that after consecration the bread has lost its substance? They cannot forget the statement in the "black rubric" which is as old as the Prayer Book of 1552, that "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances."

On p. 46 we are told that "the prohibition against carrying the unconsumed remainder of the consecrated elements out of the church involves the cleansing the vessels in church." This is not quite clear. If consuming the remainder involved cleansing the vessels, would not the direction have been given? Again, we are told that "the method of cleansing which is really intended to ensure the entire consumption of all that remains is not prescribed and the word 'reverently' leaves much to the discretion of the priest." But the word "reverently" is used not of any cleansing, but the eating of and drinking of the consecrated bread and wine which remains, by the priest and such others of the communicants as he shall then call to him.

Nothing is said by the interpreters concerning incense, either for or against. The chasuble is calmly taken for granted (p. 30), because, forsooth, the word vestment, which is to be found in the Prayer Book of 1549, "generally included chasuble, stole, maniple, albe, amice, and girdle" (p. 40 note). This precious piece of information is gathered from "the inventories and other authorities." Inventories strike one as a very poor authority for defining the exact nature of the "vestment" ordered to be worn whether in the days of Edward VI. or in our own times. Moreover, on looking at the place in the Prayer Book where the word "vestment" occurs, it seems to be an alternative name for a cope, or at any rate an alternative garment, and no one supposes that the cope is a sacrificial garment.

Altar lights are nowhere mentioned in any of the Prayer Books, but are said by the interpreter to rest on the King's injunctions (2 & 3 Ed. VI. cap. 1), and "if it be contended that Bishop Cosin is wrong in

his opinion that the injunctions were obligatory, we are thrown back upon the universal custom of the Catholic Church, which undoubtedly required lights to be used on the altar for the office of Holy Communion." To this it may be answered that if this custom was primitive it would have received formal sanction in post-Reformation documents, but we look in vain for such sanction.

The position of the priest at the holy table has much exercised the minds of the interpreters. We read (p. 26) that—

> In those Churches where the Table was placed with its long sides north and south, the Priest moved with the table and stood . . . . . at the centre of one of the long sides . . . . . and looked to the south instead of the east. But when Archbishop Laud pressed the restoration of the table to its ancient position . . . . . some of the High Church clergy placed themselves at the north end of the table. . . . . They were at once met with the reply that side and end were not convertible terms, and it was urged that the rubric could not be complied with at all unless the table were set with its long sides north and south.

The interpreters further say:—"It seems absurd that when the altar is restored to its place the priest should not be restored to his." But the fault seems to have originated with Laud. The Scotch Prayer Book, which is due to Laud, has the following rubric:—"The Holy Table having at the communion time a carpet and a fair white linen cloth upon it with other decent furniture meet for the high mysteries then to be celebrated, shall stand at the uppermost part of the chancel of the church, where the presbyter standing *at the north side or end* thereof," &c. There is no doubt, therefore, that if Laud's views had been carried out by our revisers in 1662, the rubric would have had no reference to the body of the church and none to the side of the table. As Laud's rubric has been overruled, why should not the practice he inaugurated be overruled also, and why should not the table be so arranged that the minister might stand "stall-wise?" If this be objected to, why should we not revert to the still older custom, and let the minister stand between the table and the east end, facing the congregation as he consecrates?[1]

The interpreters say nothing about the word "oblations" before the Prayer for the Church Militant. It is taken from the Scotch Liturgy. They tell us that the bread and wine should be placed "humbly as an offering" on the altar. Passing over the question-begging and "altar," it may be noted that while the Scotch rubric ordered the presbyter to do so, that order has not been introduced into our rubrics; nor does there seem any authority in our service as it now stands for calling the bread and wine an offering.

The words used by the interpreters concerning mixing water with the wine are remarkably strong. They run thus:—

> This usage (that above referred to) is properly associated also with the primitive custom (prescribed to be used in 1549) of "putting thereto a little pure and clean water." The preparatory action of mixing water with the wine

[1] There is a little book now lying before the present writer, called "A Course of Catechizing, being the Marrow of all Orthodox and Practical Expositions upon the Church Catechism, and of all Controversies upon the Church Customs and Observances. Second edition. 1674." It is written from what would be called an old-fashioned High Church point of view, and is exceedingly interesting. Among other questions it is asked, Why doth the Priest stand on the north side of the table? Answer, To avoid the Popish superstition of standing towards the east. There are numerous quaint pictures in the book, and amongst them one of the Table placed not altar-wise, but with its narrower end toward the east.

(besides being connected with the original Act of Constitution) was undoubtedly the custom of the time when this Church and Realm received the order of ministering the Sacrament, and it has never been prohibited in the Prayer Book. The practice is, therefore, a performance of the ordination vow of the English Priesthood, "so to minister the Sacraments as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God." A few drops of water are sufficient for compliance with the usage, and in no case should the quantity of water exceed one-third of the whole.

The original and inspired account of the act of institution does not specify the mixing of the water with the wine. If this took place at all, it was not as a ceremony, but according to the custom of the country, where wine is supposed not to have been drunk unmixed. It would be well if that were the custom in this and all countries, but as this is not the case, there seems to be no authority for having diluted wine at the Lord's Supper. If it is to be diluted, let it not be done ceremonially by the pouring in of "a few drops," but let it be done thoroughly. At any rate, the rubric being withdrawn which authorised the ceremony, it would be wrong to revive the custom without the sanction of the Ordinary.

We now come to the question of non-communicating attendance; and we are told that "the rubric seems to direct a change of place to be made by the communicants, and indicates not the general withdrawal of the rest of the congregation, but the separation of the intending communicants into a part of the church by themselves." Whether this direction so interpreted is generally carried out by any section of the Church might be worth inquiry. The rubric appears in its present form for the first time in our Prayer Book. It is followed by an exhortation, the substance of which came in an earlier part of the service in 1549. It is followed by the invitation to draw near. This invitation has gone through a remarkable change. From 1549 down to 1604 it closed thus:—

Draw near, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort, make your humble confession to Almighty God, before this congregation here gathered together in His holy name, meekly kneeling on your knees.

In 1604 the sentence began, "Draw near *with faith*," and the reference to confessing *before the congregation* was done away with. Was this lest there should be a misunderstanding as to the meaning of the words? They could not have been misunderstood in our older Prayer Books as referring to a non-communicating congregation, for those Prayer Books contained a remarkable exhortation to people not to remain unless they were going to partake. In 1552 the passage (in the Exhortation to the Negligent) ran thus:—

And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort and beseech you that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more; which thing ye shall do if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else, than a further contempt and unkindness unto God? Truly it is a great unthankfulness to say nay, when ye be called; but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will neither eat nor drink this holy communion with others. I pray you what can this be else, but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision?

After more to the same effect, the exhortation continues:—

Wherefore rather than ye should do so depart from hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart, I beseech you to ponder with yourselves from whom ye depart; ye depart from the Lord's Table; ye depart from your brethren, and from the banquet of most heavenly food.

Such was the mind of the Church of England from 1552 till 1662, by which time non-communicating attendance must have been practically done away with. The words now quoted were in that year omitted, the cause for their continuance having probably ceased to exist. Those who feel inclined to re-introduce the system of non-communicating attendance would do well to meditate on the exhortation now quoted. The Homilies contain a well-known passage to the same effect.

With regard to bread to be used at the Lord's Supper, the rubric says: "It shall suffice that the bread be such as is usually to be eaten." The interpreters say that these words "shall suffice" do not exclude "a higher alternative," and they quote the Scotch rubric, of 1637, as "expanding the true meaning." The Scotch Liturgy undoubtedly inserted the words in brackets, ("though it be lawful to have wafer bread"). But the Revisers (1662), refused to follow in Laud's steps, and reverted to the rubric which had stood since 1552, thereby, to say the least, implying that bread was to be used. In the face of this fact it would be decidedly uncanonical to depart from the ordinary usage without the direct sanction of the Ordinary.

Nor must it be forgotten that wafer-bread is one thing, and a wafer another. The unleavened Paesover cakes may be called waferbread, but they are as large as a plate, and are broken up. The old Rubric of 1549 was very strong on this point. It ordained that "the bread prepared for the Communion be made through all this realm after one sort and fashion, that is to say, unleavened and round as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more thicker and larger than it was, *so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces;* and every one shall be divided in two pieces, at the least or more, by the direction of the minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour, Jesus Christ."

There is only one more interpretation calling for special attention, viz., that which discusses the confession and absolution in the Visitation for the Sick. The following is the statement on the subject, (p. 60.):—

> The significant introduction in the last revision of this direction to "move" the sick person to make a special confession of his sins, recalls the fact that the practice of confession had then been interrupted for many years, and required exertion for its revival. In "moving" the sick person is included instruction upon the nature and details of sins, as well as help to discover them, such as the suggestion of questions on the commandments, baptismal obligations, marriage vows, &c. The expression "special confession" does not mean a *partial* confession, but a confession which goes into detail, and the priest should not absolve the sick person unless his confession comprehends, besides the weighty matter which had immediately prompted it, *all matters which ought to press upon his conscience*, and can be recalled to mind by his utmost efforts.

There is more to the same effect, extending to persons in health the directions given concerning persons in sickness. Here is a pretty state of things; and it is as well that it should be brought forward in this plain and public way, because this publicity will effectually prevent sick persons from sending for their minister, or even permitting him to enter their houses.

The old rubric of 1549 ran thus:—

> Here shall the sick person make a special confession, if he feels his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which confession the priest shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions.

In 1552 the reference to private confessions was left out, and the words "after this sort" were substituted for "after this form." So it stood also

in 1559 and 1604. The only change in the Scotch Liturgy of 1637 was the Substitution of "Presbyter or Minister" for priest. But in 1662 two notable changes are introduced. Are they in the direction of severity or of relaxation? The interpreters calmly lead their readers to suppose that the former is the case, whereas the contrary seems as clear as words can make it. Instead of the dictatorial "Here shall the sick person make," we find a phrase that leaves him open to act as he chooses,—"there shall the sick person be moved to make &c.," and instead of simply affirming that the priest shall absolve him, the qualifying words are added, "if he humbly and heartily desire it."

As for putting the sick person through the torture suggested by the interpreters, and holding a possible refusal of absolution *in terrorem* over them, it need only be said that the idea is odious and repulsive to every Protestant Churchman, and is bitterly repugnant to the whole teaching of the Prayer Book, and to the whole tenor of Scripture. Moreover, it has been emphatically reprobated by the Bishops of our Church.

R. B. G.

(*To be continued.*)

The Charges delivered at his Primary Visitation. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., First Bishop of Liverpool. Pp. 50. W. Hunt & Co.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rochester, at his Primary Visitation in 1881. By ANTHONY W. THOROLD, D.D., Ninety-eighth Bishop. Pp. 96. John Murray.

THE first Bishop of Liverpool; the ninety-eighth Bishop of Rochester. Such a statement is suggestive. There is adaptability in the grand old Church; it is vigorous as well as venerable.

The Bishop of Liverpool, in the opening passage of his first Address, sounds a clear and worthy note:—

> My rev. and lay brethren, [he says] we are gathered together to-day on an occasion of much interest and real solemnity. This is the primary visitation of the first Bishop of a new English Diocese. How many visitations may be held, and how many Episcopal Charges delivered before the end of all things, no man can tell. Let us pray that there may be always found in this Diocese a trumpet which shall give no uncertain sound, and a Bishop who shall promote the real interests of the Reformed Church of England.

"*No uncertain sound.*" Whatever else may be said in disparagement of Dr. Ryle's episcopal utterances, upon the point of clearness, at all events, no exception will be taken; the ἄδηλον φωνὴν cannot, by any critic, be quoted against them.

The first division of the Bishop's Charge was delivered in the pro-Cathedral of St. Peter, Liverpool, on Oct. 19; the second in the parish church of All Saints', Wigan, on Oct. 20. A considerable portion, of course, relates to the diocese. Its population; its peculiar features: its obvious needs; its financial position; its existing organizations; these and other such matters, are discussed. The National Church and the See of Liverpool; what are the facts?

From the Bishop's statement, made in summing diocesan statistics, we quote one passage:—

The spiritual provision which the Church of England has hitherto made for the 1,100,000 inhabitants of our Diocese appears painfully inadequate. In touching this subject, I would have it distinctly understood that I do not ignore the good work which has been done by our Nonconformist brethren. I thankfully acknowledge the service they have rendered to Christ's cause in Liverpool. Nor can I forget the praiseworthy zeal with which the Romish Church has provided for its adherents. Still, after every deduction, I think it is impossible to deny that there are myriads of dwellers in our Diocese for whose souls no means of grace are provided, and whose condition urgently demands the attention of Churchmen. If the Established Church of this country claims to be "the Church of the people," it is her bounden duty to see that no part of "the people" are left like sheep without a shepherd. If she claims to be a territorial, and not a congregational, Church, she should never rest till there is neither a street, nor a lane, nor a house, nor a garret, nor a cellar, nor a family, which is not regularly looked after, and provided with the offer of means of grace by her officials.

What is to be done? In the first place, the Bishop asks for a large multiplication of living agents: the Church in the diocese of Liverpool is "frightfully undermanned."[1] Secondly, twelve new churches are required for the city; several important towns in the diocese need new churches.

One favourite answer to the plea for more churches, says the Bishop, is the unhappy fact that there are existing churches which at present are not filled. Upon this fact, which recently published statistics have brought before the readers of the provincial and the metropolitan press, his Lordship's comments, unavoidably perhaps, are cautious and concise.

In the CHURCHMAN of September last we remarked, that "the statistics as to the absence of working men from public worship 'at church' or 'at chapel' in the metropolis, and in other great towns, cannot be weighed by any true Christian without feelings of sorrow and alarm." In London, it is said, many churches have been built of late years in populous districts: the preaching may be dull or doctrinally defective; the services may be cold; there may be a sad deficiency of pastoral visitation: anyhow, *where are the working classes?* Similarly, as to Newcastle, Liverpool, and other large and important towns. Such a state of things, view it how one may, is most serious.

We quote the Bishop of Liverpool's plea for more churches:—

"Fill your old churches," is the cry, "and then we will build you new ones." Allow me to say that this is an excuse and not an argument. I am not referring to Liverpool especially, when I say that so long as patrons appoint unfit

[1] Only 200 incumbents and 140 curates for 1,100,000 people. There is little in the way of endowment. "My own opinion," says the Bishop, "is most decided, that the Church of England is never in the right position, and can never do her duty as the "Church of the people," and do herself justice, until she has no parochial districts, as a general rule, with a population of more than 5,000; and until, for every such parochial district, she has a presbyter in charge. Even 5,000 is a large number if a clergyman is a thorough pastor and a house-going man. But allowance must, of course, be made for a certain proportion of Roman Catholics and Nonconformists, who are looked after by their own ministers."

clergymen who have no gifts suited to their position, and so long as the Church makes no provision for pensioning off invalided or superannuated clergymen, so long there will always be found some empty churches. But empty churches at one end of a city are no reason why we should not build new churches at another. All ministers are not equally adapted to all sorts of parishes and population. Only exercise common sense in the choice of a clergyman, and let him be a man who wisely and lovingly preaches, lives and works the Gospel, and I am certain he will never preach to empty benches. There are many proofs in this Diocese that I am saying the truth. But, alas, when people have little will to help Christ's cause, they never want reasons to confirm their will! Too many seem to forget that, in the matter of church building, or in any work for Christ, duties are ours, and results are in the hand of God.

When addressing particularly the incumbents of great colliery parishes, the Bishop, in language which carries one's thoughts back to his description of the state of things before the revival of the last century, gives most excellent advice:—

Encourage [he says] and invite every right-minded layman near you to come forward and give you his help. Never, never be afraid of enlisting the aid of the laity. Cast away for ever the old tradition that religious work is to be left to the clergy alone. Boldly make use of "lay" talent, and you will never be without "lay" talent to use. Trust the laity, and the laity will trust you. Stir up every Christian man and woman in your congregation, who has a few hours to spare in the week, to give you some voluntary aid. Break up your huge parish into well-organized territorial districts, and give to each helper his own special district. Urge your helpers to get together people wherever they can, in a shed, or a cottage, or a barn, and to give the simplest and most elementary Christian instruction, plain, kindly talk about Christ, simple extempore prayer, and hearty, lively singing. Do this, and persevere in doing it, and I am sure you will not labour in vain. Do this, and persevere in doing it, and, in process of time, the Mission-room, the Church, and the regular parochial district will be the happy result, and, what is far better, a harvest of saved souls.

Concerning a cathedral, the Bishop, not forgetting his "Church Reform" letters, speaks of the "theory," the ideal, of a cathedral establishment. But, as a practical man, he comes to the point. "Let us count the cost." Truro has a rich Exeter canonry; Liverpool has no endowment, no site; and the expense would be enormous. Above all, Liverpool needs living agents, needs new churches. "My first and foremost business, as Bishop of a new diocese," says Dr. Ryle, "is to provide for preaching the gospel to souls now entirely neglected, whom no cathedral would touch." "Nevertheless," he adds, "if any one comes forward with a princely offer like that of the ladies who have built Edinburgh Cathedral,—or if any one will do in Liverpool what has been lately done at St. Patrick's and Christ Church Cathedrals in Dublin, or at St. Finbar's in Cork,—I shall be deeply grateful."

The great ecclesiastical questions of the day are of such a "burning" character that a man cannot handle them without coming into collision with somebody's cherished opinions. But a diocese has a right to ex-

pect its Bishop to say what he thinks at his Visitation; and in Liverpool, we judge, no proper expectations were disappointed.[1]

The present position of the Church of England, says Bishop Ryle, is perilous; "more critical and perilous than it has been at any period during the last two centuries." Nevertheless, "reason and sanctified common sense" may yet prevail. "So long indeed as the Church is true to herself, and to the great principles of the Reformation, so long . . . . the laity will not allow her to be disestablished. She will be tested by her fruits."

The Bishop's observations on the present "crisis" deserve to be studied with care: he states the main and plain facts of the case, and he shows the danger of drifting away from legal and long-established landmarks. Nor does he omit to notice the shortsightedness or the apathy of those who, really disliking a quasi-Roman ritual, weaken the hands of their brethren who deem it their duty to resist it.

With the party of whom I am now speaking, says his Lordship, "the "whole value of ceremonial consists in its significance as a visible symbol "of doctrine. The evidence of leading men before the Ritual Commission, "the language continually used in certain books and manuals about the "Lord's Supper, all tend to show that the question in dispute is, whether "in the sacrament there is a propitiatory sacrifice as well as a sacrifice of "praise and thanksgiving, and whether there is a real *presence* beside that "in the hearts of believers. These are not trifles, but serious doctrinal "errors, and points on which I am persuaded the bulk of English Church-"men will never tolerate the least approach to the Church of Rome. To "use the words of the late Bishop Thirlwall, 'The real question is, "whether our communion office is to be transformed into the closest "possible resemblance to the Romish Mass.'"—(*Thirlwall's Remains*, vol. ii. 233.) (See also Note 2 at the end.)[2]

This is, indeed, *the question*. Would to God that all loyal Churchmen realized its significance!

As to myself, says the Bishop, "my mind is made up. I mean to abide "by the decisions of the Courts of Law, so long as those decisions are not "superseded and nullified by Parliament, or reversed. I see no other safe "or satisfactory course to adopt. A Bishop who sets himself *above the "law*, and ignores its decrees, is launched on a sea of uncertainties, which "I, for one, decline to face. I cannot forget, that as a chief officer of the

---

[1] We notice with pleasure, taking the portion of the Charge which relates to the Revised Version, that the views which have been advanced in the CHURCHMAN agree with the opinions of so sound a scholar, and such a master of English, as Dr. Ryle.

[2] NOTE 2.—The following evidence was deliberately given by that well-known clergyman, the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, Vicar of Frome, before the Royal Commission, on Ritual:—

"2606. 'Is any doctrine involved in your using the chasuble?' 'I think there is.'

"2607. 'What is that doctrine?' 'The doctrine of the sacrifice.'

"2608. 'Do you consider yourself a sacrificing priest?' 'Distinctly so.'

"2611. 'Then you think you offer a propitiatory sacrifice?' 'Yes, I think I do offer a propitiatory sacrifice.'"

"Church, I am specially bound to set an example of obedience to the "powers that be, and to acknowledge the Queen's authority in things "ecclesiastical as well as temporal." And, "with a settled resolution to "be just and fair, and kind to clergymen of every school of thought, "whether High, or Low, or Broad, or no party," the Bishop entreats his Clergy, for peace' sake, to keep within the limits of the judicial decisions on the great points which have been disputed, argued, and determined in the last few years.[1]

We cannot refrain from quoting one portion of Bishop Ryle's remarks upon a Ritualistic Congregationalism:—

> Shall we adopt the notable plan of throwing open the whole question of usages in the Lord's Supper, and allowing every clergyman to administer it with any ceremonies he likes? This, I suppose, is the policy of "forbearance and toleration" for which many have petitioned, though how such a policy could be carried out, in the face of the last decisions, I fail to see, except by a special Act of Parliament. A more unwise and suicidal policy than this I cannot conceive. You would divide every Diocese into two distinct and sharply-cut parties. You would divide the clergy into two separate classes—those who wore chasubles, and those who did not; and of course there would be no more communion between the two classes. As to the unfortunate Bishops, they must either have no consciences, and see no differences, and be honorary members of all schools of thought, or else they must offend one party of their clergy and please the other. This is indeed a miserable prospect! "Forbearance and toleration" are fine, high sounding words; but if they mean that every clergyman is to be allowed to do what he likes, they seem to me the certain forerunner of confusion, division, and disruption (See Note 3 at the end).[2]

Those portions of the Bishop's Charges which lay stress upon preaching the Gospel, are, we need hardly say, exceedingly valuable. We have read them with intense thankfulness and unmingled satisfaction.

---

[1] The changes of laws and customs, as the prelate, with statesmanlike sense, shows clearly, have rendered certain rubrical requirements inexpedient. Further, as regards obedience to rubrics, there is no parallelism between acts of omission and acts of addition. "To place on the same level the conduct of "the man who, in administering the Lord's Supper, introduces novelties of most "serious doctrinal significance, and the conduct of the man who does not observe "some petty obsolete direction, of no doctrinal significance at all, is to my mind," says Dr. Ryle, "contrary to common sense."

[2] NOTE 3.—"We cannot but respect the courage and openness with which the leaders of the Ritualistic movement avow their designs, and disclose their plan of operation. They inform us that their party is engaged in a 'crusade against Protestantism,' and aims at nothing less than 're-Catholicizing the Church of England, and that with a view to this ultimate object they are agitating for disestablishment.' After this, it must be our own fault if we are not on our guard. But when the same persons put in a plea for toleration, I do not know how to illustrate the character of such a proposal more aptly than by the image suggested by one of themselves, of 'two great camps.' It is as if one of these camps should send to the other some such message as this:—'We are on our march to take possession of your camp, and to make you our prisoners; but all we desire is, that you should let us alone, and should not attempt to put any hindrance in our way.'"—*Bishop Thirlwall's Remains*, vol. ii. p. 307.

The Bishop of Rochester's Charge is divided into six chapters: "Four Years," "The Diocese in 1881," "Wants," "Counsels and Directions," "Church Problems," "The Out-look."

Rochester diocese, with its three archdeaconries, 291 parishes, and 572 clergy, has a population of 1,800,000. The number of sittings is 214,575; the average church attendance has been, morning 120,289, evening 131,462. There are 17,749 "Church Workers:" 161 parishes have "Diocesan Lay-Preachers or Readers."

The results of the Bishop's inquiries are printed in a shape that may coax even haters of statistics to glance at them. As a specimen we subjoin the table which relates to Divine Worship:—

No. of Parishes.	Daily Service at least once.	Weekly Communion.	Holy Communion on Saints' Days.	Evening Communion.	Week-day Evening Service.	Public Catechising.
291	58	117	79	100	114	178

Having arranged the results of an examination of some 2,000 pages of statistics, the Bishop thus concludes:—

Without wishing to use inflated language about our own prospects as a diocese, or the immediate future of the English Church, I have a deep conviction that we have a vast work and a great opening in front. Our opportunities are immense, equalled only by our responsibilities. God help us to weigh and use them both. The progress of mental culture and refinement is, on the whole, not unlikely to tell in favour of a Communion (supposing that there is a Church of the living God), which has a history not quite inglorious, an ancestry of divines, of which most Christians are proud, a liturgy both devout and stately; and the unimpaired deposit of the Catholic Faith. Nevertheless, even more depends on our diligence, and our reasonableness, and our charity, and—our holding fast the Gospel.

A map of the diocese is given; and it appears that thirty-four Churches and thirty-nine Mission Chapels are thought to be required. The Diocesan Conference, after a full debate, resolved that ten new churches are immediately required. How is the money to be got? Our lay-brethren, says the Bishop's *ad clerum*, refer us to the City churches, "empty and always likely to be empty: work that mine well." The voice of the laity, as the Bishop gives expression to it, is much to the point: there is a pertinent protest, *e.g.*, against "magnificent buildings." His lordship concludes:—

There are also very many good, reasonable, and wealthy persons, both men and women, who, for their Saviour's honour and their country's welfare, honestly desire to enable the Church of the nation to attain her proper level of duty and service; but only on these two conditions: that the churches which they build, or help to build, shall not presently be turned into what simple

people cannot distinguish from mass-houses; and that the incumbent of a parish shall not make his own self-will the instrument of tyranny over his flock.

Referring to the evangelization efforts of Nonconformists, laymen as well as ministers, the Bishop says:—"We can observe closely, criticize fairly, learn candidly; sincerely praying for them that the Divine Redeemer of souls will overrule their honest efforts for the glory of His name." And, further, we must honestly ask ourselves [the italics are our own] "*if there is nothing more that the Church can do on her own lines and by her own methods?*"

Our own opinion is, that the Church can do many things more on her own lines. There is, *e.g.*, the urgent need of elasticity as regards the Services; simplifying and shortening are really needed. Again, there is the question of a Lay Diaconate. Further, on the particular point now brought before us, there is the securing for poor populous districts, either by bringing men from over-manned dioceses like Norwich, or by accepting earnest candidates with a generosity suited to the times, an increased supply of clerical power.

Many earnest and spiritually-minded laymen who have not had a University education are admirably fitted for Mission work. At present, as we hear from many quarters, an appeal to a Bishop is in vain: "he must get a degree, or at least go to a Theological College for two years."

We gladly quote, as stating the need, the earnest words of Bishop Thorold:—

> We have much to do yet; indeed, have we as yet really begun to do it? We have reached individuals, but have we touched the masses? Single homes have welcomed the Saviour; to the millions He is practically an unknown name. My own deep, growing conviction is this, that if we would not see the mass of the working people hopelessly surrendered either to a gross animalism or dismal unbelief, we must throw our prejudices to the winds, and organize a brotherhood of Christian workers, which with simple creed, resolute purpose, real sacrifice, and fervent devotion, shall march under the Church's banner, and preach her Gospel for the salvation of souls to Christ.

Upon the subject of Evening Communions Bishop Thorold speaks with force, and with a refreshing firmness: the remarks upon celebrating the Lord's Supper in the evening seem to ourselves, indeed, one of the most striking and practical passages in the Charge.

On the observance of Rubrics, the Bishop says:—

> It seems to me that the entire Church has of late made a distinct advance in its appreciation of the importance of observing rubrics, both out of respect to authority and a desire for peace. That was a significant sentence, as sincere as it was significant, in Bishop Perry's memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury, —"We fully recognise the authority of the bishops to exact a rigid observance of the rubrical law of the Church from all parties within her pale:" while many will quite consistently fail to "perceive how justice can require such an observance of rubrical law as would place the revival of obsolete rubrics involving no essential principle in the same category with long discarded ceremonial." [If, not without some reluctance, I venture to indicate distinctly, I hope temperately, what procedure on your part may help for peace, while also edifying the

Church generally, you I know will not be slow earnestly to consider as before God your duty in the matter. Only, when your course seems plain, be sure to consult your people, and while discreetly inviting confidence in yourselves claim sympathy for your brethren. A certain sacrifice of feeling may be necessary: and a brief misconception must be risked: but past experience convinces me that in the great majority of cases your motives will be appreciated and your counsel followed. Rubrics may perhaps be roughly distributed into three classes, of worship, edification, and faith. Under the first are the rubrics of daily prayer, baptism during Divine service, reading the offertory sentences, with the prayer for the Church Militant, and the suitable observance of Saints'-days. Where the income makes the staff adequate, still more if the congregation wish for it, at least one daily service is a rightful privilege. In mother churches the parish has a real claim for it. Nothing so diminishes the dignity of Holy Baptism as huddling it into a corner of the day when the church is empty and the worshippers few. The prayer for the Church Militant, with the offertory sentences, adds barely four minutes to the service. A slight curtailment in the music would make it easily practicable: still it should be introduced with caution. Among Rubrics of Edification shall I be thought fanciful in placing that which enjoins the presenting and placing the elements on the Holy Table immediately before saying the prayer for the Church Militant? Edifying, because suggestive of an obvious truth.

At this sentence, we pause. We are not sure that we understand it; but we may at least venture to point out that the Bishop, through an inadvertence, has incorrectly referred to the rubrics. While the first rubric says "*humbly present* and place," the second simply says "place." We have no desire to express any opinion upon the rubric to which the honoured Prelate has referred—we do not forget the Liddell judgment in 1857; but we must confess that the doctrinal difference between the rubric as to the alms and the rubric as to the elements, historically speaking, seems to us significant.

We continue our quotation. His Lordship says:—

While the great number of communicants has in some churches made it convenient that the words to the communicant should be said to a railful at a time, instead of singly to each, I cannot doubt that the latter is the intention of the Church, and that it is desirable to follow it when possible. The rubric of faith is that which enjoins the public saying of the Athanasian Creed on certain days. It appears to me that it is a clergyman's duty simply to observe the Church's orders, and that he is not responsible for what he may consider to be their indiscreetness. As to the black gown, it is absolutely immaterial. Personally, I prefer the surplice, for it prevents an unnecessary change of habit at an awkward moment; but I am not aware that any formal judgment has ever been given on the matter; and it involves no principle. As to surpliced choirs: if the choirs themselves like the surplice, why not gratify them?

Understand, says the Bishop, I do not insist, but I advise. "The alteration, where needed, can be gradual, but let it be faced. No doctrine need be diluted, no principle compromised, no pledge broken; simply the Church obeyed, and fair-play done, and the sense of justice satisfied."

These suggestions seem to us, as a whole, sagacious and seasonable. When there is a collection, *e.g.*, the prayer for the Church Militant is the

proper sequel of the offertory. Concerning Saints' Days, again, where a congregation may be secured, and the clergyman is not overworked, we have always held a strong opinion. We are not able to agree with the Bishop, however, that there "ought to be" a celebration of the Holy Communion every Sunday in town churches. To use his Lordship's own words,—Is it "*the intention of the Church*?" We think not. It may be, however, that the Bishop refers to the larger town parishes.

In the Chapter headed "Church Problems," Dr. Thorold remarks that the Ritualists repudiated the decision of the Courts *when it went against them.* "It may be inferred from the circumstance of the appeal being made by themselves to the Final Court, that had it gone for them, they would have accepted it, and then the dispute about jurisdiction would not have arisen. But when it went against them, to accept it was found to be putting the Church under Cæsar."

As regards a distinctive vestment for the Eucharistic service, the Bishop points out (p. 66) that the claim to use a special vestment "will never succeed in dissociating itself, in the minds of ordinary Churchmen, from the theory of an objective Presence." Again, in chap. vi., "The Outlook," he remarks:—"There is a plain tendency to develop a new Eucharistic theory, differing not only from the teaching of our own formularies, but from anything that the Catholic Church has ever yet taught or known."[1] Canon Trevor's book on the "Catholic Doctrine" of the Eucharist, his Lordship well says, is worth the careful study of any who doubt the seriousness of the case. It is indeed a remarkable book. Canon Garbett's "The Voices of the Church," we may add, a learned and laborious work, also proves how the Ritualists have advanced far beyond Anglicans and High Churchmen, properly so-called. The case is, indeed, serious. But it is not only ritual. Auricular Confession is "more eagerly pressed, and more diligently practised, by an advanced school among us every year."

Referring to the Royal Commission, "a strong Commission," the Bishop says:—"I earnestly hope they will take time enough for coming to a decision."

The English Church, like other public bodies, has its irreconcilables, who serve a very useful purpose, but whom nothing will ever conciliate or satisfy, except sheer liberty to do just what they please. They cannot too soon understand that it will never be granted them; and that if we cannot win their assent we do not fear their violence. But there are many, very many, who do not say much, and neither fret nor bluster, but who are seriously uneasy at the present relations between the Church and the Civil power, and who feel that some rectification of the existing balance of authority should at least be considered. They are worth conciliating, for they are among the most dutiful and valuable of the Church's sons; and if the new Commission can adequately persuade them that due attention has been given to what they feel to be solid grievances, a substantial service will be done. But there is still a more excellent

[1] It is a pity, perhaps, that the sentence on p. 67 stands alone, unexplained. In his anxiety to do justice towards those who differ from him, the Bishop puts into their mouths a statement as to ritual which symbolizes "a doctrine of the Eucharist which the Church had nearly lost, but ought not to lose."

way. "If a Church is full of errors and foolish practices, while it is possible to attack those follies outright, showing conclusively how foolish they are, it is possible and surely better to wake up the true spiritual life in the Church, which shall itself shed those follies, and cast them out; or at least rob them of their worst harmfulness."

Several other passages in this Charge we had marked for extract; but we must forbear. The Charge, we doubt not, will be widely read. It is full, persuasive, dignified, and will bear reading more than once. Of its intense earnestness, of its literary grace, of its large-heartedness, of its administrative ability, of its fervent spirituality, not a word need here be written.

The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church. By F. E. WARREN, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1881.

IN an article in the September CHURCHMAN we considered the leading peculiarities of the Celtic Church of Ireland, and traced the course of legislation by which it was brought into conformity with the pattern of the rest of the Western World, and into connection with, and then into bondage to, the See of Rome. Lately, a flood of light has been cast upon one department of this subject by the publication of the researches of Mr. Warren into the ritual and liturgy of the Celtic Churches of Britain and Ireland, illustrated by that extensive liturgical learning of which he is the known possessor. It is no small gratification to the Celtic student that this study has been taken up by one who has viewed the whole field of liturgical knowledge, and who, as an English scholar, will command the attention of a class of readers beyond the reach of any Irish or Scottish writer, no matter how eminent.

Mr. Warren has treated the subject in a manner worthy his reputation. He has opened up a new branch of knowledge; and, so far as his use of the scanty materials at his command is concerned, he has left nothing to be desired. Until the appearance of his book, the only facts known were that the Celtic Churches had a ritual of some kind, and that it was different from the Roman. From his examination of undoubted writings of the seventh and eighth centuries—viz., the Books of Mulling, Dimma, the "Antiphonarium Benchorense," with the "Stowe Missal," the "Book of Deer," the "Book of Armagh," and some St. Gall MSS. of the ninth, compared with later manuscripts, and illustrated by literary and archæological remains, he has been able to sketch for us an outline of the liturgy and ritual of the Celtic Churches, and he has been able to give us, what we never had before, a definite conception of their worship and its peculiarities. We regret that he does not seem to have had before him Mr. King's works, "The Primacy of Armagh" and the "Primer of the History of the Holy Catholic Church in Ireland." Especially in the latter, this eminent writer touches in several places upon the ground trodden by Mr. Warren, and, indeed, somewhat anticipates his results.

Mr. Warren brings out in a very striking manner, in his introduction, the independence of Rome that characterized the early churches of these islands. He shows that they were independent in origin, mission and jurisdiction. He gives instances of the sturdy spirit that was manifested by Celtic churchmen. The case of Bishop Dagan, to be found in "Bede," is well known,—how this Irish bishop refused, not merely to eat and drink with the Roman bishops, but even to eat and drink in the same house. More remarkable still was the conduct of Columbanus at a later period. His language to the then pope "implied assertion of exemption from the

jurisdiction, and a claim to be allowed to criticize freely, and from the independent standpoint of an equal, the character and conduct of any Roman pontiff." Mr. Warren sums up the position taken by Columbanus in the following words :—

> The language which he used to Boniface IV. is not that of a subordinate, but is couched in terms the freedom of which may not have been resented then, but would certainly be resented now. He laments over the infamy attaching itself to the chair of St. Peter in consequence of disputes at Rome. He exhorts the Pope to be more on the watch, and to cleanse his See from error, because it would be a lamentable thing if the Catholic faith was not held in the Apostolic See. He says that many persons entertain doubts as to the purity of the faith of the Roman bishop. He allows a high post of honour to the See of Rome, but second to that of Jerusalem, the place of our Lord's resurrection. He upbraids the Roman Church for proudly claiming a greater authority and power in divine things than was possessed by other Churches merely because of a certain fact recorded in the Gospels, and denied by no one, that our Lord entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven to St. Peter, and points out that the prerogative of the keys stands upon a different basis, and must be wielded on other grounds.

The position thus taken by her eminent son on the Continent gives an idea of that of the Church at home, in Ireland, towards the Papal See.

Mr. Warren further proceeds to show the Eastern origin and the Gallican connection of the Celtic Church.

With regard to the liturgy and ritual he gives us many interesting particulars. Celtic churches were small, and "were not named after departed saints, but after their living founders." The Celtic service was remarkable for several peculiarities. The Irish were charged with differing from the rule of other Churches, and celebrating the Holy Eucharist with a great number and variety of collects and prayers. The Lord's Prayer was not introduced as in the Roman missal; and from this arises, Mr. Warren shows, "one of the strongest proofs of an Ephesine rather than a Petrine origin of the Celtic liturgy." The sermon came next after the Gospel. The benediction was given with the right hand, and in the Eastern manner. Prayers for the dead are found dating from the fifth and sixth centuries. "There are no instances recorded of the modern practice of praying to departed saints, although there was a strong and devout belief in the efficacy of their prayers for those left on earth."

Two colours seem to have been in use—purple or red, and white. The altar is stated by Mr. Warren to have been sometimes of stone, sometimes of wood. But we have evidence[1] that to the time of the Synod of Dublin, 1186, the custom of the Church of Ireland was to have communion tables of wood; and in that synod, such tables were prohibited, and stone altars were ordered to be erected.

Mr. Warren gives us several particulars as to the dress of ecclesiastics. Celtic bishops wore a little-known ornament, called a *rationale*, in the same position, and having the appearance of the breastplate of the Jewish high priests. Many specimens of the pastoral staff of ancient times still exist; and if we are to take the pastoral staff of St. Moloch as typical of early use, it was something else as well as a ritual ornament. It "is a blackthorn bludgeon, with traces of a metal covering;" and seems to have been better adapted for enforcing discipline in a rough and ready way than for ornamenting a procession. Irish bishops seem to have worn crowns instead of mitres. With regard to some other points, such as bracelets, the comb, and the fan, Mr. Warren will be the first to admit that there is really no conclusive evidence of their ritual use. In order to exhaust his

[1] THE CHURCHMAN, vol iv. p. 433.

subject, Mr. Warren has mentioned them, and anything that even remotely refers to them; but there is really nothing in it.

No passage has been discovered referring to the use of incense in the Celtic Church; nor is there trace of incense in the early Gallican Church.

With regard to confession, Mr. Warren's observations are very interesting, and but corroborate and confirm the opinions that must have been formed by every candid student of Celtic literature. There is no trace of it as a preparation for the reception or celebration of the Eucharist. A confessor was *amncara*, or soul's friend. Confession was public rather than private; it was optional rather than compulsory. Absolution was only pronounced after the imposed penance had been fulfilled.

Many other points of curious interest might be noted. The creed given in the "Antiphonary of Bangor" is different in wording from all other forms known to exist, and its position resembles that of the Mozarabic rite, which points to a special connection, as does also the prominent position given to the Benedicite.

The foregoing is an abstract of the picture of the ritual of the Church of St. Patrick, drawn for us by a most competent hand. We see that in every respect it agrees with what we have already stated. The Church of St. Patrick was Eastern, not Italian; regarded St. John and Ephesus more than St. Peter and Rome, and maintained for many a year an attitude towards the Roman See distinctly hostile. Of course we find many of the corruptions of the age, but we find also much to remind us of the primitive simplicity of Apostolic days. In considering the teaching of the Church of St. Patrick, and of its members, we find how unlike it is to the doctrine and practice of Modern Roman Catholicism, and how much nearer it is to the teaching of its descendant, the Reformed Church of Ireland. C. S.

Short Notices.

Records of the Past. English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments, published under the sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology. Vol. XII. Egyptian Texts. S. Bagster & Sons.

The present volume, which completes the present series, says Dr. Birch, in a brief preface, "closes the translations of the principal Assyrian and Egyptian texts." A new series, it is hoped, will be undertaken, in due course. Meantime, the great benefit which *The Records of the Past*—twelve volumes—have conferred on the advance of the researches into the mythology and literature of Egypt and Assyria must be gratefully acknowledged. We set a high value on this series. By an inadvertence which we regret a notice of the closing volume has been delayed.

Early Britain. By Grant Allen, B.A. Pp. 234. S.P.C.K.

"It was not the Roman mission which finally succeeded in converting the North and the Midlands. That success was due to the Scottish and Pictish Church." The Italian monks who accompanied Augustine did a great work, no doubt; but due credit should be given to the men of Britannic feelings who derived their Orders from Iona. So writes the author of the interesting book before us, which contains a good deal of information about these matters. On Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature there are well-written chapters.

Winter Pictures by Poet and Artist, with numerous engravings by Edward Whymper. Pp. 180. The Religious Tract Society.

A charming volume. The engravings are excellent; the poetical pieces are well chosen and well arranged. This harmonious selection of pictures seems to us one of the most tasteful books of the season. A key-note quotation from John Foster appears in the Preface, as follows :—

John Foster characteristically remarks :—"The winter is generally felt an unpleasing and gloomy season of the year; the more desirable is it to make it yield us some special good by way of compensation. The practicability of doing this displays the excellence of mind above matter, and the advantage of religion. The sky is gloomy, the light brief and faint; the earth torpid, sterile, and deprived of beauty—the whole system of the elements ungenial, like a general refusal of Nature to please us, or afford us anything. Well, but MIND, with the aid of wisdom and religion, may not only flourish within itself, but may compel the very winter to afford assistance to its doing so. It may raise a richer produce than the agriculturist can in spring and autumn."

Decision for Christ. Counsel and Encouragement for Young People. By FLAVEL S. COOK, D.D. Pp. 80. Elliot Stock.

Wise and weighty words; may they win many! Dr. Flavel Cook, as many audiences know, has a very effective way of putting things; his speech is suggestive, as well as sound and strong. We heartily recommend this *multum in parvo*.

Cousin Mabel's Sketches of Character. By Miss E. J. WHATELY, Author of "Cousin Mabel's Experiences," "The Gospel in Bohemia," &c. Pp. 385. R.T.S.

The author of "The Life of Archbishop Whately" is known as taking a high rank among the able and useful religious writers of the day. Those who have read "Cousin Mabel's Experiences" will be sure to get her "Sketches of Character," which embody the result of wide and long-continued observation, especially in circles where the standard of conduct is that of the Gospel. To apply great principles to small duties, says Miss Whately, is one of the hardest tasks of life. One great hindrance to the spread of real religion, we judge, is the sad inconsistency between profession and practice on the part of so many "sound Christians."

Mary Cloudsdale: a Story for Girls, by J. M. SINCLAIR, pp. 127, S.P.C.K., is one of those books which it has been evidently a pleasure to write, as it will certainly be a pleasure to read. The writer, who is a daughter of the late excellent Canon Sinclair, knows the scenery and people both of Cumberland and Sussex, and can give with equal facility a picture of home-life in a cottage as in a mansion. In following the fortunes of "Mary Cloudsdale," we see something of both, as the heroine, who is the daughter of a North country "dalesman," leaves home to become a servant in a family of rank in a southern county. How the good seed of Christian teaching sown by a pious mother in the heart of her young daughter may spring up and bear fruit abundantly in the sweet influence of a life ruled by love to God, faith in His promises through Christ our Lord, and constant study of the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is set forth in this charming narrative, which is full of a simple interest, and may be most heartily recommended as a book "for girls" of all classes.

Willie's Choice. "All is not gold that glitters." By M. A. PAULL, Author of "Tim's Troubles," &c. &c. Pp. 144. T. Nelson & Sons.

A really good tale. Beginning from Willie's schooldays, it shows how

when a lad, in selecting a friend, and afterwards, when a medical man, in choosing a wife, he forgot that "all is not gold that glitters." The real, that which stands "wear and tear," Dr. Willie was taught to value.

Through the Linn; or, Miss Temple's Wards. By AGNES GIBERNE. Pp. 240. R.T.S.

Whether "Linn," in Scotch, *always* means a deep still pool, not a fall, we have some doubts; but whether "Through the Linn" is a well-written story we have no doubt whatever. The reality of the religious experiences in its pages may be of special service to many readers. We must not omit to state that the volume is gilt-edged, handsomely got up, and well illustrated.

The Papal Claims Considered in the Light of Scripture and History. With an Introduction by the Lord Bishop of BEDFORD. Pp. 195. Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.

There is a good deal of information in this thoughtful treatise, which is recommended by the Bishop-Suffragan, Dr. Walsham How. The author proves that the Church of the first four centuries knew absolutely nothing of the supremacy-succession. But we think that he should have laid stress, if even in few words, on the fearful doctrinal departures of Rome from the primitive rule. His remarks on the position of Mr. Gorham, as defended by Canon Mozley, are eminently reasonable. High Churchmen, he says, should not desire to exclude St. Augustine from the Church.

Freaks and Marvels of Plant Life; or, Curiosities of Vegetation. By M. C. COOKE, M.A., LL.D. Pp. 460. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Open this book where one may, some or other "curiosity" of plant life is sure to meet the eye. About pitcher-plants, "twiners and climbers," sensitive-plants, side-saddle flowers, Venus's fly-trap, and so forth, Dr. Cooke discourses in a simple style, with a wealth of anecdotal illustration. No less than ninety-seven woodcuts serve his teaching purposes. To Dr. Darwin's patient and successful investigations he alludes in passing, but no endorsement of "Darwinian" theories, so far as we have observed, appears in any form. On page 9 we read of *Eucalyptus globulus*, as follows:—

In October, 1873, M. Gimbert narrated in *Comptes Rendus*, the results of his experiments with the Eucalyptus in Algeria. The tree grows rapidly, and aids in destroying the malarious agency which is supposed to cause fever. It absorbs as much as ten times its weight of water from the soil, and emits camphoraceous antiseptic vapour from its leaves. A farm, some twenty miles from Algiers, was noted for its pestilential air in the spring of 1867; 13,000 Eucalyptus trees were planted there, since which time not a single case of fever had occurred. . . . The honour of discovering this property in the gum-tree is due to Sir W. Macarthur, of Sydney.

Helena's Household. A Tale of Rome in the First Century. Pp. 450. Cheap Edition. T. Nelson & Sons.

This is an ably written and very interesting story. The Roman, the Greek, and the Jew, are clearly brought before its readers; Christian and Pagan are well contrasted. Nero, and Tigellinus are depicted, and there are graphic sketches of gladiatorial combats and of the siege of Jerusalem. In tone and temper the tale is all that one could wish; the references to Athenian philosophy are informing; and the representation of British life adds to the charm as well as the historical value.

Hymns for the Church and the Chamber. By the Rev. CHARLES D. BELL, D.D. Pp. 140. Nisbet & Co.

Of Canon Bell's poetical insight, tenderness of thought, grace and power of expression, or of his evangelical fervour, it is unnecessary to write a single line in this Magazine. Those who have read his criticisms in THE CHURCHMAN, and other writings by the same poetical pen, will know what to expect in the volume of sacred poetry now published. In heartily recommending it, as an admirable New Year gift, we may remark that there are about fifty hymns and verses, and that the book is beautifully printed. We make a single quotation, a hymn on "Numbering our Days, Ps. xc. 12:—

Oh teach us, Lord, in love,
In such true way to number up our days,
That wisdom from above
May hallow all our words and works and ways.

Let not the world employ
Our thoughts too much, or fill our minds with cares;
For we above its joy
Would live, above its sorrows and despairs.

May all our days be Thine,
And, as the path to Heaven we firmly tread,
May we to Thee resign
Ourselves, our wills, to sin and passion dead.

Oh, guide us on the way
That leadeth upward to the perfect light,
Where the broad golden day
Is always at the noon, nor knows a night.

O Father, Saviour, Friend,
Bind us to Thee with love's strong golden chain;
To us Thy Spirit send,
So Christ shall be our life, and death our gain.

The Song of Songs, arranged in Twelve Canticles, and rendered into English Blank Verse. By B. S. CLARKE, D.D. With an introduction by HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. Nisbet & Co.

In an interesting introduction to this metrical paraphrase, Dr. Bonar, whose poetical genius is not more conspicuous than his spiritual fervour and insight, brings out what he believes to be the true teaching of the Song. Few translations are enriched by a preface so polished and so practical. Dr. Bonar warmly recommends Canon Clarke's translation: it "has done great justice to the original, and will bear many a reading, both on account of its accuracy of rendering and its classical gracefulness of style." A translation in blank verse, it appears, was published anonymously in 1856; we have never seen it, but we are much pleased with Dr. Clarke's. In ii. 17, he renders, we observe, "until [Thrupp has, "against,"] the day *breathe*," (not *break*, A.V.); the idea, we think, is separation till evening; he does not explain "the mountains of Bether," (of *division*, marg. A.V.) It occurs to us, that in a second edition, a few explanatory notes might well be added; from the mass of commentaries and renderings, the esteemed author could easily select a few gems. We must add that the volume has a tasteful cover, and is printed with much taste.

Old Oscar, the Faithful Dog. By H. G. REID, Author of "Art Studies from Landseer." Pp. 54. *Home Words* Publishing Office.

"The first thing I do," said an Aberdeen shepherd, "is just to get the

doggie to love me like. I treat him coothie and kindly, and just keep newsin to him until he about kens ilka word I say." Those who appreciate the Highland collie as he deserves, will read this charming story-sketch with an especial interest. It is illustrated after original sketches by Landseer, Wilkie, and Weir, and is got up with much taste.

A Short Notice of the Revised Version of the New Testament: an Address read at the Lincoln Diocesan Conference, October 21, 1881. By the Bishop of LINCOLN. Lincoln: Williamson. London: Rivingtons.

We should very gladly make some comments on this admirable Address, had we space; but we must at present content ourselves with one brief quotation. The eminent author says:—

In Gal. ii. 8 the rendering in the new Revision, "a man is *not justified* by the *works of the law, save* through *faith*" is illogical and erroneous, and contradicts the whole drift of St. Paul's argument in that Epistle and in the Epistle to the Romans.

The Acts and Epistles of St. Paul. By Rev. F. A. MALLESON, M.A., Vicar of Broughton-in-Furness. Pp. 596. Hodder & Stoughton.

This is a big book; and to give a notice not unworthy of it would take up more space than we can spare. At present, therefore, we may remark that although a passage, here and there, shows signs of a somewhat hasty composition, the book is a really good one, an honest piece of work, sound, readable, and informing. A single specimen passage may be quoted (pp. 108–9):—

We must now pause for awhile in our narrative to see what kind of a place was this famous Antioch of which we shall hereafter hear so often. When Saul entered it now, not probably for the first time, he beheld a great city, not hoary with antiquity like the familiar Jerusalem, but a bright and splendid city, Greek in its beauty, Roman in its stately grandeur and strength; magnificent within the broad compass of its massive, mountain-climbing walls, superlatively lovely in all its surroundings. Saul, having passed through the shady groves and along the cool, sparkling streams that gently flowed through the luxurious groves and past the sumptuous villas and the flashing fanes of Daphne, would enter the city through the western or Golden Gate. But all this beauty he would view with less of admiration than of horror and indignation, knowing of the foul, heathenish orgies that filled even Roman voluptuaries with disgust. . . . . The finest features of Antioch on which the eyes of Saul fell as he entered the Golden Gate was its noble principal street, of four miles in length, in a direct line from east to west, paved through the greater part of its extent with flags of marble by the ostentatious munificence of Herod, and lined on each side with rows of stately pillars, shady trees, and marble statues of its founder, Seleucus the Conqueror. Fine bridges, spacious baths, long and lofty aqueducts, theatres, added to the grandeur of this magnificent metropolis. The royal palace of the Seleucidæ, with all its regal surroundings, was built on an island in the Orontes, as the heart of Paris, with its noble cathedral, occupies an island of the Seine. The fortifications of the strong citadel frowned down upon the city from the craggy heights of Mount Silpius, looking upon a city the streets of which were laid out at right angles, a construction only practicable in cities built with forethought upon a preconcerted plan. In the time of the Apostles, Antioch was justly considered to be the third city of the Empire: Rome the first, for strength; Alexandria the second, for learning; Antioch the third, for luxury and all its attendant sins.

Diocesan Histories. Durham. By Rev. J. L. LOW, M.A. *Chichester.* By Prebendary STEPHENS. *Peterborough.* By Rev. GEO. POOLE, M.A. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

It was a good idea to compile a series of Diocesan Histories; and with the three volumes before us we are, on the whole, well-satisfied. The

books are not too bulky: there is a map: one cannot complain of too much detail. The "Ecclesiological Notes" in the *Peterborough* volume form a good feature. Here and there, in reading some pages, particularly in the History of Chichester, which we have most carefully examined, we have put in the margin a pencil ? Prebendary Stephens might well, we think, have written in a more cordial tone of Wycliff, and of the Reformation. We put a very large ? opposite his statement that judging from the articles of inquiry "addressed by High Churchmen of the school of Laud," there was an irreverence which accounts for the determination of Laud "*to have the Holy Table set back again, altar-wise, at the end of the church, in all parishes.*"

Lost in Egypt. By M. L. WHATELY. Pp. 241. R. T. S.

Miss Whately's graphic sketches of Egyptian life and manners, which appeared in THE CHURCHMAN a year ago, many of our readers, no doubt, will remember. Miss Whately has been doing a noble work in Egypt, with, we fear, but scant encouragment from English Christians. There are now greater native facilities for education than when she began her work; and she perceives that a Medical Mission will afford better openings among adults. The present volume, says the Preface, has been written to obtain some additional and much-needed funds for this new enterprise. An interesting story, we hope that "Lost in Egypt" may have the circulation which it merits. May it largely stir up zeal, and excite a Missionary spirit. As the Preface says :—

"Visitors to the land of the Pharaohs may," in reading this book, "be carried back in imagination by the descriptions, to watch once more the wonderful after-glow they have seen from their white-winged Nile boats; to wander in the palm groves which fringe the ancient river; to admire the emerald green of the land of Goschen, or the unearthly beauty of the shores of the Red Sea. And those who wish to know among what manner of people the bread of life is cast upon the waters, in the country whence that similitude was drawn, may almost feel, after reading *Lost in Egypt*, as if they had been denizens of the huts or farm-houses amongst which the glad tidings are at last beginning to circulate."

The Imperial Dictionary of the English Language; a complete Encyclopædic Lexicon, Literary, Scientific, and Technological. By JOHN OGILVIE, LL.D., Author of "The Comprehensive English Dictionary," "The Student's English Dictionary, &c. &c. New Edition, carefully Revised and greatly Augmented. Edited by CHARLES ANNANDALE, M.A. Illustrated by above three thousand engravings printed in the text. London: Blackie & Son.

The Imperial Dictionary, it is fairly stated in the Preface, has been accepted as a standard Lexicon of the English Language, and as one of the most extensively useful for the purposes of general reference and everyday requirement, for more than a quarter of a century. We have ourselves made use of Dr. Ogilvie's Dictionary, and can speak from personal experience of its excellence. A new edition, however, has been thought necessary. This new edition, we learn, has been in preparation for above ten years. Every entry in the book has undergone careful revision, and so great and numerous have been the changes introduced, and so extensive the additions made to the vocabulary, that it may justly claim to be considered as substantially a new work.

We have examined its pages, here and there, and we are fully satisfied. Mr. Annandale has executed his laborious task with skill and judgment. When the second volume comes before us we shall give, we hope, a fuller notice of the work. Meantime, we may remark that the new edition is

admirably arranged, and well printed in clear type; the illustrations are numerous and exceedingly good.

The Union Jack. A Magazine of Healthy Stirring Tales of Adventure by Land and Sea. 1881. Edited by G. A. HENTY, Special Correspondent of *The Standard*, Author of "The March to Magdala," "The March to Coomassie," &c. Sampson Low & Co.

The Union Jack was started by that late esteemed and eminent writer of tales for boys, the late Mr. Kingston. It is now edited by Mr. Henty; and so far as we can judge, the special character of the magazine as a collection of stories is well preserved. A schoolboy who reads his *Union Jack* with lively interest assures us that the stories are excellent. One of them, "Dorrincourt," we have read nearly all through; and it seems thoroughly wholesome, an elevating as well as an attractive story. For ourselves we should prefer a little less of the mere "adventure" element in the volume.

Dick Darlington. By A. H. ENGELBACH. Pp. 218. S.P.C.K.

Captain "Dick" was cured of his conceit; and the tale ends well. His experiences in Germany, Canada, and Afghanistan (with General Sale), are described in an attractive way.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received three very readable and handsome gift-books, *Indian Pictures*, *Footprints of Italian Reformers*, and *Past and Present in the East:* we gladly recommend them.—(1) *Indian Pictures* is one of that charming series, "Pictures drawn with Pen and Pencil," several volumes of which are probably well known to our readers. The series has been strongly recommended in the CHURCHMAN. To Dr. Green and the late Dr. Manning (to whom, in passing, we repeat an *In Memoriam* line of sincere respect), all who welcome illustrated books of travel of a high order—attractive, and really instructive—are much indebted. The volume before us, "Pictures" of India, by the Rev. W. URWICK, M.A., is a not unworthy successor of works which critics of every class have cordially commended. It gives a good deal of information, in a pleasing way, and the illustrations are excellent. One suggestion, having in view this unique series of books, may be pardoned. We have had Spanish, Italian, American, English, French, and other "Pictures;" but may we hope soon to see *Scottish Pictures?*—(2) *Footprints of Italian Reformers*, by Dr. STOUGHTON, is a companion to "Homes and Haunts of Luther." The accomplished author has made good use of standard authorities, and also of such recent works as Benrath's Life of Ochino. His book, therefore, is fresh, as well as clear. The story of Protestant struggles in Italy is deeply interesting, and Dr. Stoughton's version of it is timely. We must not omit a word of praise as to the tasteful way in which this volume is printed and "got up:" there are several choice illustrations.—(3). *Past and Present in the East*, by Prebendary HARRY JONES, is in its own way one of the best books of Oriental travel in these days. The letters "were written in short intervals of continuous travel;" a few extracts from his journal were added at home. An absence of conventionality in form and style will give to the narrative, at all events for many readers, a special charm. Of Miss Dickson's English school for native girls at Nazareth, we observe, Mr. Jones wrote:—"I was delighted, charmed . . . Here was one bright healthy spot in an ill-governed, oppressed land, well found at Nazareth—a light shining in a dark place."

From Messrs. Raphael Tuck & Sons, Fine Art Publishers (177, City Road, E.C.), we have received a large assortment of Birthday, Christmas,

and New Year Cards. Such Cards, Oleographs, Chromos, &c., we have never seen before; and our only difficulty is to give a worthy notice in our limited space. The detailed list to us is hardly a help. But we may say, in brief, that from a low to a comparatively high price, the packets are excellent, and really cheap. No. 602, small and large size, coloured flowers, are admirable art productions. No. 389, and other classical pictures, are exquisitely finished. No. 339, and other bird sketches; 462, rural groups, of various types; and several others, deserve the warmest praise. Of separate, single cards also, the specimens are, as a rule, attractive and good.

We have received from Messrs. S. Hildesheimer & Co. (14 and 15, Silk Street, Whitecross Street, E.C.), an admirable series of Christmas and other Cards. Much that we have written in praise of those published by Messrs. Tuck applies to the various series sent us by this firm. The Star of Bethlehem, No. 643, Eastern Ruins, and several other Cards, with text of Scriptures and religious verses, are exceedingly good. They are surprisingly cheap. The designs are of a high order, and the taste, skill, and judgment displayed in the execution leave nothing to be desired.

The S.P.C.K. issues this winter a large supply of Tales for children and young persons, well-written, with good illustrations and tasteful covers, and cheap.—*Ambrose Oran,* "a Story of the Buccaneers," has some spirited sketches of West Indian Life, 1666—1690, which boys will appreciate. Ambrose was first a white slave (an apprentice).—*The Brave Men of Eyam* is a story-picture of the plague. Most readers have heard of the Mompessons: their letters are here printed. Thomas Stanley, a "Puritan," was also faithful; and his heroism is well described. The word Eyam is pronounced "eem," as in the lines—

> Below the hills where the first morning beam
> Pours all its glory on the graves of Eyam.

King's Marden is a simply written "love story;" one of the village carpenter's daughters thinks of marrying a "Squire;" the tone is good, so is the "moral."—We are much pleased with *Missy and Master*; quiet, real, and attractive. "Master" was a circus pony; and "Missy" was an "infant wonder of the world," rescued, trained, and baptized.—*Aunt Kezia's Will,* a story of no small merit, relates how through a blind niece a harsh-tempered old woman was softened.—There is lack of reality here and there in *Marcel's Duty,* a tale of the Franco-German war; the descriptions are clever and spirited, but two of the incidents are improbable.—*Lapsed but not Lost,* by the Author of "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family," an ably-written tale of Roman Carthage, contains some striking passages.—*Unto his Life's End,* "a book for choirboys;" an interesting story, contains some earnest words about Confirmation and the Communion.—*Vanda* is, perhaps, scarcely up to the average.—A *Leal Light Heart,* is the work of Annette Lyster, one of the most promising tale writers of the day, author of my "Lonely Lassie," and "The White Gipsy," recently recommended in The Churchman. It gives some beautifully drawn and very suggestive word-pictures. Lady le Mesurier succeeded with Gwenevre, but Emily was faithful to her promise.

We have received the third volume of *Plutarch's Lives* (George Bell & Sons), an admirable translation, mainly the work of Mr. Aubrey Stewart, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Some of the "Lives" in the present volume were translated by that eminent scholar, the late Mr. George Long. These volumes, as we have before remarked, are well printed and handy.

Two cheap and pretty little story books are *Robin and Linnet* and *We are Seven* (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.) The latter treats of upper-class life, and shows how a stepmother won confidence and love.

Family Readings on the Gospel according to St. Mark, by the Rev. F. BOURDILLON, we can thoroughly recommend. Two volumes of "Readings" were previously published by the Religious Tract Society; and the esteemed author may now, we hope, find leisure for a volume on the Gospel according to St. Luke.

Written by a "A Student of Science," *The Great Problem: or, Christianity as it is* (R.T.S.), is an able work. Evidently, this "Student" is a man of thought and power; but, at present, we are unable to notice his work at any length.

Dorrincourt, a clever and wholesome story for boys (Nisbet & Co.), has life and spirit. The author shows skill and judgment: he will improve. Two or three things public-schoolboys may question; and once or twice the dramatic effect is rather too strong. One point we cannot understand: if the Head-Master was only "Master of Arts" (p. 2), why is he called "Doctor?" *Dorrincourt* is a pleasing gift-book.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published "A Clerical Symposium," *The Lord's Supper* (pp. 220), a reprint from *The Homiletical Quarterly*. The papers were written by Pressensé, Luthardt, Littledale, Sadler, Beet, and others.

Messrs. Nelson & Sons have published a pretty packet of cards, *Garden Flowers:* also *Glad Tidings*, floral text cards; just the thing for Sunday Schools. We have also received, from Messrs. Nelson, *Robinson Crusoe*, and other cheap coloured toy-books.

Messrs. Campbell & Tudhope (Glasgow, 137, West Campbell Street; London, 45, St. Paul's Churchyard) have published several packets of Cards for Christmas and the New Year. We have received No. 256, *Swiss Packet:* 239, *The Orchid Packet*, 250, *Peeps into the Microscope*. Not too high-priced, they are suitable for Sunday School rewards and gifts.

Mission Work among the Indian Tribes in the Forests of Guiana. By the Rev. W. H. BRETT, B.D. With Maps and Illustrations. Pp. 250. S.P.C.K. A very readable book. It gives information concerning tribes of whom many who are really interested in Missionary labour knew little or nothing. There are several passages on mosquitoes and other insects, beasts of prey, swamps, canoes, and forest life.

Surly Bob (Cassell.) A cheap little story-book. Illustrated. A Sunday School teacher tells us it is "very good."

Messrs. Hildesheimer and Faulkner (41, Jewin Street, E.C.), have sent us some charming Cards. We hardly know how to commend them. It is really an *embarras de richesses*. But the plate series is novel and peculiarly tasteful: there are several sorts. The packet No. 292, four snow-covered churches, is delightful. No. 369, fruit series, No. 347, flowers. No. 207, baskets of flowers, No. 381, vases with flowers, and several others, are most tasteful. The china series is perhaps one of the best. Many of these Cards are well worth framing.

As Happy as a King. A plain book for occasional reading. By the Rev. F. BOURDILLON, M.A., Vicar of Old Warden. R.T.S.

One of the best of this practised writer's books: simple, practical, with here and there an illustrative story.

Some Aspects of the Revised Version of the New Testament. By the Rev. ALFRED OATES, Vicar of Christ Church, Ware. Ware: H. Roberts.

An interesting pamphlet.

Dr. CURTISS, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary, has translated one of Professor DELITZSCH'S courses of University lectures on Biblical Theology: *Old Testament History of Redemption* (T. & T. Clark). With what we have read of these Leipzig lectures we are much pleased. Another, a similar volume, *Messianic Prophecies*, may be well known to some of our readers.

Harrison Weir's Pictures of Wild Birds and Animals. With 24 coloured plates from original drawings: printed in oil colours by Leighton Brothers (R. T. S).—What shall we say of this delightful volume? It is enough surely to quote the title-page.

Mr. Pym's *Outlines for the Little Ones to Colour*, published by Messrs. Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.—A charming little book. From the same publishers we have received the annual volume of their useful magazine for children, *Sunday*. It contains some 200 illustrations, and is a really cheap Christmas gift.

A readable little book (pp. 100) is the Rev. A. S. DYER'S *Sketches of English Nonconformity*, recommended by the Bishop of Winchester (W. Poole). Kindly, devout; we wish we could add, thoroughly evangelical.

Messrs. Dean & Son (160, Fleet Street, E.C.) have sent us some very pretty and amusing books for children. *Round and About*, "chromographed" pictures, with rhymes; *Little Somebody's Book of Pictures and Verse*, with plain and coloured sketches. Also cheaper, *Currant Buns* and *Golden Rhymes*, nursery songs.

From the S.P.C.K. we have received several almanacks. *The Churchman's Remembrancer*, pp. 110, we have always reckoned the most convenient clerical diary. *The Churchman's Almanack*, in cloth and paper, two or three sizes; also, as everybody knows, a sheet for the wall.

The *Band of Hope Annual* (Partridge) is practical and attractive as usual.

We gladly recommend the volume of *The Quiver* (Cassell, Petter, and Galpin) just published; exceedingly good. We have always had a kindly feeling for this magazine, in which the religious element is sound and prominent; and we are pleased to see that our old friend keeps improving.

We have received from Messrs. Nisbet & Co., and must content ourselves, at present, with a bare mention of it, Mr. NEIL'S *Palestine Explored*, a well-written, interesting work.

A New Illustrated Biblical Dictionary, specially suited to the requirements of Sunday School Teachers, and issued at an exceptionally low price, is announced by Mr. Elliot Stock.

THE POET COWPER.—We gladly make mention, as a sort of postscript to Canon Bell's essay in THE CHURCHMAN, of an annotated edition of Cowper's Letters, published by the Religious Tract Society (*Letters of William Cowper*. A Selection from his Correspondence, with a Sketch of his Life, and Biographical Notices of his Correspondents. Pp. 415.) Canon Bell's description of the letters (p. 128) is in itself a sufficient recommendation of this excellent edition: but we may remark that the "selection" has been made with judgment, the notes are informing, and by no means dry or dull, while there are several illustrations. In referring to p. 128 (second line) of the last CHURCHMAN, we may add that by some unaccountable mischance the word "*translations*" became a typographical puzzle.

THE MONTH.

THE first meeting of the Executive Committee of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences was held on the 8th at the National Society's Rooms, Westminster.[1] It was stated that up to the 4th inst. the following Conferences had by distinct resolution agreed to the nomination of three laymen and three clergymen to attend as representatives at the next meeting of the Council:—viz., Winchester, Bangor, Chichester, Ely, Lichfield, Lincoln, Norwich, Oxford, Peterborough, Rochester, St. Albans, St. Asaph, Truro, Ripon, Chester, Carlisle, Manchester, Sodor and Man:—

The committee carefully revised the terms of the provisional constitution and rules passed last July, and suggested certain by-laws to be submitted to the meeting of the Council early next year. Reports from several of the Conferences have been received, and others were expected. A summary of these, with other matters, was ordered to be brought before the committee at its next meeting on the 20th of December, with the view of preparing an *agenda* paper for the council.

At the third Annual Diocesan Conference in Norwich, 111 cleric and 120 lay members were present. In the opening address the Bishop spoke of lay-ministrations:—

I believe that at the present time one of the great practical wants of our Church, which has existed so long, and has held wisely to her formularies through so many generations, is adaptation—not to let go anything she has, or any of the principles she maintains, or many of the forms that she is employing, but along with them to seek to adapt her agency to the particular wants of the times in which she is called to serve God, and the particular circumstances in which vast masses of the population are placed. One element of that adaptation, I believe, would be to employ men of different ranks of life to labour and work generally, but more particularly in that class of life to which they belong, and the people amongst whom they are generally living. I speak this not only with regard to, as it is generally said, our working class, but among all classes of society we want a good deal in our Church of the adaptation of our different machinery to the exigencies of the time.

A Report on Church Discipline being presented, Mr. C. S.

[1] The Dean of Lichfield, the Master of Magdalene, Cambridge, Chancellor Espin, Canon Temple, Archdeacon Hannah, Archdeacon Emery, Canon Howell Evans, and the Rev. W. J. Jones, Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P., Mr. C. Magniac, M.P., Mr. H. Cecil Raikes, Mr. F. S. Powell, and Mr. W. E. Hubbard were present.

Read protested against its adoption, and the Report was rejected by an overwhelming majority.[1]

At the Chester Diocesan Conference, on the question, "The Just Limits of Variation in Ritual," an extremely interesting paper was read by General Sir Richard Wilbraham, K.C.B. Sir Richard dwelt on the importance

> Of bringing under the wholesome influence of the Church those masses in our large towns who are unhappily becoming more and more estranged from it, if not actually hostile to it. It is only those whose sphere of work has lain among those masses who can, I think, fully estimate the vital importance of making every effort to bring them out of their state of practical heathenism. They are not only a standing reproach to the Church, but a great and increasing danger to the State. There are whole classes which—with, I fear, very rare individual exceptions—never enter any place of worship, for no form of Dissent has succeeded in laying hold of them any more than the Church has; indeed not so much; for it is a class above these which fills the Dissenting chapels.

Of the Chichester Diocesan Conference discussion on the Supreme Court, the *Guardian* says:—

> We observe that a far more prominent part than usual was taken by lay speakers; nor can we refrain from adding that, so far as we can judge from the report, their utterances stood, in respect of good sense, moderation, and propriety of tone, in very favourable contrast with those of some of the more prominent clerical orators. The whole course of the debate and its result showed plainly—what the experience of the Colonial Church has always shown—the salutary effect produced by union of lay and clerical delegates in discussion, whether they subsequently vote by orders, or all together. . . . . One other characteristic we are constrained to note with much regret—the intolerant tone of those who seemed to be champions of what is called the Ritualistic party, giving some occasion to the retort that they would accept no law except their own will, and representing one of the most dangerous and perplexing elements of our present difficulty.

At the first meeting of the Liverpool Diocesan Conference there was a large attendance. The constitution provisionally adopted in this diocese is a mixture of the collective and the elective: all clergymen holding the Bishop's licence are summoned; a layman or two laymen from each parish, are elected. On the advantages of Diocesan Conferences the Bishop spoke with his

---

[1] The Conference discussed the question of "Deacons and Secular Occupations." The Rev. S. Garratt moved for a Committee to consider whether any legal or other impediments prevented deacons from supporting themselves by honest trade or profession, and if any, what they are, and whether it is desirable to remove them. Sir T. F. Buxton seconded, and the motion was, after a short discussion, carried.

usual power.[1] As to sending delegates to the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences, his Lordship suggested a reference to the Standing Committee (as in Canterbury): he thought it "wiser to wait." On the motion of Archdeacon Bardsley, seconded by Canon Clarke, this question was referred to the Standing Committee without discussion.

The condition of the town parishes of the diocese was duly discussed, and the general feeling seemed to be in favour of a greatly-increased and organized lay-help.

At Hereford, in the second annual Diocesan Conference, on the motion of the Bishop, carried unanimously, delegates were chosen for the Central Council. After discussing Mr. Mundella's Proposals for Revision of Code and Examination Schedules, the following Resolution was agreed to:—

That in the opinion of this Conference any alteration in the present system of Government grant which involves excessive expenditure, excessive raising of the standard of education, and frequent changes in the code, is much to be deprecated.

To the late Bishop Barclay, of Jerusalem, many tributes of respect have been paid.

A meeting preliminary to the forming of an Association, which it is proposed to call the Curates' Alliance, has been held:—

The object of the Association suggested in the circular of invitation is "the removal of the grievances of the unbeneficed clergy, and with the wider aim of promoting such general reforms as are necessary for the existence of the Church of England as the Church of the people." The questions put forward in the circular as being of pressing moment were, the position and prospects of curates, the readjustment of ecclesiastical revenues, the reform of Convocation, the state of the laws regulating patronage, and the need of union.

At the Annual Conference of the Church Association, the Chairman, Mr. Valpy, referred to the imprisonments for contempt:—

---

[1] For example. He said: "At present our dioceses are far less strong than they ought to be. We are weak, though endowed and established. The plain truth is, that numbers and size alone do not constitute strength. In the late Franco-German war the French found, to their cost, that crowds of 'men with muskets' do not make an army. Discipline, training, and organization are the first principles of military success. Men must learn how to act together, to stand together, to move together, to support one another, to fill their own places, and to obey the word of command. These are the secrets of an effective soldiery. Now, a Conference tends to organize the Church of England in a diocese. At any rate, I am slow to believe that clergymen and picked laymen from any diocese can meet, confer, and take counsel together annually without adding great power and vigour to the Church, unless they waste their time most strangely. If, by conferring and conversing together, we can only find out the weak points in our present position, and consider the best remedies, we shall have gained something."

There has been a great deal of abuse of the Church Association on account of the carrying out of the legal process against Mr. Green. It has been said that we actually sent down persons to the place to become parishioners. I am prepared to assert on behalf of the Council that there is not the smallest particle of truth in that statement. The Association did not hear of the case until after some three hundred parishioners had made a complaint to the Bishop of the diocese with regard to the Romish practices of the vicar, and had received no redress. They also preferred a request that his Lordship would receive a deputation from their body; but the Bishop refused to see them, and no alteration was made in the services. Finding that they could obtain no redress of the wrongs of which they justly complained, and that they were refused a hearing, they then applied for the first time to the Council, and were advised as to the steps to be taken. Had the Bishop exercised his episcopal authority, and given the parishioners proper redress, there would have been no necessity to take legal proceedings. It is asserted that the complainants are Dissenters, and the only persons in the parish who complain of the Bishop's proceedings, but the fact that they made a declaration that they were members of the Church of England before the proceedings commenced negatives the assertion that they are Dissenters; and those who know the parish state there are hundreds of persons there who objected, and do object, to the Romish services.

At a Meeting of the S.P.G. in Lincoln under the presidency of the Bishop of the Diocese, Sir Richard Temple, Bart., G.C.S.I., the late Governor of Bombay, delivered an interesting and encouraging address on Church Mission work in India.[1]

Mr. Bradlaugh has been worsted on another appeal.

The Cambridge correspondent of the *Record* refers to the protest in the able Charge of the Bishop of Ely against "the novel practice of evening communion," which he regarded as fast becoming a mark of division, and as tending very distinctly to irreverence.[2]

---

[1] One objection, said Sir Richard, was that missions were failures. He would ask them to consider in what did failure or success consist. What would they consider to be a successful result? What was the result? Why, that at that moment there were 390,000 native Christians in India, of whom 100,000 were communicants. Besides these there were 200,000 boys and girls at school, who, though not all of them Christian, were entrusted by heathen parents to the missionaries, and were receiving Christian instruction. Out of these no less than 40,000 were girls. So that, with converts and scholars, there were 590,000 persons, or, in round numbers, 600,000 altogether.

[2] The correspondent says:—Would it not be fair to ask the Bishop if he has ever been present at an evening communion, to judge for himself of its irreverent tendencies? It is really incredible that anything but personal lack of acquaintance with the thing as it is can account for so earnest a denunciation by so good and kindly a man as the Bishop of Ely. I cannot think that his objection can be based on a strongly materialistic view of the ordinance. But if not, what then? Does he really think

In the Arches Court, on appeal by Sir Henry W. Peek, M.P., and other inhabitants of the City parish of St. Mary-at-Hill, from a decision of the Chancellor of the Diocese of London (Dr. Tristram, Q.C.), granting a faculty for certain alterations in the church, Lord Penzance said:—

In the absence of a clearly expressed opinion in their favour by a sufficient body of the parishioners, the Court ought not to sanction such an interference with the existing arrangements of this old Church. The order of the Court below must be reversed, and the faculty refused.

On the occasion of Mr. John Bright's seventieth birthday, several congratulatory addresses from his constituents at Birmingham, and his workpeople and friends at Rochdale, were presented, the event being also celebrated by the decoration and illumination of the latter town. The right hon. gentleman made a characteristic speech.

The conversion to Christianity of one of the most learned and famous of living Mohammedan Ulemas is a remarkable event. Never before probably has so eminent a Mussulman embraced the Gospel as the Effendi (Ahmed Tewfik) whose baptism took place in London on the 11th. Sir William Muir was one of the "witnesses" at the font.

The Very Rev. G. H. S. Johnson, Dean of Wells, has passed away. Dr. Plumptre,[1] an eminent scholar, who has well earned preferment, has been appointed to the vacant Deanery.[2]

The new Dean of Westminster, Dr. Bradley, has been instituted.

To the Deanery of Carlisle, vacant by the resignation of the veteran Dr. Close, Mr. Gladstone nominated the Rev. John Oakley, Vicar of St. Saviour's, Hoxton.

Dr. McHale, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, has died, at the age of 90.[3]

---

that the average attendants at evening communions have come from a late dinner-table, plentifully supplied with wine? Does he know so little of the people and their habits? True, evening communicants seldom display the "reverence" of marked gestures of devotion; simple and orderly kneeling is all that one usually sees. But if by reverence is meant collectedness of demeanour, absolutely orderly approach to and departure from the table, and earnest private prayer after communicating, surely there are few more reverent worshippers than evening communicants, at least in such Cambridge churches as follow this "novel praetice." If the custom is hardening into a mark of difference, the fault is surely with the opinions which condemn the guiltless in this matter.

[1] The Rev. E. H. Plumptre, Prebendary of St. Paul's, Professor in King's College, London, whose writings are numerous and distinguished.

[2] The Canonry of Westminster, rendered vacant by the death of the Warden of All Souls', Oxford, has been filled by the appointment of the Rev. T. J. Rowsell, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Paddington.

[3] Rather profanely termed by "the Liberator," O'Connell, whose cause he espoused, "the Lion of the fold of Judah."