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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1882.

ART. I.—ST. PAUL IN SYRIA AND PHŒNICIA. THOUGHTS AT BEYROUT.

THOSE who travel in the regions to the north of Palestine with their minds on the alert to receive definite Biblical impressions, and who pause (as they are sure to pause) amid the beauty of Beyrout, in the presence of Lebanon and the Sea, to classify and deepen those impressions, find their thoughts at this place very easily taken to four distinct movements of St. Paul's life—each of these movements being expressive of great principles for all time and for all men.

Instinctively they turn in the first instance to Damascus, the connection of which with this city of Beyrout is now so constant and so direct,[1] and to the Apostle's Conversion, which, next after the Resurrection of our Lord, is to be placed in the first rank of the evidential facts of Christianity. This momentous change in his life was the essential condition of all that followed; and the outward and inward circumstances that attended it are brought before us in Scripture on three separate occasions.[2] We may justly be thankful that the southern part of that wall of Damascus, with its courses of Roman masonry, is still bare to view, and that from any height that we may choose within or without the city we can survey the plain and the mountains as they always were, and thus in both ways help ourselves better to realize this great transaction in the History of Religion.[3]

[1] The French road connecting Beyrout with Damascus, which was made after the massacre of 1860, and which is admirably maintained, is a prophecy of the inevitable progress of Western civilization in the East.

[2] Acts ix., xxii. and xxvi.

[3] The length of Damascus lies east and west, the "Straight Street" being still very well defined. On the north side, the old wall is built round and hid by modern houses. On the south, which was the side both of St. Paul's arrival from Jerusalem and of his return thither, the ground outside the wall is quite open.

But the city on the coast, where we now are, was likewise a station on the great Roman road, which connected Antioch on the north with Gaza and Egypt, as well as with Jerusalem,[1] on the south; and at two separate times, which are most carefully recorded, the Apostle Paul, on sacred errands, travelled this way. Once he came here in that early period of his Apostolic life, which was not long subsequent to his conversion. It was revealed at Antioch that a famine was impending: and it was decided that relief should be sent to the poor Christians in Judæa; and this relief was sent by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. And again their return is recorded: "Barnabas and Saul came back from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministration."[2] This implies a journey taken by St. Paul in each direction along this coast. And so it is on the second occasion, soon after the First Missionary Journey was over. Certain persons came from Judæa and disturbed the minds of the Christians at Antioch by teaching, apparently with some authority, that salvation would be impossible except on the condition of adopting the ceremonies of the Jews: and it was determined that Paul and Barnabas, with others, should go to Jerusalem to help in settling this question. This they did; and St. Luke, with his usual accuracy, informs us of their return, with the official letter which was a charter of liberty for the Church in all coming time.[3] Thus again we have an expedition undertaken by this Apostle in each direction along this shore. Of course, we cannot say with absolute certainty that no part of these journeys were accomplished by sea. But on the occasion of this second expedition, it is stated expressly that, on their way to Jerusalem, "they passed through *Phœnicia and Samaria*, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles."[4] Thus we trace distinctly St. Paul's path and St. Paul's voice, through three towns with which those who know this coast are familiar—Sidon and Tyre, and also Acre, which then bore the name of Ptolemais[5]—and so onward, beyond the great plain, with Carmel on the right, and along the well-travelled road through Samaria. Nor are these the only cases where the same coast was touched by this Apostle when he journeyed in the cause of philanthropy, or

---

[1] Such an extract as the following from the Itinerary of Antoninus, coupled with the finding of Roman milestones, is a really valuable commentary on the Bible:—"Beryto, M.P. xxiiii; Sidona, M.P. xxx.; Tyro, M.P. xxiiii.; Ptolemaidam, M.P. xxxii.; Sycamina, M.P. xxiiii.; Cæsarea, M.P. xx.; Betaro, M.P. xviii.; Diospoli, M.P. xxii.; Jamuia, M.P. xii.; Ascalona, M.P. xx.; Gaza, M.P. xvi."—See Wesseling's *Itineraries*, pp. 149–151. Sycamina is Chaifa, Diospolis is Lydda.

[2] Acts xi. 30; xii. 25. [3] Acts xv. 2, 30. [4] Acts xv. 3.

[5] See the extract given above from the Itinerary of Antoninus. This place retained through the Roman period the name which was a record of the Macedonian period, and resumed in mediæval times, as St. Jean d'Acre, its ancient name which it bore in Old Testament times.

to uphold religious truth and religious conduct. At the close of his Third Missionary Journey, scenes of his varied experience, most pathetic, most instructive, are associated with two of these same famous Phœnician cities. He landed at Tyre, and spent seven days there; and when these days were ended, it is said by the historian with exquisite simplicity and tenderness—"We departed and went on our journey; and they all, with wives and children, brought us on our way, till we were out of the city; and, kneeling down on the shore, we prayed and bade each other farewell; and we went on board the ship, and they returned home again."[1] The sail from Tyre to Acre (or Ptolemais) is not a long one. There another affecting scene took place. Intimation had been given to St. Paul, on the most unquestionable authority, that troubles and sufferings awaited him at Jerusalem; and at Acre he was earnestly entreated not to proceed. This deeply moved him. But, strong in his convictions of duty, he determined to execute his errand, which partly was the taking of a collection of money, most diligently gathered for the poor Christians of Judæa, and partly had reference to the promotion of union between two sections of the Church, which tended violently to discord and separation. "What mean ye," he said, "weeping and breaking my heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus;" and it is added, "when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done!"[2] We ought, surely, not to dissociate such passages of an Apostolic life from the places with which they are so carefully, we might say so jealously, identified. And, with our present purpose in view, we have to note that these points of contact with the Phœnician shore group themselves, so to speak, under two heads, indicating two distinct movements of St. Paul's life, one having reference to philanthropy, the other to the maintenance of general principles of religious truth and practice.

But the associations of this Apostle with the Phœnician coast have not been exhausted in the preceding enumeration. When at length it was decided that he was to go to Rome, under circumstances very different from those which he expected, and the departure from Cæsarea had taken place, the "next day" the ship touched at Sidon, and the centurion who had charge of the prisoners "treated Paul kindly, and gave him leave to go unto his friends"—those Christian friends who were well known to him through previous visits—and then, "going to sea from Sidon, they sailed under the lee of Cyprus, because the winds were contrary."[3] Thenceforward the Gospel moved decisively to the West, with St. Paul as its chief messenger.

[1] Acts xxi. 5, 6. [2] Acts xxi. 13, 14. [3] Acts xxvii. 3, 4.

Does it not seem as if each of the old maritime cities of the Old Testament on this coast were intended to be brought into mention again, in connection with this new Gospel ?[1] As to the island of Cyprus—which, as recent events have reminded us, is very near to the spot where we are supposed now to be engaged in thought—it is remarkable that immediately on the dispersion that took place on account of the death of Stephen, the good news is specially said to have travelled to "Phœnicia and Cyprus;" again, men of Cyprus are particularly named as becoming evangelists on the mainland; this island, too, supplied to the Christian cause, in Barnabas, one of the earliest and best of missionaries; and to this island he and Paul first came when officially sent forth from Antioch.[2] Thus we certainly do well if, in true harmony with the old Phœnician spirit of commerce, adventure and discovery, we think on this shore, and with Cyprus close at hand, of St. Paul on these waters as the glorious representative of missionary enterprise.

Now, briefly resuming these four topics again for our own spiritual benefit, I think it is worth while that we should note with what remarkable force and emphasis that word "Damascus" is impressed on the Scriptures of the New Testament. With the exception of Jerusalem, there is no other case of precisely the same kind. If the geographical framework of Bible-history is a certain and a divine fact, we see this principle strongly exemplified here. In the direct narrative of the conversion, which is by no means long, the word occurs five times.[3] It occurs four times in the account which St. Paul himself gave of it many years afterwards to the infuriated Hebrew mob.[4] This shows how deeply the recollections of the place were impressed on the Apostle's mind. But there are other proofs of this. In the Epistle to the Galatians, when he is giving a summary of his

---

[1] This resumption, so to speak, in the New Testament of the old Biblical interest of this Phœnician shore is by no means exhausted in what is written above. To make the subject approach completeness, we must add three particulars. First, from the banks of the Sea of Tiberias our thought is carried by our Lord's words in the most remarkable manner to Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xi. 21). Secondly, His own visit to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, beyond its immediate teaching through the faith of the Syro-Phœnician woman, may justly be viewed as prophetic of the ultimate spread of the Gospel (Matt. xv. 21); and thirdly, the mercantile relations of Phœnicia and Palestine in the time of Herod Agrippa I. (Acts xii. 20) had a connection as close with the history of religion in the New Testament as the same relations had with the history of religion in the times of Solomon and Ezra. See also Mark iii. 8; Luke iv. 26.

[2] See Acts iv. 36; xi. 19, 20; xiii. 4. It is worthy of note that Cyprus is mentioned eight times in the Acts of the Apostles, and each time in such a way as to suggest some useful and encouraging thought in connection with missionary work.

[3] Acts ix. 3, 8, 10, 19, 22.

[4] Acts xxii. 5, 6, 10, 11.

early Christian experience, he says suddenly, though he has not named the place before, "Immediately I went not up to Jerusalem; but I went away into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus.[1] What help we seem to have derived for the understanding of the word "Arabia" in this place, when we have marked with what abruptness the arid desert surrounds the green environment of Damascus![2] But this is not the only illustration of the same kind. Writing his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he says, in a manner equally unexpected and sudden, but in a totally different context: "In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king was guarding the city of the Damascenes, in order to take me: and, let down by the wall, I escaped."[3] We often trace in a man's letters the deep impressions of his memory: and so it is here.[4]

And every man, who has experienced a true *conversion*, remembers well the circumstances of that conversion. I speak, of course, generally. There are cases where the spiritual progress moves and brightens onward from the time of Baptism, so that no conspicuous turning-point in the life can be traced: but such instances are few; and I believe they are frequently marked by an early departure to the heavenly home. All difficult questions connected with St. Paul's Conversion I leave on one side—the nature of his vision—the words that were spoken to him—his relation, at this moment, to his companions—and the like. The question I urge that we should put to ourselves, with Damascus in our thoughts, is this. If we have been by God's grace converted, what acknowledgment have we made of so great a blessing—what living fruit of love is there which corresponds with it—what active and useful work in the world? Conversion is a turning-round from the past: but such a turning-point is likewise the beginning of a new road; and in the very use of the word "road" are involved the

---

[1] Gal. i. 17.

[2] The question touched here has reference to the meaning of the word "Arabia" in this passage. It is quite allowable to understand it as restricted to the immediate neighbourhood of Damascus. The desert hems in very closely the verdure of this beautiful city. It is as if the wilderness of Sinai touched the very trees of the Abana and Pharpar. It must be admitted, however, as most probable that St. Paul really went to the region made famous before by the presence of Moses and Elijah.

[3] 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33.

[4] It must be remembered, too, that these two Epistles were written about the same time, and that St. Paul, while writing them both, was deeply moved by remembrances of the past. A reference may here be allowed to *The Speaker's Commentary*, and to the Appendix in the edition of Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

thoughts of directness of aim, of steadiness of purpose, and of perpetual advance.

A second great movement of St. Paul's life is expressed by the word *philanthropy*. It surprises us to observe how much and how earnestly his mind was occupied with the relief of temporal suffering and want. We might have supposed, if we had followed our poor human guesses, that he would have been engrossed with the great doctrinal truths of the Gospel and the propagation of the Christian faith through the world. And indeed with these things he was engrossed; but he knew how closely philanthropy and evangelization are connected. Thus in Galatia, in Achaia and Macedonia, three distinct provinces, covering a wide area, he occupied himself diligently with the second of the two collections for the suffering Christians of Palestine.[1] Notice has been already taken of his deep feeling on this subject; and we find additional proof of this in the Epistle to the Romans, written not long before that voyage which brought him to Tyre and to Ptolemais. This was not an ordinary passage in his life, as can be shown by abundant evidence. What he says there is this: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the love of the Spirit, that you strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; that I may be delivered from them that are disobedient in Judæa, and that the ministration which I have for Jerusalem may be acceptable, that I may come to you at Rome with joy."[2]

And in harmony with this were the interest and trouble taken regarding that earlier contribution of charity towards Judæa. In the relation, too, which we have of it, there is a circumstance which does not always receive the attention it deserves. Here first comes into view that institution of Presbyters, which thenceforward we find part of the settled organization of the Church. The relief was "sent to the Elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."[3] Whatever else may be added from St. Paul's Epistles or the Acts as part of the business of Presbyters—and whatever else some may think it right to add thereto from sources not found in Holy Scripture at all—no attempt is made to enter into such questions here—it is, at all events, instructive to observe that this institution of Presbyters, when we first see it, has its root and beginning in the midst of philanthropy. We remember, too, how remarkably this was the case in the institution of the Deacons.[4] And I venture here to throw out another subject of thought. What if the Widows named on that occasion, and also in the account of the death of Tabitha,[5] were

[1] See Rom. xv. 25, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii.
[2] Rom. xv. 30.
[3] Acts xi. 30.
[4] Acts vi. 1.
[5] Acts ix. 36.

not recipients of bounty, but administrators of bounty, precursors, in fact, of the Deaconesses of earlier and later days?[1] At all events, there are "differences of administrations" under the One Spirit;[2] and the traveller cannot be blamed if at Beyrout his thought lingers long to thank God for the charitable and religious work done by women now, in divers places and in divers ways, through Phœnicia and Syria. Rather he would be justly blamed if such thanksgiving here were omitted.[3]

Of that other great movement of St. Paul's life, which had reference to *true doctrine and correct practice*, only one single word can be said. That maintenance was firm and uncompromising; but it was attended with the utmost conciliation and prudence. We see this in the whole tone of the discussion at Jerusalem, and of the letter which was conveyed from thence to Antioch. The necessity of Jewish ceremonial was absolutely denied: but a considerate regard was observed towards old custom and old prejudice. And on his last visit to Jerusalem St. Paul took part in some such ceremonial, not as a necessity, but in charitable concession, lest the Church should be divided for the sake of things that were merely external.[4] Herein he was true to his own principles, as deliberately expressed in his writings. If he says that "circumcision is nothing," he says with equal precision that "uncircumcision is nothing."[5] If a Pharisaism of ceremonial is possible—as I fear we must admit to be the case—it is equally possible that there might be a Pharisaism which prides itself in the absence of ceremonial.

There remains that greatest movement of St. Paul's life, the movement of *missionary enterprise*, which was, we may truly say, symbolized by his contact with this coast. Here Christianity seemed to gather its elasticity and strength for its

---

[1] See in the Revised Version Rom. xvi. 1 and 1 Tim. iii. 11. It may fairly be said that on the theory here suggested we obtain a more dignified view of the "widows" of Acts vi., than if we regard them as the first instance of complaining almswomen; while in Acts ix. the phrase "the saints and widows," seems to imply that the latter had some position distinguished from that of the Church at large.

[2] 1 Cor. xii. 5.

[3] The reference is primarily to the admirable Deaconess-House at Beyrout, in its two branches, the Hospital and the School. But mention must be made in the same sentence of the large schools founded in the same city by Mrs. Thompson, after the massacre of 1860, and now conducted under her sister, with branches at Damascus, Sidon and elsewhere. If an account were to be given of similar work by women in Palestine proper, as at Jerusalem and Nazareth, we should be taken beyond the region with which we are at present concerned.

[4] Acts xxi. 18–26; see xviii. 18.

[5] Three times is this repeated by St. Paul. See 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6; vi. 15.

flight to the Far West. And is it not most fitting that it should have been so? Of all those who in succession have held the Empire of the Sea—

> First of the throng, with enterprising brow,
> The keen Phœnician steered his shadowy prow.[1]

The mariners of this coast showed the way to Columbus. The ship that took St. Paul from Sidon contained the hopes of the world. The Christians of America know what they have received from the East; and I suppose we should rightly interpret their beneficial action here, if we were to say that the light they have been rekindling on these shores is partly an expression of their earnest gratitude.[2]

The reality of a conversion of the heart—the diligent exercise of useful philanthropy—the firm maintenance of religious truth in the spirit of conciliation—the possession of an ardent missionary enthusiasm—these are four components of Christian character. And they ought to exist in combination, each helping and strengthening the others. Let us remember that we have been taking a glance at the biography, not of four men, each illustrating a separate point of character, but of one man, in whom they were united—whom, therefore, we must imitate at all points, if we are to be "followers of him even as he also was of Christ."[3]

J. S. Howson.

Art. II.—THE CLAIMS OF THE CONVOCATIONS OF THE CLERGY AS TO THE PRAYER BOOK.

(*Continued from page* 305.)

THE circumstances attending and following the King's reference to the Convocations, in 1661, will show that no constitutional precedent was then made or intended.

Before the King's Restoration, he made a Declaration from Breda, on the 14th of April, 1660, which was read in both the

[1] Poem on "The Empire of the Sea," which obtained the Chancellor's Medal at Cambridge, in 1835, by T. Whytehead.

[2] The American College at Beyrout, with its branch-work in the Lebanon, is an institution of the highest importance, providing varied education, and opening out useful careers, to a very large number of students.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 1.

Houses of the Convention Parliament, and was entered on the journals of both of them, and formed the basis of their determination to restore the King.[1] One of its clauses was this:—

> *We do declare a liberty to tender consciences;* and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered unto us, for the full granting that indulgence.

As soon as the King had returned to England, the two Houses of the Convention became a Parliament, with the King at their head; and, upon the continued faith of this Declaration of Breda, and in accordance with its terms, both Houses passed an Act of Indemnity from punishment for political offences (with such exceptions as the King and they agreed to be consistent with it), and also an Act, which, while it restored the dispossessed Episcopalian incumbents of benefices, if they were still living, *confirmed in the possession of their benefices all the existing Presbyterian incumbents, if there were no living Episcopalian claimants.* This was the Statute 12 Car. II., c. 17, "An Act for the Confirming and Restoring of Ministers."

The number of Presbyterian incumbents thus quieted in their possession must have been upwards of two thousand, because as many as that number of such incumbents eventually relinquished their benefices, rather than adopt the terms which the next Parliament imposed upon them; and there must have been at least some, and perhaps many, of such incumbents who *did* adopt those terms. The Royal Assent was given to this Statute of Confirmation on the 13th of September, 1660.[2] There is ample evidence, in many ways, of the truth of what Rapin says of the Convention Parliament,[3] in these words:—

> This Parliament is, therefore, to be looked upon as an assembly where the Presbyterians had certainly a superiority of voices, and it was this Parliament that restored the King to the throne of his ancestors, and during their short continuance, gave him very real marks of their zeal for his service, and the re-establishment of peace and tranquillity in the kingdom.

On the 13th of September, 1660 (just mentioned), the Convention Parliament was adjourned to the 6th of November, on which day it re-assembled; and it then continued sitting until

---

[1] This declaration will be found in full in Professor Swainson's "Parliamentary History of the Act of Uniformity," and in other places mentioned by him, and also in the second vol. (folio) of Rapin's "History of England," pp. 616, 617.

[2] See Rapin's "History of England," vol. ii., folio, p. 621.

[3] Vol. ii. p. 619.

the 29th of December, 1660, on which day the King dissolved it. During this last-mentioned sitting, various Acts of Parliament were passed, and received the Royal Assent; but none of them are material for the present purpose.

The King's reasons for dissolving a Parliament so devoted to his interests have been the subject of much controversy. It is very likely that Rapin[1] is right in attributing the dissolution to the great hatred against the Presbyterians, which Lord Clarendon, the King's Prime Minister and Lord Chancellor, undoubtedly had. It is certain that the King's Ministers took great care to have a majority of members of anti-Presbyterian views returned to the new House of Commons for the next Parliament, which did not meet until the 8th of May, 1661.

It is necessary to consider what was the legal position of the quieted Presbyterian incumbents, after the passing of the Quieting Act of the 13th of September, 1660.

The effect of the King's Restoration was to treat as invalid all Acts of Parliament which had been made since King Charles I. had given the Royal Assent to the earlier Statutes of the Long Parliament. But one of the Statutes, so assented to, was an Act to abolish Queen Elizabeth's Court of High Commission; and another was an Act to deprive the Bishops of their seats in the House of Lords. The former contained some additional provisions, by which it was considered, by many persons, that the jurisdiction of the Bishops' Courts had been entirely abolished; and that opinion was very prevalent, until it was put an end to by an Act of the Parliament which met in May, 1661 (13 Car. II., c. 12), which declared the authority of the Bishops' Courts to be restored, but upon the terms of not putting in force any Canons, or other Ecclesiastical Law that had not been in force in the year 1639. No Statute, however, which had been passed with the Royal Assent, had repealed Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, or the orders issued in pursuance of it, or the obligations of the Book of Common Prayer which it had established. The consequence of the Restoration, therefore, was, to restore the force of those things at once, so far as their obligation went; but the means of putting the obligation in force, adversely, were, at present, defective. The Bishops' Courts were the proper means of so doing; but many of the Sees of the Bishops had been vacant at the Restoration, and were now only in the course of being filled; and as to the Courts of all the Bishops, old and new, the difficulty occasioned by the probable repeal of their authority, which has just been mentioned, must have been felt.

[1] P. 621.

It was well known that the Presbyterian incumbents, who had thus been quieted in their possession by the Convention Parliament, objected to use some parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and that they also very strongly objected to wear the surplice, and to "sign with the sign of the Cross" in baptism. There could be no doubt that, as the Elizabethan law then stood, both the surplice and the sign of the Cross were obligatory. It is not intended, in these observations, to speak of the question, lately adjudicated upon, whether, after the Restoration, any other "ornaments of the minister" than the surplice, were either obligatory or permissible. The only "ministerial ornament" *then* made the subject of objection was the surplice; and, against it, the feeling was so strong, that, before the King returned to England, he was entreated by some Presbyterian ministers not to allow it to be used even in his own chapel; to which his answer was, that he would not be himself deprived of that liberty which he intended to grant to others. This took place shortly after the Declaration from Breda, and was understood to be not inconsistent with it, as regards the surplice, but merely as a confirmation of it, and an assurance that the surplice should not be compulsory anywhere, except in the King's own chapel.[1]

No effectual relaxation of the obligations of the Elizabethan law could be made without the authority of Parliament. This, both the King and the Presbyterians perfectly well knew; but the very least which the Declaration from Breda, followed by the Quieting Act, could have amounted to, must have been, and been known to be, a promise by the King that he would do all that he could to induce Parliament to concur with him in making such relaxations of the Elizabethan law as would enable the Presbyterian incumbents to conform to it.

In accordance with this view, the King issued the Declaration of the 25th of October, 1660, which is mentioned in the preamble to the present Act of Uniformity. That Declaration promised a revision of the Liturgy, and a present indulgence from the obligation to use it, and to comply with the Elizabethan ceremonial requirements; and, in particular, it promised that a minister should not be obliged to sign with the sign of the Cross in baptism, if he permitted another minister to do it, when the parents of the baptized child required it; and, as to the surplice, the King meant it to be used in his own chapel, and in cathedrals, and collegiate churches, and in college chapels, but not elsewhere, unless by choice.[2]

At this time, the Convention Parliament was in existence,

[1] See 2 Rapin, 617, and Tindal's Note.
[2] See the details given in Swainson, p. 7.

and, apparently, likely to exist; but the King dissolved it on the 29th of December, 1660.[1]

It was in pursuance of the Declaration of the 25th of October, 1660, that the Savoy Commission, of the 25th of March, 1661, was issued. We are expressly told this, in the preamble to the Act of Uniformity.

The Declaration from Breda, the Declaration of the 25th of October, 1660, and the Savoy Commission, all promised "liberty" or "satisfaction" *to "tender consciences,"* sometimes called "private consciences;"[2] and the preface to our present revised Book of Common Prayer tells us that the "review" which the Revisers there present to us, has been made, in consequence of the importunities made to his Majesty for such a revision, alterations, and additions "as should be thought requisite for the ease of *tender consciences.*"

When the four months limited by the Savoy Commission for its own duration, expired, without the Joint Commissioners having been able to agree upon any report, common honesty, on the King's part, required that another Joint Commission should be issued, which should be composed in such a manner as the experience of the former Commission had shown to be more likely to give relief to the "tender consciences," to whom the King was so much indebted for his Restoration; but when the four months of this first attempt came to an end, effectual means had been found of "keeping the promise to the ear, while breaking it to the hope;" and the new Parliament of the Presbyterians' enemies had met.

If the Savoy Commissioners had reported to the King some amendments to the Book of Common Prayer as being desirable, and the King had approved them, there is no reason to suppose that he would not have recommended them to Parliament, either with or without some qualification or exception; and there is no reason to suppose that the King would not have approved them, provided that they did not affect the services in his own chapel, and in non-parochial places of worship, as mentioned in his Declaration of the 25th of October, 1660. *If he had made a recommendation to Parliament, grounded, wholly or in part, on the advice of the Savoy Commission, there is no reason whatever for supposing that any reference to the two Convocations, or to either of them, would have been made.*

On the 25th of June, 1661, while the Savoy Commission was still in force, and had still a whole calendar month more to run, the House of Commons resolved, that a Committee should be appointed of all the members of the House who were "of the

---

[1] 2 Rapin, 621.

[2] See Swainson, pp. 4, 7, 8.

long robe," that is, of all its barristers and serjeants-at-law, to "bring in a compendious Bill, to supply any defect in the former laws, and to provide for an effectual conformity to the Liturgy of the Church for the time to come," and the preparation of the Bill was especially recommended to the care of Mr. Serjeant Keeling.[1]

The same Resolution of the House of Commons (June 25, 1661), directed the same Committee to "make search whether the *original book of the Liturgy* annexed to the Act passed in the fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward VI. be yet extant." This was the Act of 1552, establishing Edward VI.'s Second Prayer Book; and the reason for thus referring to that Act, obviously, was, that the Act of Queen Elizabeth, 1 Eliz. c. 2, which was now in force, did not annex any book to itself, but merely provided that the services should be conducted

> in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book, so authorized by Parliament in the said fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward VI., with one alteration or addition of certain Lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other, or otherwise.

Professor Swainson seems to consider it clear that "the book annexed to the Act of Edward, of the year 1552, could not be found, and that that of James was used," and was shortly afterwards annexed, by the Commons, to a Bill of Uniformity prepared in pursuance of the Resolution of June 25; and then he says that "the Prayer Book annexed, was a book printed in the year 1604; measures having been taken for the 'taking out and obliterating' of certain prayers 'inserted before the reading Psalms'" (p. 11). This Book of 1604 must have been that edition of the Prayer Book of Elizabeth which the 80th Canon of 1603–4 orders the Churchwardens of every parish to get, and which it describes as "the Book of Common Prayer, lately explained in some few points by His Majesty's authority, according to the laws and His Highness's prerogative in that behalf;" but neither laws nor prerogative gave the King any authority to explain the Prayer Book, or to cause it to be explained; and neither this edition nor any other Book of Common Prayer put forth in King James's name was ever sanctioned by Parliament; and, therefore, the Act of Uniformity of 1662, in its final shape, very properly treats the Book of Elizabeth as being the only Prayer Book then in force, and as being the Book which was to continue in force, until the revised Book annexed to the Act should have come into operation on the Feast of Saint Bartholomew then next ensuing.

[1] "Commons' Journals," as quoted by Swainson, p. 11.

The Book of 1604 seems to have contained some additional prayers, besides the explanations mentioned in the 80th Canon; but it would answer the present purpose of the House of Commons as well as the old editions of the Book of Elizabeth, provided it did not contain anything which the House thought objectionable, *as to which (as we have seen) they exercised their own judgment*, by "taking out and obliterating" certain prayers.

The Bill of the Commons was carried up by them to the Lords, on the 10th of July, 1661, with the title of "An Act for the Uniformity of Public Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments."

It has been clearly ascertained [*see* Professor Swainson, p. 12] that the Bill thus carried up by the Commons was, in fact, that part of our present Act of Uniformity which requires that the Book annexed to it should be the only form of Divine Service in all places of public worship in England; that every *present* incumbent should declare his assent to the use of it before a certain day (which was then intended to be Michaelmas Day next); and that every *future* incumbent should declare his assent to the use of it within a certain time after his possession of his benefice; and that the consequence of default in either of these obligations should be deprivation.

This would be quite enough to dispossess present objecting incumbents, and to disqualify future objectors; but the special form of giving assent to the use of the Book, which is set forth in the present 4th Section, was not prescribed. The substance of the severe enactments against lecturers, in s. 19 and 21, seem, however, to have been in the Bill of the Commons.[1]

The bold initiative thus taken by the Commons influenced everything else that was afterwards done, either by the Lords or by themselves, either by the King or by his Ministers, either by the nominal Revisers or by the actual Revisers, either by the Convocations or by the Bishops, down to the passing, and, at last, the enforcement, of our present Act of Uniformity of 1662.

The Commons very probably knew, when they prepared their Bill, that the Savoy Commission was likely to fail, for want of agreement amongst its members in the short time allowed for their agreement; but they also knew that the Commission might be renewed as often as the King pleased, and that changes of the component members of the Commission might easily be made, if difficulties of temper, or other causes, had shown the desirableness of them; and that one failure of one Commission, limited to the short duration of four months, could not honestly be considered a performance of a Royal promise,

[1] See Swainson, p. 12.

upon the faith of which such great constitutional events had been allowed to take place. They determined, however, to prevent the promise being any further performed, and, with that view, to force on a Bill of Uniformity of their own, and, if possible, to procure the assent to it, both of the House of Lords and of the King. We *know* these to have been the principles by which they were actuated, because *they expressly declared them* in a Conference with the Lords, on May 5, 1662, which will be hereafter stated. The construction which they then put, in that Conference, upon the King's Declaration from Breda, is so extremely like the false construction of it which Lord Clarendon has given in his "Own Life," namely, that the promise was only that the King would assent to an indulgence to tender consciences, *if* Parliament should advise him to do so, that it is highly probable that the Commons' Bill of June, 1661, really originated with Lord Clarendon, who was then the King's Prime Minister, as well as being Lord Chancellor. We know, also, from the same Conference, that this House of Commons ridiculed the notion that the consciences of the Presbyterians or Puritans could justly be called "tender," or anything else but "schismatical," and insisted that there were, in fact, no such consciences as the King had supposed, when he used the word "tender," as applied to them; and that, if he had supposed that there were such, he was mistaken.

The House of Commons evidently considered that, being in possession, however acquired, of a certain share of the supreme legislative power, they might consider themselves as not being bound by anything done before their own election in the spring of 1661. They therefore determined to put an end to all notions of such a revision of the Prayer Book as might make it capable of being adopted by the Presbyterian incumbents, whom the Convention Parliament had quieted in their possession; and, for that purpose, they sent up to the Lords a Bill of their own, which, in substance (as we have seen) required all those incumbents to adopt the *un*revised book, immediately, upon pain of deprivation.

Ten days had sufficed to pass this Bill through all its stages in the Commons, from the 29th of June, when it was brought in, to the 9th of July, when it was read a third time and passed.[1] On the 10th of July, the Commons carried their Bill to the Lords.[2] The Lords sat twenty days more, before the summer adjournment of the 30th, and so also did the Commons; and if the Lords had been as expeditious as the Commons, in this matter, there would have been time to pass this Bill during

[1] See Swainson, p. 11. [2] *Ibid.*

those twenty days; but the Bishops had not yet resumed their seats there, and a Bill for restoring them was then in progress, and did not receive the Royal Assent till the 30th of July; and therefore they could not become, practically, members of the House of Lords, until the resumption of business, which was not intended to be, and was not, until the 20th of November; and it cannot be for a moment doubted, that Lord Clarendon, Lord Chancellor and Prime Minister, the bitter enemy of the Presbyterians,[1] saw that a better opportunity for passing a Bill which should extinguish Presbyterianism in the Established Church would be afforded *after* the adjournment, than before; because, *after* the adjournment, the Bishops would be present in the House of Lords, and would form a large and influential part of it; and, also, because there would be an opportunity of obtaining such a revision of the Book of Common Prayer, in the interval, as would, at the very least, not remove those parts of it to which the Presbyterians objected, and might even make it more distasteful to them than at present. Even if no material alteration in principle should be introduced into the Book, it would be easy to make so many verbal alterations, particularly in the services not of daily use, as would make it practically impossible (as eventually proved to be the case) for many men of scrupulous minds to satisfy themselves as to the justice of the variations; and the same observations would apply to the introduction of additional forms of prayer, for special occasions, or particular purposes, which the experience of a hundred years since the last Act of Uniformity had shown to be desirable.

Whether Clarendon had then in view any further revision than that upon which the Bishops worked (as he tells us in his "Own Life") during the sixteen weeks of the adjournment, and which, as we shall see, they had probably begun already, or whether he intended that a still further multiplication of alterations should be afforded by a reference to the Convocations, cannot now be ascertained; but it is beyond all possible doubt that the Bishops' revision was by his wish and concurrence. We may see this in his description of it in his "Own Life," independently of the certainty that such proceedings could not be carried on without his concurrence, who was both Lord Chancellor and Prime Minister. The King, also, must have known of the failure of the Savoy Commission, and must have known that *something* else in its stead had become necessary; and as he did *nothing* else, he must have availed himself of the excuse of the Bishops' revision.

Lord Clarendon also probably wished to impose further burdens upon the Presbyterian incumbents, in the shape of Re-

[1] See 2 Rapin, *passim*.

Ordination and the "Threefold Declaration," both of which we find in the Act of Uniformity. These burdens the Lords inserted in the Bill; and the Commons not only adopted them, but extended the Threefold Declaration to other classes of persons besides Church incumbents.

It will be presently seen, that the subsequent proceedings of the Commons showed that they were indifferent as to the precise contents of *the Book*, whether altered or not, when their Bill of Uniformity came back to them with its amendments; and that all that they cared about, with respect to the contents of the Book, was, that those contents still remained such as the Presbyterian incumbents would not adopt.

Meanwhile, we return to the 30th of July, 1661.

All attempt at joint revision having now been abandoned by the King and his advisers, an exclusively Episcopalian revision was made, for recommendation, first to the King, and afterwards to Parliament. The manner in which that exclusive revision was set on foot, and prosecuted, will be presently stated. It is a most significant circumstance, that that exclusive revision is authoritatively set forth in the preface to our present Prayer Book, as being made in consequence of "great importunities," to the King, for such a revision as "*should be thought requisite for the ease of tender consciences,*" *the exact expression used in the Declaration from Breda, and in the Declaration of the 25th October*, 1660.[1]

In like manner, the Act of Uniformity, in substituting the revised Book of 1662 for the Book of Elizabeth, recites the Declaration of the 25th of October, 1660, and says that it was "according to" it, that the Commission now called the Savoy Commission was issued; and then, in the same sentence, it tells us of the "authority and requisition" given to the Convocations to present recommendations to the King, for his further allowance or confirmation; thus, apparently, founding the Declaration of October, the Savoy Commission, and the authority and requisition to the Convocations upon the same Royal wish to give ease to tender consciences.

The King's personal wish to do this cannot be doubted, in the presence of the indications he repeatedly gave of his uneasiness under the conviction that he was *not* doing it. The reason of his not doing it, and the mode in which he was prevented from doing it, while doing it was still in his power, will be perfectly plain to any one who reads the history of this crisis in Lord Clarendon's account of his "Own Life."

It nowhere appears that the Episcopalian laity required any revision of the Prayer Book to be made. But if a new revision

[1] See those Declarations in Swainson, pp. 4, 7, and 8.

must still be made, and if the Convocations were the only proper revisers whose revision could be constitutionally submitted for Parliamentary adoption, and if a mistake in that respect had been made by inviting the Savoy Commissioners to make such a revision, *now was the time*—namely, at the adjournment of Parliament, on the 30th July, 1661, for sixteen weeks certain, to set the preliminaries right, by immediately referring the revision to the Convocations. They had been sitting during more than the last two months of the Savoy Conference, and they were sitting still, ineffectually trying to make or mend Canons, and more effectually resolving to give the King a "Benevolence;" which last object they accomplished two days after the 25th of July, the day on which the Savoy Commission expired. The impending failure of that Commission must have been known to Lord Clarendon, Prime Minister and Lord Chancellor, and intimate friend of some of the Bishops upon it, for a good while before it happened; and a Royal licence or direction, or even a Commission (if preferable), to the Convocations, to proceed with the work of revision, might well have been issued before the adjournment of Parliament, and, consequently of the Convocations, on the 30th of July, 1661.

That which was done, in fact, during the sixteen weeks of this vacation, from the 30th of July to the 20th of November, we are told by Lord Clarendon,[1] in these words:—

The bishops had spent the vacation in making such alterations in the Book of Common Prayer as they thought would make it more grateful to the dissenting brethren—for so the schismatical party called themselves—*and such additions as, in their judgment, the temper of the present time and the past miscarriages required.*

Then he proceeds, at once, to give a justification for presenting the revision to "Convocation," *which we must presently examine*, and a description of what the consequences of this presentation were. His words are these:—

It [*i.e.*, the Book, with the alterations and additions which he had just mentioned] was necessarily to be presented to the Convocation, which is the national synod of the Church; *and that did not sit during the recess of the Parliament, and so came not together till the end of November*, when the consideration of it took up much time; all men offering such alterations and additions as were suitable to their own fancies, and the observations which they had made in the time of confusion. *The bishops were not all of one mind.* Some of them, who had had the greatest experience, and were, in truth, wise men, thought it best to restore and confirm the old Book of Common Prayer, without any alterations and additions.

We know, from the result, that those Bishops whom Lord

[1] "Own Life," vol. ii. p. 118. Oxford ed., 1827.

Clarendon here describes as having the greatest experience, and being, in fact, wise men, were over-ruled, in their wishes, by the others; but his reason for stating this difference of opinion amongst them probably was, to account for the delay in presenting the revised book to the King, and in the King's recommending it to the House of Lords. The Commons were impatient at this delay, and complained of it several times to the Lords, and indirectly to the King.[1]

It is important to observe, that Lord Clarendon, when speaking of "Convocation," attributes everything *to the bishops*, just as when, before, he had spoken *of the bishops spending the vacation in making alterations and additions.* The Lower House of Convocation, whether of Canterbury or of York, is treated as of no practical account. It is probable that there were some Presbyterian Proctors in the Lower House; but they are not likely to have been many, as representatives of the parochial clergy, because the system of election would, in some instances, have enabled the bishops (as at present) to decide which of several elected candidates should sit; and the bishops were pretty sure to decide for Episcopalians, in preference to Presbyterians. It is said that, in fact, Bishop Sheldon, of London, rejected Baxter and Calamy, who had been returned with two others for that Diocese.[2]

It was an after-thought of Clarendon's to say, in writing his account of these times, that the revision was "necessarily" to be presented to "Convocation;" and also an inaccuracy to state that "Convocation" is the "national synod of the church." There is no constitutional authority for thus speaking of "Convocation" *in the singular*, as one single body for the whole of England, even if "the Church" is to be spoken of in its *inaccurate* popular sense, of the Clergy of the Church, instead of its accurate sense, of the Church itself. There are two Convocations, one for each province, and they have no constitutional unity; and it will be presently seen that they were separately, and not jointly, consulted by the King on this occasion.

That the "necessity" of this "presentation" was an after-thought of Lord Clarendon's, *is conclusively proved against him, by his having put the Great Seal to the Savoy Commission*, whose powers of recommending alterations and additions to the King, were substantially as extensive as those in which the King

[1] By messages to the Lords of the 16th Dec. 1661, and the 28th Jan. 1662, and further signs of dissatisfaction, which the king personally answered by summoning the Commons to him on the 1st March, 1662. See Swainson, 17, 18, 20, and 2 Rapin, 628.

[2] See Neal's "History of the Puritans," vol. iv. p. 350. Ed. of 1796. See also Mountfield's "Church and Puritans," p. 76, third ed., 1881, and authorities there cited.

afterwards consulted the two Convocations;[1] and if the Savoy Commission had made recommendations to the King, and he had approved them, it must be supposed that those recommendations would have been adopted and forwarded by the King to Parliament, without reference to the Convocations, or to any other advisers, except his own Ministers.

If the "necessity," which Lord Clarendon suggests, had existed, it must have been created either by the Common Law or by the Statute Law; *but the English Liturgy is wholly a creature of the Statute Law, in derogation of the Common Law,* which, if it had been still in existence as to the system of public worship, would have prescribed the Roman Catholic Ritual, as it existed at the time which legal principle fixes for everything of Common Law existence, namely, in the year 1189, the period of "legal memory," to which everything regulated by the Common Law must relate. *That part of the Statute Law which regulated public worship from* 1559 *to* 1662 *(except during the Interregnum), was simply and entirely Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and the Book to which that Act referred;* and it has been already shown that to *that* Act, and *that* Book, neither the Convocation of Canterbury nor the Convocation of York can possibly have assented at the time of the passing of the Act and the adoption of the Book, because every one of the then Bishops, constituting the whole of the Upper House of Convocation of both the Provinces, most strenuously objected to them. The nation alone, therefore, through its Parliament, and in opposition to "Convocation," had prescribed the national system of public worship, and the forms for conducting it, and for conducting all other offices of religion requiring the intervention of the clergy, even including the manner in which the clergy of all ranks, bishops, priests, and deacons, should be consecrated or ordained.

It is quite possible that the Bishops, or some of the other members of the two Convocations, may have *wished* to establish a precedent, for what Lord Clarendon represents as being "necessarily" done, in "presenting" the revised book to "the Convocation;" and that they may have therefore expressed the notion of this necessity to Lord Clarendon, and that, in so doing, they may have called "Convocation" "the national synod of the Church;" but no wishes of this kind, and no descriptions of "Convocation," could create the necessity thus suggested, if it did not really exist. It has been already shown that it could *not* possibly exist.

We can hardly fail to see that the consultation of the two Convocations was merely an expedient for delay, in order to obtain

[1] We know this from the preamble to the present Act of Uniformity, and from the exact words of the Savoy Commission in 2 Rapin, 624.

further time for that revision which Lord Clarendon has told us that the Bishops were engaged upon, and which it was soon seen that they could not finish in time for the reassembling of Parliament on the 20th of November; shortly after which, the Commons would be sure to urge the Lords to proceed with the Bill of Uniformity which had been sent up to them on the 10th of July.

As regards the King, the Act of Uniformity shows, on the face of it, that he did not consider the Convocations the exclusive bodies to be consulted; because it recites his consultation of the other set of advisers there referred to, and now called the Savoy Conference, and also because it shows that the very form in which he consulted the Convocations reserved to himself the absolute power of approval and allowance of their advice.

As regards both Houses of Parliament, it is clear that *their* primary object, in passing the Act of 1662, was to dispossess the Presbyterian Incumbents, and, for that purpose, to enforce the principle of absolute uniformity of divine service in every place of public worship throughout the realm, and that the revision of the existing Book for regulating that uniformity was *merely an incident in the progress of the new Act of Uniformity* through the two Houses of Parliament; and that no revision at all had been intended by the House of Commons, up to the time at which it sent the new Bill of Uniformity to the Lords, except that they struck out two prayers, of no parliamentary authority, from an already existing book, to which they made their Bill relate; and that the eventual adoption of a revised book was due only to the King's recommendation to the House of Lords.

At first, the King's reference was made to the Convocation of Canterbury only. The form of it was a letter or warrant from the King to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Juxon,[1] and it authorizes and requires the Archbishop and other Bishops and Clergy of the Province of Canterbury to "review, or cause review to be had and taken, both of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Book of the form and manner of making and consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" which were, in fact, at that time, only one book; and then the requisition proceeds thus: "And after mature consideration, that you make such additions or alterations in the said Books respectively, as you shall deem meet and convenient: which our pleasure is that you exhibit and present unto us, in writing, *for our further consideration,*

[1] It is set out at length by Professor Swainson (p. 15) from "The Domestic Entry Books," vol. vi. p. 7; "Ecclesiastical Business," in the State Paper Office.

allowance, or confirmation. And for so doing, this shall be your warrant."

The most important words of this reference are those which, at its conclusion, state its object, namely, "our further consideration, allowance, or confirmation;" which words are repeated in the recital of this reference in the present Act of Uniformity, except the word "consideration;" but the word "consideration" is an additional and material proof of the merely deliberative character of the reference itself, meant only to assist the King in forming his own opinion.

The date of this reference to the Canterbury Convocation is the 10th of October, 1661; but we know, from what Lord Clarendon has told us,[1] that "Convocation did not sit during the recess of the Parliament, and so came not together 'till the end of November." The King's letter or warrant to the Archbishop of Canterbury must, therefore, lie, useless, in his possession, from the 10th of October till the 20th of November (at least); except that the existence of it, when made known to the Bishops who were then engaged in the revision, would assure them that they would have plenty of time to complete it; and this time they accordingly had, as we know, from the records of what passed in the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation, when it met, on the 21st of November, and when it gave authority to various Bishops, as a committee, to proceed with the revision upon which they had been at work during the sixteen weeks of vacation, and which they had not yet finished.

But the Convocation of Canterbury did not, of itself, constitute "the Convocation," of which Lord Clarendon speaks; and accordingly, we find that the "Domestic Entry Books," immediately after copying the King's letter or warrant (already stated) to the Archbishop of Canterbury, of the 10th of October 1661, contain an entry in these terms: "The like letter directed to the Archbishop of York, dated the *22nd day of November, mutatis mutandis.*"[2]

Thus, each Convocation was separately authorized and required to present such additions or alterations, as, to it, should seem meet and convenient, for the further consideration, allowance, or confirmation of the King. *But what if the additions or alterations, thus presented by one Convocation, should be inconsistent with the additions or alterations presented by the other Convocation?* It is, obviously, quite possible that this might be the case; *and the mere existence of this possibility is conclusive proof that the reference which the King made to the two Convocations was merely an inquiry for his own information, and not an authority to exercise a power of revision,* which, being given in equally full terms to

[1] *Ubi supra.*

[2] See Swainson, 16.

each Convocation, separately and distinctly, would be absurd, on the face of it; to say nothing of the absurdity of one Province having an absolute power of regulating the public worship of the other Province.

No authority was even purported to be given, to the Convocations of the two Provinces, to blend themselves into one Convocation, for the purpose of revision, or of advice.

That the consultation of the two Convocations was, in this case, a mere pretext, is abundantly proved, by the records of the Upper House of Canterbury, which are stated by Professor Swainson (p. 13 *et seq.*), and of which a separate and independent statement is made by Lord Selborne, in his "Notes" upon Mr. James Parker's "Introduction," and also by a letter from the Bishops of the Province of York to the Lower House of Convocation of that Province, which is also stated by Lord Selborne, and by the proceedings upon it. The records of the *Lower* House of Canterbury were burnt in the Fire of London in 1666.[1]

From the particulars thus given by Professor Swainson and Lord Selborne, it is evident, that the business of the revision was continued after the re-assembling of the Convocations in November, not primarily or really by either Convocation itself, but by the Bishops, who had been doing it during the Vacation (as Lord Clarendon says), and by some more Bishops now added as a committee, and that their labours were adopted by the Upper House of Canterbury, as a matter of course, and by the Lower House almost in the same perfunctory manner; and that, as regards the Province of York, its bishops sat with the Canterbury Bishops, when they pleased; and that one of the York Bishops, Bishop Cosin of Durham, was allowed to be a reviser from the first, or very nearly from the first, and afterwards to act, as one of a few, for all the Bishops of England; and that, as regards the *Lower House of York*, they were persuaded by the Bishops of that Province (including Cosin) to appoint certain members of the Lower House of *Canterbury* to act in their stead. Thus, it is evident, *that there was no real revision by the Convocation of York at all,* except so far as it may be considered that Bishop Cosin of Durham was their representative. He had been the Domestic Chaplain of Charles II., during exile, and must have been well acquainted with the King's wishes, if he had any.

What Lord Selborne says is this:—

When we turn to the official records of the Acts of the Convocation, we find that the whole Liturgy, properly so called,[2] passed through

[1] See Swainson, 13.

[2] Note, by Lord Selborne: "Excluding the Prefaces and Calendar, the Psalms, the Ordination Services, the General Thanksgiving, and the Prayers for Use at Sea, which were afterwards added."

the Upper House, in five days, and was sent down by them to the Lower House, part on the 23rd and the rest on the 27th of November. To enable this to be done, a committee of eight Bishops was appointed *on the 21st of November, the first day of their meeting*, not merely (as Mr. Parker seems to think) to prepare matter for the subsequent consideration of the whole body, but really to continue every day's work, at Bishop Wren's house, after five o'clock in the afternoon, the Convocation sitting only from 8 to 10 A.M. and from 2 to 4 P.M. on each day, and itself making progress, in the same work, during those hours. The Committee consisted of six of the twelve Bishops who had been Savoy Commissioners—Cosin, Wren, Morley, Henchman, Warner, and Sanderson—and two, Skinner and Nicholson, who were not.[1] There is no trace of their having even made any reports or report,[2] *and the terms of their appointment show that they were entrusted with powers making this unnecessary;* for the Upper House "commisit vices suas eisdem, aut eorum tribus ad minus, ad procedendum in dicto negotio; et ordinavit eos ad conveniendum apud palatium reverendi patris domini Episcopi Eliensis [Wren], horâ quintâ post meridiem cujuslibet diei (exceptis diebus dominicis), donec dictum negotium perficiatur."[3] Nor can such a delegation of powers (amounting, really to a continuation of the sittings of the Upper House by some of its most trusted members after business hours) seem extraordinary, to those who know what was, at nearly the same time, done, to obtain the concurrence of the Convocation of York. On the 23rd of November, the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham [Cosin], Carlisle, and Chester addressed a letter to their own Lower House, saying that all possible expedition was necessary; that they were themselves sitting in consultation with the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury;[4] and that the ordinary course of proceeding would be too dilatory; and, upon those grounds, asking the clergy of their Province, on behalf of their whole Lower House, to appoint the Prolocutor of Canterbury, the Deans of Westminster and St. Paul's, and some others of the clergy of Canterbury, their proxies—"to *give your consent to such things as shall be concluded here, in relation to the premisses*"—which the Lower House of York accordingly did; adding only one other name to the Prolocutor of Canterbury and the two Metropolitan Deans.[5] *In this way, and in this only, the Convocation of York was a party to the Revision of* 1661.[6]

---

[1] Query, whether Wren, then very old, was on the Savoy Commission? But the other five were.

[2] Note, by Lord Selborne: "The House would, of course, be informed, every morning, of the progress made at the last evening's sitting of the Committee; and any points reserved, or otherwise arising for consideration, would be then discussed."

[3] Introd. p. 88. Gibson "Syn. Angl." Cardwell's ed., Oxford, 1854, p. 214.

[4] Note, by Lord Selborne: "The Northern Bishops first sat with the Southern on the 21st of June, 1661."—*See* "Syn. Angl.," p. 210.

[5] Kennet's "Register," pp. 564, 5.

[6] Lord Selborne's "Notes" on Mr. James Parker's "Introduction."

What can more clearly show, than an examination of these facts and dates does, the illusory nature of the references to the two Convocations?

First, we have the date of the 21st of June [1661], as that at which "the Northern Bishops first sat with the Southern," which is also the date given by Professor Swainson (p. 14), from the Canterbury Records, as that upon which the Archbishop of York (Frewen) and the Bishops of Durham and Chester (Cosin and Walton) "joined the Convocation" of Canterbury; and Professor Swainson tells us that, on the same day, the preparation of a series of Visitation Articles was entrusted to six Canterbury Bishops, "with the assistance of the Bishops of Durham, Carlisle and Chester."[1] This does not seem to be properly Convocation business. It seems, rather, to be merely Episcopal business. But it is probable that the Canterbury Bishops were already engaged, and that, after the York junction, the Bishops of *both* Provinces were engaged in preparing additions or alterations *in the Prayer Book, independently of the still existing Savoy Commission*, which was not to expire till the 25th of July; for which they had not yet received any authority from the King, beyond that given by the Savoy Commission itself; for we learn from Professor Swainson's Extracts from the Records of the Upper House of Canterbury,[2] that on *May* 18, "the Bishops of Salisbury, Peterborough and St. Asaph, with six of the Lower House, nominated by the Prolocutor, were deputed to draw up *a Service for the baptism of adults;*" and that on *May* 31*st* "the service was submitted and approved." He interjects the observation, that "it is difficult to reconcile this with the position of the Liturgical question at the time." What his precise difficulty is, he does not explain; but probably he meant to intimate the difficulty, which unquestionably exists, of justifying this proceeding of the Upper House of Canterbury with the fact that nine of its members were at that time professing to make a joint revision of the Prayer Book with the Presbyterians, with "such alterations and additions" as they and the Presbyterians should "think fit to offer;"[3] and yet the Service for Adult Baptism, which must have been intended by the Bishops to be added, and was in fact added (as we see), was being prepared separately and independently from the body of Commissioners whom the King had requested to make all necessary additions, *and which body comprised two of the very preparers of this new Service*, the Bishop of Salisbury (Henchman) and the Bishop of Peterborough (Laney).[4]

[1] P. 14. [2] See p. 14.

[3] See the words of the Preamble to the Act of Uniformity.

[4] See the Lists in Neal's "History of the Puritans," vol. iv. p. 337, ed. of 1796.

It is to be borne in mind that all the Northern Bishops were members of the Savoy Commission. Their joint sittings with the Canterbury Bishops, thus beginning long before the King's reference of the Prayer Book to either of the Convocations, could not be for the general business of the Convocation of Canterbury; for it would be both irregular and illegal for the Bishops of one Convocation to sit as part of the Upper House of the other Convocation; because, whether greater or less in number, their votes might turn the scale upon a division; which might have the effect of making the canons of a body of which they were not members. Whatever the Northern Bishops did, in conjunction with the Southern, must, therefore, have been as part of an assembly of Bishops of all England, and not as part of the Convocation of a Province.

R. D. CRAIG.

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—CHURCH COURTS.

Church Courts. An Historical Inquiry into the Status of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Second Edition. Revised, with Appendix. By LEWIS T. DIBDIN, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Hatchards. 1882.

IN this well-written pamphlet Mr. Dibdin has discussed the status of our ecclesiastical courts, and the objections taken to them by the Ritualists, in a candid and conciliatory spirit, and with a considerable amount of research. The present edition has been materially improved and added to, and contains a new appendix, in which various disputed points are discussed, and a good many little known authorities are brought together.

The principal point Mr. Dibdin endeavours to establish is that there is nothing Erastian in ecclesiastical courts deriving their authority solely from Parliament, nor is this any violation of that Reformation settlement to which the leaders of the Ritualists have appealed, and which both the Bishops and the Government have made the starting-point for the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. For this purpose Mr. Dibdin insists on the distinction between matters of faith and matters of discipline, between the doctrine and ritual of the Church and the machinery by which this doctrine and ritual are maintained unaltered; and contends that the true constitutional theory and that which has been in substance adhered to ever since the separation from Rome, is that, while no change in doctrine,

ritual or substance can properly be made, except with the joint consent of Church and State, the courts, procedure and penalties through which the established doctrine and ritual were to be maintained, were matters for the State alone to regulate.

While I agree that there is a distinction between the modes of legislation on these two classes of subjects, I think it would be more correctly described by substituting for "except with the joint consent of Church and State," in the above statement of Mr. Dibdin's view some such words as "without Parliament being authoritatively certified that such changes were in accordance with the true doctrine of the Church." During Henry VIII.'s reign the Convocations of Canterbury and York were habitually appealed to on all doctrinal questions, but from the beginning of Edward VI.'s reign, it has been much more usual for Parliament and the Crown to rely on a selected committee of bishops and learned men as their advisers on doctrinal questions. In 32 Hen. VIII. cap. 26, we have an earlier instance of such a Commission being placed by Parliament on the same level with the whole clergy of England. The two Prayer Books of Edward VI. were both prepared by commissions of bishops and learned men (see preamble to 2 & 3 Edw. VI. cap. 1, and Cranmer's letter of the 7th of October, 1552; "State Papers (Domestic) Edward VI.," vol. xv., No. 15; Perry's "Declaration on Kneeling," p. 77), and a similar commission of bishops and learned men was authorized by 3 & 4 Edw. VI., cap. 12, to prepare the ordination services. Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz. cap. 2) authorized the Queen to make any orders as to ornaments of the Church or the ministers upon the advice of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or the Metropolitan, and though the Ecclesiastical Commissioners who acted as to the Advertisements of 1566 and as to James I.'s Prayer Book were bishops, there was always a majority of laymen on these commissions, and there is considerable reason to suppose that those powers were first exercised by a commission consisting entirely of laymen in Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559. These Injunctions certainly emanated solely from the Queen and the lay members of her Privy Council, but the evidence that these Privy Councillors were clothed with the character of Ecclesiastical Commissioners is only circumstantial and would occupy too much space to state here. A limited number of bishops and learned men obviously could not be regarded as giving the consent of the Church, though they might be very good authorities as to its doctrine. Even before the Reformation, the Convocations were not regarded as the only authorities as to doctrine. The Council of the Earthquake of 1382, whose condemnation of Wicliffe's doctrines was the foundation for the first statute against heretics (5 Rich. II. cap. 5), and was

also communicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury to his suffragans as an authoritative list of heresies (3 Foxe, p. 23; Knighton, p. 2651), was not a provincial convocation, but an assembly of a limited number of bishops, doctors of civil and canon law, friars, monks, and bachelors of divinity, whose names are to be found in 3 Foxe, p. 22, and in Shirley's "Fasciculus Zizaniorum," p. 498.

But for those who hold that the Convocations are the representative organs of the Church, while Parliament is only connected with the State, as well as for all who may doubt whether, though Parliament formerly legislated by itself for the Church, it is any longer competent to do so without the consent either of the convocations or of some other body representing the clergy and laity in communion with the Church, Mr. Dibdin has furnished a satisfactory explanation why the machinery for maintaining the established doctrine and ritual should be left to the State alone. According to Mr. Dibdin (p. 5) "the State says:— "It is the creed, the ceremonies, the doctrines of this Church, "as they now are, that we wish to make the religion of the "nation, not whatever modifications of them the leaders of the "Church may at any future period see fit to introduce. To "guard, therefore, against the danger of unwelcome changes, "the State, in exchange for its support and countenance, takes "certain securities. First, it requires that no changes of "doctrine, ritual, or substance, shall be adopted without its "consent; and secondly, it demands to have confided to it the "duty of seeing that the teachers, and to some extent the other "members of the Church, are true to its doctrines, ritual, and "substance for the time being. This duty is practically dis- "charged by the erection of tribunals, to the judges of which 'are entrusted the adjustment of all litigation on Church "matters, and the punishment of all offences either of doctrine "or practice. Thus the supremacy of the State or Crown is "exercised by means of courts, set apart, indeed, for ecclesias- "tical purposes, but deriving their jurisdiction from the State."

That, in fact, this has been the constitutional practice ever since the separation from Rome, Mr. Dibdin does not attempt to prove in detail, but directs his attention specially to the great Statute of Appeals, 24 Hen. VIII. cap. 12, and to that part of the Act of Submission, 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 19, which related to ecclesiastical appeals, and brings together (pp. 94–101) some curious pieces of evidence bearing on the subject. But he could have made a much clearer case, as it seems to me, if he had made use of certain statements in the third volume of Wilkins's "Concilia" as to the different sittings of the Canterbury Convocation and the principal business transacted there, stated to be made up from the Acts of Convocation, and from extracts made

by Heylin, and covering the whole period from 1530 to 1545. As Dr. Wilkins lived in George I.'s reign, his materials must have survived the fire of 1665, when the registers of the Canterbury Convocation were destroyed; but whether they are still extant I have not been able to ascertain. As Heylin was a politician and historian, as well as a divine, we may feel sure that he would not have omitted to notice if Convocation were consulted upon any important statute, and, therefore, these statements of Dr. Wilkins constitute valuable negative evidence that Convocation was not consulted as to either of these enactments as to appeals.

In connection with the statutes 24 Hen. VIII. cap. 12, and 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 19, Mr. Dibdin discusses Dr. Pusey's and Mr. C. L. Wood's contention that the latter Act (the Act of Submission) which gave an appeal to delegates appointed by the Crown "for lack of justice at or in any of the courts of the archbishops," did not give them any appellate jurisdiction in cases of doctrine; and after pointing out that both Dr. Pusey and Mr. Wood assume the language of the Act of Submission to be very different from what it really is, he displaces the only possible real ground for their contention by showing in detail (Appendix, pp. 73–89) that bishops and archbishops unquestionably had jurisdiction in matters of doctrine before the Reformation.

Among the passages collected for this purpose a considerable number (pp. 79–84) relate to the question whether, apart from statute law, a heretic could be burnt on a conviction by a bishop, or only on a conviction before the provincial convocation; and they show in a curious way how little the most eminent common lawyers were to be depended upon when dealing as textbook writers in their studies, and without the assistance of arguments on opposite sides, with questions relating to out-of-the-way branches of ecclesiastical law. We find Fitzherbert in Henry VIII.'s reign ("Natura Brevium," p. 269), and Sir E. Coke in Caudrey's case, 5 Coke's Reports, and again, in 12 Coke's Reports, pp. 56, 57, laying down that before the statute 2 Hen. IV. cap. 15, no one could be burnt for heresy, except on conviction before Convocation. Next, we find that in James I.'s reign this question was solemnly argued before four judges in connection with the conviction of one Legate by a bishop, the statute 2 Hen. IV. cap. 15 having been repealed; and in accordance with a report by Dr. Cosins, Dean of the Arches, they decided that a conviction before Convocation was unnecessary. Legate was burnt in accordance with this decision; which Coke not only reports, 12 Coke's Reports, p. 93, but also adopts as correct in his third Institute, p. 39. Nevertheless, after this Finch (1678), Hawkins, "Pleas of the Crown," book 1, pt. 2, cap. 26 (1723); and Blackstone, 4 Comm. pp. 46, 49 (1765), all repeat

Fitzherbert's rejected doctrine without noticing the contrary decision. Perhaps, however, their disregard of this decision may be partly due to a mis-translation in the printed editions of Coke's report of the case, which states that the judges decided "without considering Coke's authorities," instead of "on consideration of" them, as the Law-French MS. in Lincoln's Inn Library has the passage.

This is a digression from Mr. Dibdin's pamphlet, as he merely quotes these authorities to show that it was universally admitted that the bishops had a certain jurisdiction in heresy, and that the only dispute was whether a bishop's conviction could be the foundation for a writ *de hæretico comburendo*, but I have been tempted to make it, partly because the alleged necessity of a conviction before Convocation has a material bearing upon the question what a trial for heresy before Convocation *really was*. Mr. Dibdin touches on this question, pp. 85–87, though more briefly than I could have wished, and without arriving at any definite conclusions beyond these, that the cases which came before Convocation seem to have been treated in some way or other as under the jurisdiction of the archbishop, and that there are two possible modes of accounting for this—viz., that either the archbishop in synod may have been the most complete form of a provincial court, or the archbishop may have invited the synod to sit with him as assessors. Mr. Dibdin assumes that the jurisdiction of Convocation (if any) belonged to the whole body, but in his subsequent account of Whiston's case in Queen Anne's reign, he quotes Burnet as writing ("Hist. Own Times," vi. p. 54) that "two great doubts still remained, even supposing Convocation had a jurisdiction, the first was of whom the court was to be composed, whether only of the bishops, or what share the Lower House had of this judiciary authority." Also the records of the cases which came before Convocation as reprinted in 3 Wilkins's "Concilia" from the registers of the archbishops, show that occasionally (*e.g.*, pp. 433, 497) the archbishop was only assisted by the bishops, the rest of the Convocation being excluded, which suggests that if they were not all merely assessors, at any rate the lower clergy were so.

One of Mr. Dibdin's statements as to Convocation has puzzled me a good deal, and I am doubtful whether the words may not have been accidentally transposed. He says, "we do not know whether Convocation acted merely as a Court of Appeal or also as a Court of First Instance." After examining a good many cases, including almost all those Mr. Dibdin refers to, I have not found any instance of its acting as a Court of Appeal, while I have met with a considerable number in which it seems to me to have acted as a Court of First Instance.

Mr. Dibdin devotes part of his appendix (p. 89) to discussing

a statement of Lyndwode, the great English authority on canon law, that the cognizance of heresy belonged to only two judges, the bishop and the inquisitor appointed by the Pope (Lyndwode, "Provinciale" p. 296), a statement which Chief Justice Hale (1 "Pleas of the Crown," p. 392) understood to mean, that according to the canon law, and until the statute of 2 Hen. IV. cap. 15, no vicar-general, commissary, or official of the bishop could try heresy. Mr. Dibdin inclines towards this being the correct view of the law before the Reformation, and only doubts whether it is still law, on the ground that the canon law is in this respect contrariant to the laws, customs, and statutes of the realm, and therefore not in force in England under 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 19, sect. 7. This statute of 2 Hen. IV. cap. 15, assumes that the bishop's commissary (*i.e.*, some one commissioned by him) had jurisdiction in heresy as well as the bishop himself; and it appears from the "Fasciculus Zizaniorum" (p. 334) that part of the proceedings against Swinderby some years before this Statute (A.D. 1389) were before the commissary of the Bishop of Lincoln. It is very unlikely that a Dean of the Arches, in a commentary on the constitutions of the archbishops of Canterbury, should have laid down a rule contrary to the English usage of his own time, without remarking on the difference of usage. Lyndwode had been saying just before that, in a peculiar—*i.e.*, where the general ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been transferred from the bishop to some other ordinary—the bishop had jurisdiction in heresy, not the ordinary, and he might easily say what he did thinking only of the ordinary of the peculiar, and not of any delegates of the bishop. Besides, according to Bernard of Como, as quoted by Mr. Dibdin, the bishop may appoint a special delegate to hear cases of heresy, though his vicar-general cannot do so without special authority; and Mr. Dibdin considers that the authorities quoted by Lyndwode and Bernard bear out the latter rather than the former. But whatever Lyndwode may have meant, or whatever the rule of the canon law may have been, it is clear that inquisitors appointed by the Pope, though not bishops, had jurisdiction in heresy; and, therefore, the denial of jurisdiction in heresy to the bishop's vicar-general and commissaries did not rest on any ecclesiastical principle. I strongly suspect that if this denial did exist, it was devised by the Papal Court and the commentators on canon law to extend the practical jurisdiction of the Papal inquisitors, by limiting the number of other persons who could adjudicate on heresy. Nearly all the canon law as to heresy dates from after the introduction of Papal inquisitors of heretical pravity, and consists of orders issued for their guidance and to regulate their relations with the bishops.

Besides developing and illustrating his own views, Mr. Dibdin

has devoted a considerable part of his pamphlet to analyzing Mr. Gladstone's well-known pamphlet on the Royal Supremacy, and criticizing some of his principal propositions. In connection with the visitatorial jurisdiction of the Crown, and to show that it is not so absolute as Mr. Gladstone alleged, Mr. Dibdin explains how this visitatorial jurisdiction was the source of the Commissions of Review, which were frequently granted down to the abolition of the Court of Delegates, to re-hear cases decided by that Court. He also discusses the claim Mr. Gladstone makes that Convocation should be the instrument of legislation for the doctrine of the Church, explaining how far it agrees with his own views; and to meet Mr. Gladstone's assertion that the Reformation settlement contemplated that the ecclesiastical laws would be administered by ecclesiastical judges, he brings together a good deal of interesting information on the difference between civil law and canon law. A statute passed in 1545 (37 Henry VIII. cap. 17) authorized the employment of lay and married men as chancellors, &c., in ecclesiastical courts, provided they were doctors of civil law, and this is quoted by Mr. Gladstone as if a civil law degree was a security for knowledge of ecclesiastical law. Mr. Dibdin shows that throughout the Middle Ages canon law and civil law were distinct studies, in each of which separate degrees were conferred, and that Henry VIII. in 1535 suppressed the study of canon law at Cambridge, and probably also at Oxford, leaving only the Roman civil law, a knowledge of which was required for the proper exercise of the jurisdiction which the ecclesiastical courts then possessed as to wills and the administration of estates, and for cases in the Admiralty Court.

Mr. Dibdin's last chapter discusses the relations of Church and State in early times, being intended for those who may not be satisfied to abide by that Reformation settlement, which was to be adopted as a starting-point by the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, and it comprises among other things a full analysis and review of an interesting pamphlet by Dean Church, published in 1850, and recently republished.

H. R. Droop.

Art. IV.—IRELAND FORTY YEARS AGO.

THE native-born Irish peasant, when left to himself and not unduly influenced by interested political adventurers, is kind-hearted, courteous, and obliging. Such, at all events, was his character as I knew him some forty years ago. Since then, I have been in many lands, and I have closely observed the habits and characters of the labouring classes in Europe and in

America, and in a portion of Africa, but nowhere have I met such kindliness of heart and genuine hospitality as among the humble occupants of the unpretending, and, in too many cases, poverty-stricken cabins in the West and South of Ireland. With all their faults—and I know them well—there is not in any part of the world which I have yet visited any other race of people who, under such untoward circumstances, were so happy and contented as the Irish peasantry in days gone by. And God alone knows what trials these poor people were called upon to endure. In spite of industry and toil, the land was hardly sufficient to supply the barest necessaries of life to the poor tenant. There were exceptions, no doubt; but the average regularity with which the men who tilled the soil were compelled to be satisfied with food unfit for human beings, is a fact which there is no use in disputing. Any traveller who ever visited Ireland in those days was impressed with the truth of this remark, and the piles of pamphlets which have issued from the press, add additional weight to the statement. The land in itself was, on the whole, good, and in experienced hands, with a little capital, things would have looked different. But the poor man had no capital except his labour, and no knowledge of agriculture except the traditional customs to which, unhappily, with undeviating fidelity the Irish cottier only too sturdily adhered. In reply to useful hints from landlords and others interested in the success of the farming operations of the small occupiers of holdings, it was not unfrequently said, "Sure, yer honour, none of the ould people ever did that sort of thing at all, and they got on well enough, an' sure it will do for us too, an' isn't God as good now as He ever was." Many a time have I heard this inconsequent though piously-worded reply given to real friends of the peasant. And not only so, but in several instances the well-meant efforts of generous landlords were utterly frustrated by this rigid reliance upon traditional routine.

There can be no doubt that the Irish peasant was easily satisfied and well content, provided he had plenty of potatoes and milk twice or three times a-day. This humble, but not by any means despicable fare (whenever it could be had), with the occasional addition of butter and eggs, "a bit of bacon and cabbage," now and then, not forgetting on market days or at the "fairs," a plentiful supply of whisky, or, better still, in the estimation of the poor man, "just a drap or two of potteen,"[1] made life

[1] This is the name given to the home-brewed whisky which has a peculiar relish for the peasant from the fact that it is forbidden by law. If "stolen waters are sweet," illicit whisky has still greater attractions for the poor Irishman.

positively enjoyable to the Irishman. But such fare was quite exceptional—only on State occasions and high days! I am now referring to a period in the history of Ireland about 1840. At that time the potato was at its very best, both in quality and in quantity. There was a kind, now extinct, called "cups," which were remarkably fine, and were sold at 2½*d.* a stone. These were more frequently on the tables of the rich and well-to-do classes than on that of the peasant. He preferred the "lumper," as that kind of potato was called. It grew in perfection in the counties of Galway and Clare, and in 1841, I remember that they were supplied on contract to some of the workhouses for 1½*d.* a stone, and the "cups" at 2½*d.* Many a time, after a hard day's snipe-shooting, have I been the welcome guest of a poor tenant. Those were the days when a man could easily bag his twenty brace of snipe in the good old bogs before civilization introduced its modern drainage system! What a luxury it was, after bog-trotting all day, and far from home, to sit down at the pressing and polite invitation of the peasant, who followed you with the keen zest of a sportsman, and dine off the following fare, got up by special effort, but with whole-souled hospitality. Splendid potatoes, each laughing at you through their half-broken rind, mealy and dry, fresh butter, milk of the purest brand, and without any sophistical adulteration, eggs newly laid "for the occasion!" Add to this the painfully hospitable plenty with which "the lady of the house" pressed you to relay after relay of potatoes, boiled, roasted, and fried, eggs "galore," milk in the old-fashioned "noggin," replenished again and again, and you have a true and faithful picture of the Irish peasant's warm-hearted disposition, as I remember it previous to the heart-breaking famine of 1846. When I say "the lady of the house," I mean what I say; for if unaffected modesty, kindly consideration for the feelings of others, and a genuine desire to make you feel perfectly at home, and to do everything to make your stay as happy and as comfortable as circumstances will allow—be considered, then, the Irish woman in an Irish cabin in the days of old was every inch of her both a true woman and a real lady.

I do not mean to imply that the above was the ordinary fare of the peasant. Many a time he had nothing but dry potatoes and salt, month after month. Milk and eggs and butter were exceptional luxuries, and confined to the better class of tenants. The fortifying bill of fare which I have given above was the extreme limit of the hospitable resources of the Irish peasant, but it was given to his guest with an overwhelming sense of that kindness of heart which in the Irish language is called *cead-mil-a-failtha*, or, "a hundred thousand welcomes." That state of things is unhappily getting out of date, owing to the

present evil influence of the leaders of the people. There existed ordinarily great poverty and hardship; but the peasantry bore these trials with a light spirit. Their temperament stood between them and despair. They were too kind-hearted to originate schemes of spoliation. That has been reserved for the Jerrymandering type of the political charlatan, who makes capital for himself at the expense of the poor tenant. These interested schemers, as a rule, care very little for the welfare of the people, and less for the credit of their country. There have been noble exceptions, among which may be reckoned Smith O'Brien, poor Tom Steele—with whom I remember travelling, in the year 1848, from Drogheda to Dublin, attired in his undress uniform of the Repealers—and, perhaps, O'Connell, whose persuasive oratory, racy, and pathetic, and delivered with wonderful precision and effect by a man possessing a splendid voice and imposing *physique*, contributed so much to the final settlement of the Bill on "Catholic Emancipation." The last time I ever heard him speak was in the market-place of a small provincial town in the co. Roscommon, in the year 1843. I listened to him with rapt attention, and in spite of my strong political prejudices against him at that time, and my belief that he was engaged in a campaign of mischievous malevolence, I was carried away so effectually by the force of his arguments, and the pathos and genuine feeling which he introduced into them, that I could not resist the conclusion that the people of Ireland had genuine grievances which ought to be adjusted. I also heard him plead in Galway in the celebrated case of *Ruttledge v. Ruttledge* a few years previously, and I could not help thinking that if he had continued to practise in his original profession as a barrister he would have died a richer man, and, for his own sake, a happier one. At all events, the politicians at that time, though in many cases actuated by self-seeking caution, were very superior in point of disinterestedness, intelligence, education, and refinement, and, above all, good breeding and gentlemanly bearing, to the present tribe of arrogant political upstarts who are (with a few exceptions) bringing shame and contempt on the cause which they advocate, and on the unfortunate country which they are reducing to irremediable ruin. The cause of the Irish peasant, so far as my experience goes, has been, as a rule, quite distinct from that of their leaders.

The peasant, as I knew him forty years ago, beyond the effort necessary to eke out a scanty subsistence, and to meet the half-yearly settlement with the agent or the landlord, seemed to have no other object in life. He was quite content with potatoes as his chief article of diet. The unvarying uniformity of potatoes, morning, noon, and night, from one end of the year to the other,

was the staple form of sustenance. They are all very well in their way when assisted with milk, and butter, and oatmeal, and flour; but the days on which such sumptuous repasts fell to the lot of the poor man might easily have been counted in the entire lifetime of an Irish peasant forty or fifty years ago. But there was no trace of Communism in his character. The Irish peasant was, and still is, a man of strong family feeling. His love for his wife and children has always been of the truest and tenderest type. The following instance, only one out of many, may serve to show what acts of self-sacrifice an Irish peasant will undergo for his family.

I knew, in the year 1842, one of Nature's gentlemen—for every honest man, of whatever rank, is the gentleman of Nature—whose name was Tom Carty. He was a labouring man and lived near Ennis, co. Clare. He was given a job which consisted in quarrying stones, and it lasted for ten months. During that time he was obliged to live near the scene of his work, which was too far from his cabin to admit of his returning at night. He had a wife and children who still occupied the old hut while he lodged in a sort of shanty far worse than an Indian wigwam. That poor man whom I knew well and greatly respected, accompanied me on many and many a day's shooting along the low lands adjoining the river Fergus, stretching from Ennis to the town of Clare. In one of those conversations he gave me the following narrative and almost in these very words:—

"I had tenpence a-day for the ten months I was in the quarry, and if only the wife and the childher were with me I'd have been as happy as a king. But you see, sir, I had to feed myself and the family too, and all the spare money I sent to them."

In reply to my question as to how he managed, he said, "Oh! begorra, sir, that was aisy enough, for sure a man can't go wrong on a straight road. I had no choice about food, it was potatoes always, with every now and then a bit of salt herring. As for milk, in throth, I forgot the taste of it, for not a dhrop of it ever passed my lips during the ten months I was in the quarry. I saved every penny for the wife." The ordinary rate of wages for men in that year was eightpence in summer, and sixpence in winter, so that my good and faithful friend Tom Carty considered himself well off. Ireland at that time was over-populated. There were about eight millions of people. Now, there are about five and a half millions. Wages are more than double what they were. Every thing has been done by an over-indulgent Parliament to make Ireland peaceable and contented. The Church has been disestablished. Landlords have been robbed. Land Acts of every eccentric form have been passed. Legisla-

tion in every shape almost has been suspended, except what concerns the sister isle, and yet she is not happy. I do not hesitate to say that the state of Ireland at this moment exceeds in misery that of any nation upon earth, and far beyond that of any previous period in her own history. The present reign of terror has never had a parallel in that country. She has reached the climax of misery and disorder. On the page of Irish history are written "within and without, lamentations, misery, and woe." She was bad enough fifty years ago, but compared with her existing condition, she was then prosperous and happy.

There were outbreaks and outrages at that time, as at present, connected with agrarian discontent. The "Molly Maguires" and the "Terry Alts"—the latter so called from the name of their leader—caused a good deal of annoyance. They were the Ribbonmen of the period. Now and then a landlord was shot, and others were threatened; still, bad as things were, they never reached the present climax of lawlessness and bloodshed. That condition of things has been the result of the paternal tenderness of Mr. Gladstone and his coadjutors, whose painstaking conscientiousness led them to devise "soothing syrups" for Irish discontent. How well our political empirics have succeeded with their nostrums let the Ireland under radical rule bear witness. Every so-called message of peace to the Irish nation from the English Government was, in the estimation of the people, nothing but an exhibition of feebleness to cover the want of power. There has always been a party in Ireland adverse to British rule ever since the conquest of that country. The Romish clergy never fraternized with the English settlers. An English Pope—Adrian, towards the close of the twelfth century—handed over the whole of Ireland to an English king. Up to that time the Romish clergy had no recognized standing in the country.[1] Since then they have settled in Ireland by the order of the Pope. The constant squabbling of the native chiefs and the newly arrived English nobles left no time for either party to attend to the tillers of the soil, who were mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. They were nothing more nor less than serfs who held their lands under the feudal system. When the Romish priests came over to the country they took the part of the neglected peasantry, and the latter from that day to this looked to the priests as their friends, and to the Pope as their adviser. Thus, the people gradually withdrew their allegiance from the King of England, and transferred it to the "Holy See." And for this state of things England has only to thank herself.

[1] All islands in the world, whether inhabited or not, by the Canon Law, are the exclusive property of the Pope.

She utterly neglected the people, and allowed them to shift for themselves any way they could. The Romish missionaries gave them the full tide of their sympathy, and identified themselves with the popular cause. The people, in fact, instinctively began to see that the Romish missionaries were their only friends, and gradually, they came to regard them with gratitude and affection. The endearing epithet which they gave their priests—"Sogorth Aroon"—shows the feeling of the people towards them, and that feeling, though somewhat rudely shaken lately by the Communism of the Land Leaguers, still in the main continues to be generally adopted.

There exists a very strong tie between the priest and the people—and can we wonder at it? For centuries past the Romish clergy have made the people's cause their own. The English have ever been regarded by the Irish peasantry as interlopers—aliens—"Sassenachs'"—or Saxons. The Celt has kept his individualism as distinctly as the Jew, and, generation after generation, they hand down from father to son the history of the wrongs, real or imaginary, which they have endured from their conquerors. By way of conciliating the Celtic population in Ireland, Queen Elizabeth introduced a law compelling the people to attend the services of the Church of England—not one single syllable of which they understood. It was as unintelligible as Arabic to the people, yet they were forced to go to church to listen to it. After much petitioning, the Government permitted the service to be read in Latin! as a sort of compromise between English and Gaelic; but there was no relaxation in the law which made it punishable for any one to absent himself from church-services. And this was the plan which the conquerors adopted in order to win over a sensitive, quick-witted and excitable people to the blessings and privileges of the English Church and the English Government! The result has been that the Irish peasantry have never taken kindly to their English masters, and a good many of them never will, no matter what "sops" time-serving and truckling political tricksters may devise. The memory of the past is too deeply graven on their minds, and so long as the native Irish have a footing "in their own green isle" they never will be reconciled to the rule and authority of England. Their religion, their language, and their habits are totally opposed to those of Great Britain. Into every corner of the globe the native Irish have carried their prejudices of race and caste with them, and although, owing to various causes, many have abandoned the old creed and the old customs, still with average regularity they cling to the past line of demarcation between them and the English people. This is evident from the vitality which has been imparted to the Fenian and Land League movement. Without the aid of Irish

emigrants in all parts of the world the present revolution could not last a single day.

It is worse than useless to close our eyes to the evidence which glares upon us from the history of Ireland since its conquest by Great Britain. Had there been no Irish Channel separating the two countries things would, perhaps, have been very different from what they now are. But here is an island at a distance of sixty-four miles from England, difficult of access in days gone by, its people left in a great measure to themselves and their native chiefs, who were always either building castles, or stealing cattle, or engaged in petty warfare with each other—a turbulent and restless set of marauders. Had there been no breach of continuity between Holyhead and Kingstown, Ireland would probably by this time have been as quiet and peaceable as Wales. But it was the isolated position which Ireland occupied, and the difficulty thereby of maintaining English jurisdiction effectively in the island, that has contributed so much to the social and political entanglements with which the Irish question is now surrounded.

The mistakes which successive administrations during the last fifty years have made, consist in an attempt to allay Irish grievances by appealing to party feeling. Class legislation has been the rock on which politicians have split. Every Irish peasant knows right well the character of John Bull, and the one peculiarity connected with his political history is his unaccountable ignorance of the Irish people and Irish affairs generally. For example. The Government of England, after granting Catholic Emancipation, innocently imagined that the ideal civil war with which the country was then threatened had been satisfactorily allayed. There would have been no civil war. Had it arisen, the Orangemen alone would have stamped it out, without any aid from the police or soldiery. It was only a vain threat—a ghost dressed up to overawe the ignorance of English politicians. But Catholic Emancipation, after all, did not put down disloyalty and discontent, so another sop was thrown to Cerberus. The national system of education was devised, and to render the scheme successful no clergyman of the Irish Church was eligible for promotion from the Crown who was known to be hostile to its operations. Then, to please the Romish priests, the Maynooth Grant was considerably enlarged and made a permanent endowment.

This also did not answer the expectation of its promoters. And so on, from that day to this, political expediency has been the moving power of English legislation for Irish discontent—and yet the country and the people are worse off than ever. It is clear, therefore, that our rulers have not yet discovered the true character of the moral disease, to remove which they have

been prescribing all kinds of specifics and quack remedies. If Ireland had been governed as an integral part of Great Britain, as Kent, or Surrey, or Middlesex is governed, there would have been no necessity for exceptional legislation, overwhelming naval and military armaments, landlord spoliation, Church Disestablishment, or any other eccentric confiscation of property under the misnomer of Justice to Ireland.

As to injustice, I know of nothing of the kind, except the undue partiality that is now shown to the Irish, and of that no Irishman can complain. The fact is, that the poor people were never in so good a way for improving their land, their houses, and themselves, as at present, if only they were allowed to do so. Everything that England can do is being done for them, but the vulgar and interested gang of Irish demagogues, who call themselves Land Leaguers, are doing their very utmost to neutralize every well-meant effort intended to ameliorate the condition of the peasantry. The Land Leaguers are reckless in their plans, and in spite of all the devices of human skill and wisdom, they are unsettling the tenants, baffling, as far as they can, Parliamentary legislation; and as the result of such an unscrupulous and unprincipled policy, Ireland at this time presents scenes of anarchy and bloodshed which it would be impossible to exaggerate. Crime, in spite of all the safeguards and resources of civilization, is walking in naked and discontented defiance over the land.

This I maintain is not the work of the poor peasant. No doubt he is aiding and abetting the movement in so far as his sympathy may not be enlisted on the side of law and order. But this is more in appearance than in reality. He knows well that there is a secret conspiracy consisting of desperadoes of the deepest dye. Their deeds of daring scare the people themselves, upon whom summary vengeance would be taken if they seemed to be supporters of the Government and the police. One fact, at least, is very clear, and that is, that the existence of the Irish Church was not the real grievance of the people—nor yet was inequality or unfairness in the land question. Expedients have been resorted to by the English Parliament to remove these real or imaginary grievances, and they have been resorted to in vain. Nothing of this kind ever constituted the true source of Irish discontent. There has been from time immemorial a party in that country which has been opposed to English rule and authority. Wild and visionary as their schemes have been, nevertheless they were such as to keep agitation alive, and to foment a spirit of rebellion among the people. This is really at the bottom of the present revolutionary mania. The year 1798 was the last crisis of the blood-poisoning worth speaking of. The virus of that attack passed off, though still leaving the body

politic more or less infected with a constitutional taint. And now, once more after eighty years, with all the aids and appliances of improved locomotion between Ireland and America, and with the still more potent agency of the science of destructive warfare in the shape of weapons of precision, explosive bombs, and dynamite, we see another outbreak of the political poison that has been all along secretly permeating the moral nature of unreasonable and wicked men whose traditional hatred of England is a matter of congenital disposition. Nothing short of total separation from Great Britain, nationally and politically, will ever satisfy these fanatics. And yet most of them are well aware of the utter hopelessness of their scheme. But, in the meantime, it pays. Their dupes are blinded, and consequently money is freely supplied for the promotion of what is conceived a great national cause. None know so well the weakness of the foundations of this gigantic sham as the so-called leaders of the revolution. But the instinct of self-preservation is upon them. They must live, no matter who pays for their subsistence. Most of the men engaged in the movement never owned a blade of grass in their lives, or ever worked in agricultural pursuits. Some of them are sprung from the humblest origin—creditable to them in a noble cause—but suggestive a little too much of self-interest than of a public-spirited patriotism where men have no bye-ends or secondary considerations to promote. When a man's bread or his self-importance depends upon agitation, the probability is in favour of the continuance of the agitation, not so much for the benefit of the distressed, as for the personal aggrandisement of the demagogue. This is the motive power which directs the movement. Assassinations, and Boycotting, and Parliamentary obstruction, are utilized for the purpose of evoking Irish-American sympathy and support. As funds are falling off, some new deed of blood in Ireland gives fresh impetus to the movement, and calls forth a corresponding pecuniary response. In the meantime, however, the poor peasants for whose benefit all this costly machinery of blood and bluster is supposed to be set in motion, are no better off, but worse, than they were before; and the conspirators who desire to pose as disinterested patriots are living on the funds of sympathizers, whose heart is in Ireland, and their home in America. If every agitator to-morrow were silenced, and the people were left wholly in the hands of the British public and Parliament, a new era of peace, contentment, and order would be inaugurated in the history of Ireland. But so long as the political agitator comes in between the people and the Government, so long legislation will be baffled, the peasantry will be unsettled, and the country will be kept in a state of chronic disaffection and disorder.

The Irish Roman Catholic priests forty years ago were in

many cases men of high culture and refinement of manners. The fact that most of them were educated in France, at St. Omer and in Paris principally, made them very agreeable guests at the houses of their Protestant friends and neighbours, with whom in those days they freely associated. I well remember the late Father Tom Maguire being a constant guest at my father's house. Many a time I travelled in his company in the old coaching days, when he shortened the journey considerably by his interesting and entertaining conversation. He was a famous connoisseur in greyhounds, and generally he was accompanied with a brace of them. He never touched on religion or politics on such occasions, unless, indeed, every now and then when some adventurous but conscientious traveller attempted "to improve the occasion" by calling Father Tom's attention to matters connected with the distinctive differences between the Churches of England and Rome. It was a treat to hear him argue, for whether he was right or wrong he not only never lost his temper, but he threw into his observations a degree of good-natured controversy which could never be offensive to his opponent. "Can you tell me, sir," he once remarked to an opponent, "anything about the origin of evil? You say that the devil was the author of it. In that case, was it Satan who invented sin, or was it sin that degraded Satan? If you say that it was Satan who invented sin you are drawing largely upon your imagination, and besides you are entering upon a subject of extreme embarrassment, for you have still to account for the source whence evil sprang. Was it from the mind of Satan within him, or from some suggestive and malign influence without him? If you say that sin degraded Satan—a statement I am ready to endorse—then your theory as to Satan being the author of evil falls to the ground." This and similar conversation took place on the top of the old stage-coach from Carrick-on-Shannon to Dublin, when the famous M'Cluskey was the guard —a man of many accomplishments, from the playing of the cornet, which he did to perfection, to the recital of the best parts of the English classical authors in prose and verse.

Father Tom McKeon, of Dromahair, was also another specimen of the old Irish gentlemanly priest, whose guest I have often been for weeks together in his humble dwelling outside the town, on the roadside. The house was little better than a peasant's cottage. It had only three rooms—one, as you entered the door, which was kitchen and general reception room, all in one, for all comers on business to the priest, and one room on each side of it. There was no grate. The fuel, which was the very best peat or "turf," was always burned upon the ground, on a large stone at the fireplace. An elderly woman presided over this department, whose duty it was to cook for the priest the

very simple fare which came to his table. Chickens and bacon, and sometimes the bacon without the chickens, or the chickens without the bacon, for the sake of variety; excellent vegetables of all kinds, especially the "cup" potato; a rabbit now and then, or some game sent by the Protestant squire; a leg of mutton sent as a present "for his Reverence," from some kindly disposed parishioner; plenty of eggs, butter, milk, and—whisper it not—the very best of poteen, which the producer of it would prepare with special care for Father Tom. He was an honest good fellow, genial, and gentlemanly, spoke French like a native, and was an excellent scholar. Day after day he would drive me all about the country in his gig; and when we were all alone, beyond the sound of the village, he amused me with many an old Irish song, the plaintive notes of which I can remember to this day. I had a peculiar respect, and indeed affection, for this priest.[1] He was a favoured guest at my father's house, "Grouse Lodge," near Drumkeerin, co. Leitrim, and as my mother was a Roman Catholic, he was her spiritual adviser. She died at a very early age—twenty-six—but she lived long enough to mould my heart (which did not always respond to her loving precepts) in the ways of practical piety, which she taught me to believe did not consist in mechanical forms, but in unsullied purity of thought and

[1] I still have a Bible which he gave me, and begged me to read it. "Your father's name is in it. He was my friend, and I want to be yours now." Though he had not seen me since I was a child, this priest, out of regard for the memory of my mother, wrote privately to me, in 1844, to say that a property left to my sister by my father, called Canbeg, close to Drumkeerin, for which my father paid some thousands in 1834, was being unfairly dealt with, and he begged me to come at once to him as his guest at Dromahair. He requested me to keep secret the information. I went to him, and remained four weeks in his house. He succeeded in getting part of the property, but when it came to the knowledge of Bishop Browne's ears what he was doing for me, he received a plain reminder to attend to his own affairs. Owing to the intrigues carried on afterwards, the entire of that property—Canbeg—was laid hold of by the said Bishop Browne and is now, at least it was lately, owned by the trustees of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, and the rents, since 1846 or thereabouts, have been paid to that College, or to the Bishop of the diocese of Elphin, though neither he nor the College have the slightest claim whatever to it. The property belonged to my father, who bought it from a Dr. Cogan. I visited it in 1843 and in 1845, but there was a detachment of soldiers of the 6th regiment at that time quartered in the house belonging to me, as the tenants were a wild and lawless set of fellows. They shot, or shot at some bailiffs, and Mr. Fawcett, near Drumkeerin, they intended to shoot, but they mistook another gentleman for him, who had the privilege of being under fire, but happily without any bad effects. No one could get these men to pay rent, and accordingly the Bishop of the diocese, finding that nobody could tame them, took them in hand, and by some inexplicable process of law and Church authority he claimed the property, aye, and he and his successors have kept what they claimed, to this day. It would be a gracious act to restore it to its proper owners.

feeling, acts of liberality with a full perception of the Sacrifice, and to love and serve the Blessed Saviour with all my heart and soul, and to lean only on His merits. This was what she taught me, and as a proof of it I found, years after she died, a copy of the authorized version of the Bible with my name and date of birth, written on the title-page, with these words: "The gift of his affectionate mother." I mention this because, whatever change may have come over Irish Roman Catholics in these days, I know that in my youth there was a more friendly reciprocity of feeling between Romanists and Protestants than perhaps now exists, and much less bigotry and wrangling between Protestants and Catholics. I have seen as many of the latter as of the former side by side on the same form at school—men who are now judges on the Irish Bench, and some of them very distinguished men. I am not arguing one way or the other, for or against Popery or Protestantism. I am merely narrating scenes of which I was an eye-witness and a sharer in Ireland some forty years ago.

Then there was another priest whom I remember, but did not know—Father Denis Mahoney, better known as "Father Prout." He was the ablest writer and scholar of his day, and an able contributor to the leading English magazines. His lines on the "Bells of Shandon" (Cork) are well known.

The first verse runs as follows:—

> With deep affection, and recollection,
> I often think of those Shandon bells,
> Whose sound so wild would, in the days of childhood,
> Fling round my cradle their magic spells.
> On this I ponder, where'er I wander,
> And thus grow fonder, sweet Cork, of thee,
> With thy bells of Shandon, that sound so grand on
> The pleasant waters of the river Lee.

With the increased facilities to the Irish priesthood in reference to Maynooth, their education in France and Italy has become quite exceptional, and I do not think that the change has been productive of good either to the clergy themselves or to Ireland. This restriction of the students to their own country has produced too many hot-headed and bigoted priests, without the softening influences which foreign travel and experience invariably produced on their minds and character.

In many other points, too, I notice a considerable change. The priest forty years ago dressed very quietly on week-days, unless on duty; he lived very simply, and, altogether, he kept himself in the background. There was a quiet reserve of manner about him, and a gentlemanly bearing, which showed that his mixture with foreign habits was not in vain. When he travelled he adopted the most economical plan. But now all that is changed. The priests, who can afford it because of the

better salaries, put up at the best hotels, dress in the first style, and some of them keep their livery servants. But, as an old waiter in one of the principal hotels remarked to me a short time since, "The Catholic clergy are not as friendly or civil to the likes of me as the old priests used to be. They don't return my salute as kindly as in the good old days. Sure, sir, my old priest would stop me and say, 'Pat, my boy, how's every inch of you?' But now, the new priests are too much of the gentleman to be seen talking to a common fellow like me. The old priests didn't doubt themselves, and they knew every one respected them; but these new chaps notice the Quality more than a spalpeen like me, because they think it's fine and grand. Ah! sir, God be with the ould time, the ould priests, and the ould gentry. Sure, Ireland isn't the same counthry at all at all." And yet I know some Irish priests who are still as kindhearted and as peaceable and quiet as in the olden times. Some of my Protestant brethren may not think so; but I am responsible only for a faithful narrative of facts with which I have been, and am, familiar. There are many priests who are better than their creed, and I have known such, to one of whom (already mentioned) I had reason to be more than ordinarily grateful. Peace to his memory, and honour to his grave!

The poor people at all events are no longer what they were. Under the orders of their political leaders they are doing despite to their once noble qualities of courtesy and generosity. They no longer exhibit that native politeness which hitherto distinguished the Irish race, and in their stead there has been grafted a sullen and almost morose disposition which sits very awkwardly on the native Irishman. Forty years ago, whatever might have been the heartburnings of the people in face of their hardships, they neither forgot their self-respect nor attempted to establish the principle of self-reliance by conduct at variance with law, justice, and religion. O'Connell's agitation was based on constitutional grounds, and to the day of his death he denounced every suggestion that seemed to drift in the direction of physical force. The blood that has been shed in Ireland of late may be traced to the demoralizing influences of secret societies established for avenging the supposed grievances imposed on the people by English rule, and the existence of landlordism—not for the purpose of benefiting the peasant, or of seeking by legitimate agitation to put right whatever may have been wrong. It is an attempt, unfortunately too successful, to set class against class, to alienate the affections of the people from English control, in order to establish an irresponsible and self-constituted Government, chiefly composed of ambitious filibusters and place-hunting politicians. At present, none of the Irish party leaders dare accept office or emolument from the

English Government. It would be as much as their lives are worth to do so. And as they are nearly all men whose private means are either very slender or nothing, it becomes necessary that they should have some compensation for their trouble and labour in the so-called national cause. Thus, if they could put down the landlords, and establish their own importance in the eyes of the populace, they would drop into a comfortable means of living which, under a peaceful and loyal state of things, could have no existence for men whose sympathy and active agency are with anarchy, lawlessness, and crime.

G. W. WELDON.

ART. V.—NATURAL RELIGION.

Natural Religion. By the Author of "Ecce Homo." London: Macmillan & Co. 1882.

THIS is the latest, and probably the most earnest, attempt we have yet witnessed, to widen and expand, to make more broad, what has been commonly called "the Broad Church." Uncertainty as to the limits of that church has been felt all along: but this book appears to disclaim, to repulse, the idea of any limits at all.

The main object of the book appears to be, to induce men to believe, that, without surrendering the Bible, they ought to be willing to embrace, to welcome, men who, although not believing the Bible, were still worshippers of some sort, believers of some sort—even while often unable to tell what it was they worshipped, what it was they believed. A writer in a weekly journal, who has in some measure forestalled us,[1] says of the author: "While he does not in any sense give up supernatural religion for himself, and does not wholly despair of it for others, he holds that there is something which may properly be called Natural Christianity, as distinguished from the supernatural Christianity of the disciples of Christ."

If we wonder, if we are curious to learn, what this "Natural Christianity" can be, or where it is to be found, the author of "Natural Religion" explains himself in this wise:—

> Who that has seen the new generation of scientists at their work does not delight in their healthy and manly vigour, even when mos he feels their iconoclasm to be fanatical? No great harm surely can come in the end from that frank, victorious ardour. As for the oppo-

[1] *The Spectator*, July 1.

site enthusiasm of Art, here, too, there is life, a determination to deal honestly with the question of pleasure, to have real enjoyment and that of the best kind. . . . . Art and Science are not of the world, though the world may corrupt them, they have the nature of religion (pp. 132, 133).

Now this is, on the whole, about the most baseless vision, the most unreal imagination, that we have seen in our time; and we feel comfort in the belief that it will find but few sympathizers. Even such a journal as *The Spectator* can thus remonstrate—

The truth is that it is the very essence of our author's view of "Natural Religion," that man should have an ideal of humanity by which to compare his actual progress, or stationariness, or regress; and yet, as a matter of fact, we cannot find any ideal of humanity, unless we are allowed to look beyond humanity, which is just what our author, in his intense desire to gain over the humanists, will not permit. If there be a God who says to man, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," and who tells us, both through our own conscience and by outward example, what He means by holiness, then we have a basis for our human ideal, and something more—a super-physical, even if not a supernatural, power to guide and help us. But this strange book, which insists that we may have a genuine religion without trust, and founded solely on an admiration which itself has no fixed standard, does not explain to us at all, how this ideal is to be attained.

Turning to the author himself, we find him dwelling much on the desirableness of what he calls "development." He says, at p. 246—

Other religions have been stereotyped early, because their first preachers were narrow-minded, and could not conceive of development in religion. But our religion was not at first of this kind, since the most remarkable feature of our Bible is its system of successive revelations, covering many centuries, and its doctrine of an Eternal God, who from age to age makes new announcements of His will. Here, again, in archaic form we have a modern doctrine, by the help of which Christianity ought to have been preserved from the fate of other religions which have found themselves incapable of bearing a change of times. It follows that we may find in Christianity itself the principle that may revive Christianity; for the principle of historical development, which is what we need, is plainly there, and the whole Bible is built upon it. Christianity was intended to develop itself, but something arrested it. The spirit of prophecy, that is, of development, did not continue sufficiently vigorous in the Church. It was not, indeed, absent. The prophet of the Apocalypse and Paul, both show us in what way Christianity might have faced the new exigencies. In later times, too, this spirit exhibited itself occasionally. Augustine's "City of God" may be called a true prophecy (p. 247).

The chief error, plainly, of this book is the assimilating, the mingling together, things wholly different; especially the constant endeavour to raise "Science" and "Art" to a level with "Religion," or even to make each of them a religion by itself. We confess to a degree of astonishment at this strange estimate of these two human pursuits. They are far, indeed, from what this volume tries to represent them. Science should deal with *things known*; but the Science of our day is apt to deal with guesses—with surmises.

Art and Science have had, in the providence of God, a fair and ample trial; and their value, or want of value, as regards man's spiritual state, has been proved. The trial and the result are both before us in the history of Greece.

The most valorous, the most manly, the most graceful of any race or family that the earth has ever known, was surely to be found in Greece. This race of men was planted, too, in one of the most beautiful of all lands.

Turning to the higher, the intellectual qualities of men, what other race could compare with the men of Greece? If Science or Philosophy, or Literature, be asked for, what shall be said of a country or a people which produced, in the course of a few centuries, such men as Homer, Hesiod, Thales, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Æschylus, Epicurus? Or, if Art be sought, though many names are lost, that of Phidias, greatest of all, survives; but without names, such are the qualities, such the excellences, of the works of those days, that a statue of the age of Pericles, if now discovered, and without great injury, would be deemed of almost priceless value.

On the whole, can less be said, than that the men of Plato's days, if tried by the severest tests, would be deemed to be far beyond, in natural qualifications, any race, or people, or nation, that has been seen in later times?

Yet, what is their succeeding history? Did they conquer, or convert, or absorb, all the other nations of mankind? Far from it. Not even were they themselves absorbed—on the contrary, left undisturbed, of their own vices they were the prey. No other nation attempted their extermination—they were neither massacred, nor carried captive. They simply perished, the victims of their own corruptions, they decayed, they disappeared.

Strabo, a Greek geographer, writing a few years before the coming of Christ, reports, that in travelling over Greece, he "found desolation everywhere prevailing; Messenia was for the most part deserted; the population of Lycaonia was very scanty; Arcadia was in utter decay. Acarnania and Etolia were worn out and exhausted; of the towns of Doris scarcely a trace was left; Thebes had sunk to an insignificant village; the other cities were reduced to ruins." Bishop Thirlwall, in his

history of Greece, gives these facts, and passes on to inquire the causes. These he found to be, "a want of reverence for the order of Nature—for the natural revelation of the will of God. The sanction of infanticide was by no means the most destructive or the most loathsome form in which it manifested itself." He adds:—"In the course of the seventh and eighth centuries the worst forebodings were realized. After many transient incursions, the country was permanently occupied by Sclavonic settlers. The native population was swept away, and the modern Greeks are the descendants of barbarous tribes."[1] Such was the result of a real and earnest worship of Science and of Art. To exceed Greece in this sort of "Religion" is scarcely possible—to follow Greece would probably be to lose ourselves with her in the vortex of utter destruction. The idea, then, which the author before us seems to entertain, that Science and Art might become, if not the equals, if not the rivals, of Christianity itself, still, something which might be called "a Natural Religion," seems to us one of the most baseless theories that ever was offered to mankind.

We do not find it easy (unless we could give an abridged edition of the work) to give our readers a clear account of this new sort of "Religion." Here are two brief passages, which partly explain it:—

"That which is peculiar to the Bible, and has caused it to be spoken of as one book rather than many, viz., the unity reigning through a work upon which so many generations laboured, gives it a vastness beyond comparison; so that the greatest work of individual literary genius shows by the side of it like some building of human hands beside the Peak of Teneriffe" (p. 176).

"Thus we arrive at a Christianity which is independent of supernaturalism but at the same time is historic, not abstract; and does not in any way break with the Christian tradition, or discard the Christian documents as obsolete. The miracles of the Bible, if the world should ultimately decide to reject them, would fall away, and in doing so would undoubtedly damage the orthodox system. But the Natural Christianity sketched in this chapter would not be damaged" (p. 177).

A Christianity, "not damaged," in which the miracles of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ, were "rejected!" Let the reader reflect upon this strange idea—remembering that the author only describes *what may happen* "if the world should ultimately reject" those miracles!

Our "Religion," as the author of the book before us is fond of calling it, is, according to many, built upon a collection of human writings, of no higher authority than the works of Plato

[1] Bishop Thirlwall's "History of Greece," vol viii. p. 509.

or of Cicero. To cite, as we are constantly doing, a "passage of Scripture," is only to court the scornful retort, "Oh, yes, Scripture, indeed! but we know better, now-a-days, than to pin our faith on what you call 'Scripture.' You quote St. Paul's fifteenth chapter of the First of Corinthians. Well, our answer is, that St. Paul was not infallible. He seems to have taught that Christ actually rose from the dead. But I do not think so. Therefore, I differ from St. Paul, and many other people think as I do."

All this sort of talk only shows us the truth of Dr. Robert Vaughan's caution, thirty years ago: "If we have not a Christianity based on written documents, we can have none at all." If the position of the Bible as DIVINE, as the work of the Spirit of God, could be shaken, then nothing but uncertainty, nothing but doubt, would be left to us. We should be sent back to the position of Socrates and Plato, who despairingly confessed, "You may pass the remainder of your days in sleep, or in despair, unless God in His goodness shall be pleased to send you instruction." If God has not been so pleased, then we remain in Socrates' position, and may sigh out, as he did, "All I know is, that I know nothing!"

These opinions and their spread seem to us the chief peril of our day. The book now before us, called "Natural Religion," does not, directly, touch this question. We do not think that we have seen, in its pages, any opinion expressed as to whether the Bible is "infallible" or not. It deals with a different part of the same great subject: whether a devotee of Science or of Art may not be deemed a "religious man," seeing that he "worships" an object of his own selection. There is an unreality, a fictitiousness, about this theory, which will, we hope and trust, prevent it from gaining much serious attention. Yet the religion of "culture" is undoubtedly spreading.

The other part of the "Broad Church" system is, as we have said, far more dangerous. It goes to the root of the whole matter. JEHOVAH *has spoken to man*, the Bible is the Word of God—that fact lies at the foundation of all real religion. The denial of this fact—with criticism of a destructive tendency, which calls the fact in question or logically denies it—is, as we have said, the main peril of the day. Both, however, are parts of the same question, and both lead in the same direction: away from the Bible, and, by consequence, away from the teaching of the Church.

ART. VI.—EPISCOPACY IN ENGLAND AND WALES; ITS GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT TO THE PRESENT TIME.

PART IV.—THE NORMAN CHURCH.

IT has been computed, with as much accuracy as is possible in the circumstances, that at the date of the Conquest, the population of South Britain did not exceed a million and a quarter. It is difficult to assign the relative proportions of these, to the two great divisions of the country; but we may compute approximately. At this moment, or by the census of 1881, the population of England is about eighteen times as great as that of Wales; and making ample allowance for the different conditions of eight centuries ago, we may fairly say that it was six times as great. There would thus be in England an average of less than 72,000 to each bishop, and in Wales nearly 43,000. What a contrast to our overgrown populations! And it was not a bad skeleton—especially for those unenlightened times—to be filled up by the future increase of population.

From this date to the Reformation, or from 1066 to 1517, a period of 451 years, the growth of the Episcopate was apparently, and indeed actually, slow; for Theodore and his successors had made their arrangements so well, and spread their network so completely over the whole country, that very little change was urgently called for.

(xx.) ELY.—In the county of Cambridge, and to a limited extent in the adjoining shires of Norfolk, Lincoln, Northampton, and Huntingdon, there is a long stretch of ground of a low level. A portion of it was formerly known as Holland (the hollow-land), and a wide extent of it is still known by the general name of the Fen country. Towards the close of the Saxon period, much of it was covered with water, and even in the driest seasons there were numerous lagoons or shallow lakes. It has been described as "a wilderness of shallow waters and reedy islets, wrapped in its own dark misty veil, and tenanted only by flocks of screaming wildfowl."[1] Macaulay has described the people as a peculiar and almost amphibious race; and previous to the large drainage operations which converted the district into arable land, the passage from point to point was extremely difficult; and the recesses were the home of those who fled from society. An elevated portion of this territory was known as the Isle of Ely;

[1] Green's "History of the English People," p. 31.

and here a religious house was founded about 670, which was destroyed by the Danes just 200 years after. The wife of the Northumbrian king who founded it had been its first abbess. In 970, or after the lapse of another century, a similar building for males was erected, and largely endowed; and for the first half-century after the Conquest, or till about 1100, the place was greatly resorted to by eminent Saxons. In 1108, King Henry I. gave the abbot permission to establish an Episcopal See, as the latter was desirous to be freed from the control of the Bishop of Lincoln. The county of Cambridge was assigned as the diocese: the first bishop was Harvey, previously Bishop of Bangor, but who, it is said, was driven out by the Welsh; and the conventual church became the cathedral. It is now a beautiful building, though differing from the usual proportions in buildings of the kind, being long and narrow.

(xxi.) CARLISLE.—The history of this diocese is somewhat peculiar. At an early period, the date of which is not accurately stated, Fergus, Lord of Galloway in the south-west of Scotland, founded a priory of Praemonstratensians in Wigtonshire. This order, which took its name from a place in France, was also called the *Candidus ordo* from the white garb worn by them.[1] Adjoining the same spot, St. Ninian, who had converted most of the neighbouring people (the Southern Picts), had built a church of white stone about 432, which Pinkerton says was "the first stone house[2] erected in Scotland." It probably had a little spire; for

---

[1] Spottiswood's "Account of Religious Houses in Scotland, at the time of the Reformation."

[2] This was probably true; but the remark does not refer to such structures as the prehistoric forts called the White and the Brown Caterthun at Strathmore (Wilson's "Prehistoric Annals of Scotland," vol. ii. pp. 90, 91; Roy's "Military Antiquities," pl. xlvii). Nor does he refer to the "Vitrified Forts," produced by the application of fire to stone which experience had shown to be fusible. The houses of the Gauls, which Cæsar said those of the Britons resembled, were somewhat like Indian wigwams, constructed of wood, of a circular form, and with lofty tapering roofs of straw. The remains of houses found in bogs show that the sides were invariably of wood, scarcely six feet apart, the floors being usually of stone or earth, but sometimes also of wood. In comparatively modern times, wooden houses were common in the British isles; and wooden churches have existed, and still exist, in our own time, like those which gave the local name "Woodchurch." In the "Pictorial Vocabulary," of the fifteenth century, the word *domus* is illustrated by a wooden house with walls of lattice work. And in Alfric's "Colloquies," the "Lignarius," or tree-wright, argues that he cannot be dispensed with, as with other useful things he constructs houses. He enumerates the parts, all of wood. John de Garlande, in the thirteenth century, enters still more into particulars, but in the same spirit (Mayer's "Vocabularies," from the tenth to the fifteenth century). "Jack of Newbury," or John Winchcombe, a celebrated clothier, entertained Henry VIII. and Queen Catherine in his house of wood; and in 1836, the Angel Hotel at Derby had at least one remaining side of wood

from that date the place was called Whitehorn,[1] vulgarly Whithern, or in Latin *Candida casa*.[2] Here the See of Galloway was founded, consisting nominally of Wigtonshire and the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright, but the bishops exercised a permissive jurisdiction over other places adjoining. In the troubled periods of our history, the northern portions of Cumberland and Westmoreland belonged sometimes to the English and sometimes to the Scotch:[3] but their spiritual interests were generally superintended by the Bishops of Whithern in either case. These were frequently consecrated at York, and regarded as within that province. In the Scottish list there is a hiatus from 790 to 1154—*i.e.*, of 364 years;[4] and our diocese of Carlisle was founded by Henry I., in 1133. William Rufus had driven out Dolphin, son or grandson of the great Earl Cospatrick; so that the new diocese was created for the new subjects. It was not, like Ely and the other dioceses noticed here, a better provision for those on the same area. In 1703, when Bishop Nicholson made his primary visitation, it had only 106 churches. Most of the

---

(*Reliquary*, vol. vii. pp. 178, 179). There was "a bird-cage wooden house" in Dublin till 1813, and another in Drogheda till 1824, which was 254 years old, for the builder had placed his name on the front, "Hiv Mor, carpenter, 1570." In 1513, the Borough Moor at Edinburgh was "a field spacious and delightful, by the shade of many stately and aged oaks," but it was so great a nuisance as a forest that the citizens were encouraged to build wooden galleries projecting over the street, in order to get rid of the timber.

[1] Uriconium, now Wroxeter, near Shrewsbury, was also built of white stone, which had a pretty appearance among the trees. It was burnt down by the West Saxons, and a British poet says:—"In the white town of the valley, its chieftain's hall is without fire, without light, without song."—Green's "English People," p. 14. In rural districts, white is a favourite colour, and white-washed houses are very popular. Also, the gates leading to fields or houses are usually swung from massive pillars —cylindrical, but with low conical caps—and these are usually white-washed. They are each about a yard in diameter. At a spot on the road near the Giant's Causeway, I saw thirty-two, or sixteen pairs, at the same moment; and from a point in Belfast Lough, on a clear day with a good glass, one might reckon as many as eighty!

[2] Whitchurch, in Shropshire, near Oswestry, is also called Ecclesia Alba (Latin), Eglwys-Wen (Welsh), and Blonde Ville (Norman). "Qui locus ad provinciam Berniciorum pertinens, vulgo vocatur: 'Ad candidam casam,' eo quod ibi ecclesiam de lapide insolito Brittonibus more fecerit."—Bede. In 1154 Bishop Christianus is called "episcopus Wittern," and "episcopus *candidæ casæ de Galveia*."

[3] On the dangerous and elevated borderland between Yorkshire and Cumberland, a stone cross was erected to mark the boundaries between the two kingdoms. Its popular name was a corruption from the word meaning the King's Cross.

> And the best of our nobles his bonnet will vail,
> Who at Rere-cross on Stanmoor meets Allen-a-Dale.—Scott.

[4] Keith's "Scottish Bishops," edited by Bishop Russell, 1824.

"benefices" were wretchedly poor. It now contains 155 benefices in the old (Scottish) portion, and 138 in that which was added from the diocese of Chester about 1856.[1]

(xxii.) MAN.—This diocese is commonly called "Sodor and Man," but the term is a misnomer. Archdeacon Hessey says, "The first portion of this title has become as meaningless as the title *King of France* was upon the English coinage in the reign of George II., for it is understood to refer to a group of islands on the Scottish coast, which have long since been thoroughly Presbyterian."[2] The Scandinavian sea-rovers called the Orkney and Shetland groups the Norder-eys and the Hebridean group the Suder-eys; while we, very naturally from our position, call the latter the Western isles. There was a Bishop of Orkney from about 1100 till 1688; and the See now forms part of that of Aberdeen; but the Southern islands, lying more within the range of Christian influence, had, according to some, a bishop of their own from 360. A more credible account, however, is that St. Patrick appointed the first bishop, Germanus, in 447. The first nine bishops were each styled *Episcopus Sodorensis*,[3] and probably this term included, from time to time, the Isle of Man, for a very intimate connection was maintained with it.[4] The Danes and Norwegians, of whom there are numerous traces, subdued the island in 1065; but they did not obtain possession of Iona and the other Western isles till 1098. During this interval of thirty-three years, they appointed a bishop of their own at Man, distinct from the Scottish bishop of the isles or Suder-eys. As the tide of battle ebbed and flowed between the Scots and the Danes, so the fortunes of the island changed. Sometimes the two lines of Bishops (1) of Sodor (or the Isles), and (2) of Man, were distinct, and sometimes coincident. In 1203, Bishop Nicholas is styled *quondam Manniæ et insularum episcopus.* After the conquest of Man by the English, the [Scottish] Bishops of the Isles were still styled *Epis. Sodorensis;* and this designation was retained down till 1566, when Queen Mary of Scotland dropped the

[1] I am indebted to Mr. Mounsey, the Diocesan Registrar, and also to Mr. R. S. Ferguson, F.S.A., editor of Bishop Nicholson's Primary Visitation, for some interesting information on the general subject.

[2] Report of the Norwich Conference, 1865, p. 168.

[3] This is the evident explanation of the term "Sodor," about which a good deal of nonsense has been written. Keith thinks that as the cathedral at Iona was dedicated to the Saviour, *soter*, the name is explained: but how then could it have been in use centuries before the little building was erected? The people of Man, by way of giving in the course of time a *quasi* authority for the name, have called a little island on the south-west coast "Sodor;" but two falsehoods certainly cannot make one truth.

[4] The cathedral within Peel castle is dedicated to Germanus; and others of the early bishops,—as Maughold, Michael, and Brandan (now Braddon) have given names to churches and villages.

word Sodor and called the bishop *Epis. Insularum.* In 1380, the English, who had conquered the island in 1340, appointed a bishop under the old title of "*Sodor* and Man," then quite incorrect, while the Scotch continued their line under the correct title, Bishops of "Sodor."[1] The civil rulers of the Isles had never adopted the Latinized Danish title, but were simply *Domini Insularum.*[2] The diocese of the Isles is now united with that of Argyle.

Hence, the diocese of Man is an English one, and is correctly brought in here. It was not, like that of Carlisle, a necessary provision for new people; but the new subjects brought their own ecclesiastical arrangements with them. As Canterbury was our great ecclesiastical centre, it was first connected with that province; but by the Act 33 Hen. VIII., chap. 31, it was attached to the province of York.[3] The bishop is nominally a lord of Parliament, but has never had a vote.

The island had a separate king, with laws and recognized customs of its own, so that it became a sort of city of refuge for offenders against law and order. In 1764 this over-lordship was purchased by the Crown; but it was not till 1826 that the island became thoroughly incorporated with Great Britain. After the minute inquiries in 1835, which led to many of our modern ecclesiastical arrangements, an Act was passed in 1836 which provided, among its many clauses, one for the union of Sodor and Man with the diocese of Carlisle. This excited such an outcry, however, among the people of the island, that a short Act was passed, consisting of only one paragraph besides the preamble, on the 4th of July, 1838, repealing this portion. Still it was felt that the diocese was anomalous, and hardly afforded sufficient work for a bishop, so that Bishop Powys, about 1856, wrote to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, suggesting a "union of the Bishopric of Sodor and Man with a portion of the Bishopric of Chester." This suggestion was taken up in 1875, or nearly twenty years after, by the Bishopric Committee of Liverpool; but neither the Manx nor the Liverpool people received it with favour. So it fell to the ground.

We thus arrive at the number of twenty-two bishops, when the Reformation took place. In this third great period, 451

---

[1] Similar ancient designations exist among ourselves, as *Ebor* and *Sarum*, to denote York and Salisbury respectively. The episcopal seal of Sodor or the Isles was, *az.* St. Columba in an open boat at sea, all *ppr.*, in chief a blazing star, *or.* It is engraved in Bishop Russell's edition of Keith.

[2] "Lord of the Isles."—*Scott.*

[3] It is called in the Act the "Diocese of Man;" there is no mention of "Sodor."

years, the country appears to have gained three bishops, when it had in reality gained only one. With the exception of Ely, there was no founding of a new diocese for the better spiritual supervision of the people. At the time of the Reformation the population had risen to four millions—that is to say, every 100 people had become 320—and many had found homes in obscure or almost inaccessible parts of the country.

From the Reformation to the Present Time.

This period extends from 1517 to 1882, or over 365 years; and it is very curious that each of the three periods already treated of approximates to four centuries and a half. Their average is 446 years. In the present era our social changes have been more important, and our intercourse with the world more widely extended, so that we "make history" with a rapidity formerly unknown. For the sake of clearness, it will be necessary to examine the three and a half centuries in sections.

a. The Reformation.

It is commonly said that Henry VIII. founded six new Sees in 1541; and though this is quite true, we cannot find this number in existence at the present day.

(xxiii. *a.*) Westminster.—One of the new Sees was Westminster; but there was only one bishop, Thomas Thirleby; and when he was translated to Norwich, nine years after, Westminster ceased to be a bishopric. Some of the funds set apart for the purpose of endowing the See had been misapplied; and the diocese, which consisted of the county of Middlesex, was restored to London, from which it had been taken.

(xxiii. *b.*) Gloucester.—There is a tradition that before the departure of the Romans, Gloucester had been for a short time the seat of a bishop; and the name of Eldad is mentioned as having presided over the diocese in 490. It is much more likely that one of the Bishops of Caerleon-on-the-Usk, in the adjoining county of Monmouth, resided at Gloucester for a short time. The whole county of Gloucester was part of the large central kingdom of Mercia, and therefore originally a part of Lichfield diocese; but in September, 1541, the King, by letters patent, afterwards confirmed by Act of Parliament, erected it into a separate diocese. The cathedral church, which is dedicated to St. Peter,[1] was the old abbey church; the building of it occupied a long time, and though presenting different styles it is very elegant. At the Dissolution, in 1540, the revenue of the abbey

[1] The arms of the diocese are two gold keys in saltire, on a blue ground.

was nearly £2,000. This See was afterwards united with that of Bristol (which see).

(xxiii. *c.*) BRISTOL.—The diocese of Bristol, founded at the same time as that of Gloucester, was taken mainly out of Salisbury; both dioceses affording relief to others which had become too large and populous. The cathedral, dedicated to the Holy Trinity,[1] was also the collegiate church of a priory. It was of Black canons; was founded in 1148; and at the time of the Dissolution its annual revenue amounted to £768.

The "Third Report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, appointed to consider the state of the Established Church in England and Wales," recommended the foundation of a new See at Ripon, to relieve those of York and Chester; but as a great dread existed at the time of increasing the number of spiritual peers, it was further recommended that the two Sees of Gloucester and Bristol be united. An Act to this effect was passed in 1836 (6 & 7 William IV. cap. 79), and an order in Council was published in the *Gazette* on the 7th of October in that year, declaring them one See. The bishop of the united diocese is styled "of Gloucester and Bristol." In 1830, James Henry Monk, D.D., was appointed Bishop of Gloucester; and a vacancy having been created at Bristol by the translation of Bishop Allen to Ely, Bishop Monk at once became prelate of the united See. [Hence we have, thus far, only twenty-three dioceses, instead of—apparently—twenty-five.]

(xxiv.) OXFORD.—When the little village of Dorchester, situated at the junction of the Thame with the Isis, ceased to be the seat of a bishop, the whole county of Oxford became part of the diocese of Lincoln. This was shortly before the Conquest; and about 1525, Cardinal Wolsey commenced the foundation of Christ Church College in Oxford, which was completed by the King, after his death, in 1532. The church of St. Frideswide was raised to the position of a cathedral, under the name of Christ Church; the new diocese of Oxford was founded in 1541; and it was endowed out of the lands of the dissolved monasteries of Osney and Abingdon. It was at first almost confined to the county, but now it includes also Berkshire and Buckinghamshire. The revenues of the See were greatly diminished by Queen Elizabeth.

(xxv.) PETERBOROUGH.—This was another of the dioceses founded by Henry VIII. in 1541. The city lies on the west side of the wide dreary flats known as the Fens, and is just within the county of Northampton. On the river Aufona, now the Nene, which flows past the town, there was a sort of whirl-

[1] The arms are three crowns, arranged perpendicularly on a black ground.

pool, which gave the early name to the spot.[1] Here Peada, a violent heathen,[2] having been converted to Christianity, founded a monastery, which was completed by his brother Wulfhere. This was destroyed by the Danes; and again, after its restoration, by Hereward the Saxon, who was irritated at the thought of his paternal lands having been given to a Norman by the Conqueror. A castle or fort was subsequently built for the protection of the town. The abbey was a Benedictine one, and the abbots mitred, several having been summoned to Parliament, *temp.* Henry III. At the Dissolution, its revenue amounted to nearly £2,000; and on its erection into an episcopal See, the conventual church became the cathedral and the abbot's house the palace.

(xxvi.) CHESTER.—This ancient city has long held a prominent place, partly owing to its lying in the immediate neighbourhood of the Welsh. Its Roman name was *Deva*, derived from the *Dee* (or river of black water), and the old Welsh one was *Caer-Leon-Vawr* (the Station of the great Legion). Its neighbourhood was the battle-field where the monks of Bangor-is-Coed were slaughtered in 607; and after varying fortunes, King Edgar, about 972, was rowed from his palace to St. John's Church by eight tributary kings.[3] Chester was an important station as a bulwark against the Britons; and it formed a Saxon wedge breaking them into two sets,—those of Wales proper, and those of Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancashire, all of whom formerly lay in one continuous piece. The whole of Cheshire

[1] Peada, King of Mercia, succeeded his father Penda in 655; and he and Oswy came together and agreed that they would rear a monastery to the glory of Christ and the honour of St. Peter. And they did so, and named it "Medeshamstede," because there is a whirlpool at this place which is called Medes-wael. This is one of several late additions, to one copy of the Saxon Chronicle. The place was afterwards named "Burgus S. Petri," literally St. Petersburg, but commonly Peterborough. "In eo, sedes episcopalis, saluberrima concilio posita, ecclesia, episcopo digna, post Danorum incendia, et rebellium furorem restat adhuc insigne antiquitatis monumentum."—*Mon. His. Brit.* p. 217, *n.*

[2] The mode of signing and sealing, as mentioned in reference to one of the grants of the king is curious:—"These are the witnesses who were there, who subscribed it with their fingers on the cross of Christ, and assented to it with their tongues. King Wulfhere was the first who confirmed it by word, and afterwards subscribed it with his fingers on the cross of Christ." In 852, the abbot and monks let to a person for his life, certain land in Medeshampstede, for which he was to give another portion of land absolutely, besides paying the following rent:—"Sixty fother of wood and twelve fother of 'graefan' [brushwood?] and six fother of faggots, and two tuns of pure ale, and two beasts fit for slaughter, and six hundred loaves, and ten measures of Welsh ale, and each year a horse, and thirty shillings, and one day's entertainment." [N.B.—There is very little mention of money; but rents were paid "in kind," as tithes were till lately, down to about the year 1136.]

[3] For a picture of this triumph, see the margin of Speed's Map of Cheshire.

was comprised in the large kingdom of Mercia, and therefore originally formed part of the See of Lichfield; but Mercia had also extended northward as far as the Ribble, so that the whole of South Lancashire was part of the Archdeaconry of Chester. In 1541, Chester was one of the new dioceses of Henry VIII.; and the Archdiocese of York gave to it the Archdeaconry of Richmond, embracing large parts of Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, and all the remaining portions of Lancashire. It was an enormous diocese; but the population at that time was very small. It was endowed with the revenues of the old Abbey of St. Werburgh, which at the Dissolution amounted to £1074;[1] and the cathedral, originally the conventual church, was dedicated anew to Christ and the blessed Virgin. Bishop Peter, of Lichfield, removed the See to Chester in 1075, but his successor, Robert de Limesey, removed it to Coventry in 1102. The diocese of Chester was originally in the province of Canterbury, but was given to that of York, along with the See of Man, in 1542.[2]

In 1803, a list of the churches in the diocese, grouped under their proper heads, was printed on a large broadside, accompanied by a map. They were intended to be sold privately,[3] for the benefit of the Girls' Blue Coat school in the city, and have now been long out of print. The list is of great interest and importance, and from it I restored the map which is still more rare; and I also discovered that it had been reprinted in the third "Report of the Church Commission," 1836, map xxiv.

In 1803, the diocese of Chester was 120 miles long, 90 broad, and 570 in circuit. It appears to have been about 5,000 square miles in extent, or equivalent to four average counties. Its 592 benefices were scattered over seven shires, as follows:—in Lancashire 252, Cheshire 139, Yorkshire 114, Cumberland 44, Westmoreland 35, Flint 6, Denbigh 2. Of course the number of churches on the same area has been greatly increased since; but it may be interesting to see how these 592 are distributed[4] among the fragments of the dismembered diocese.

b. From the Reformation to 1831.

During a period of nearly 300 years, or from the death of Henry VIII. till 1831, there is very little to record in connection with this subject. The movement in favour of chief pastors

---

[1] One account says £1,073 17*s.* 7*d.*; and another £1,003 5*s.* 11*d.*

[2] 33 Henry VIII., cap. 31. [3] Price 3*s.* 6*d.* coloured.

[4] *Lancashire* (252), to Manchester 173, Carlisle 29, Liverpool 50. *Cheshire* (139), all in Chester diocese. *Yorkshire* (114), all in Ripon. *Cumberland* (44), and Westmoreland (35), all in Carlisle. *Flint* (6), and *Denbigh* (2), all in St. Asaph.

appears to have died out; the people became apathetic, and large classes arose, who did not recognize the value of episcopacy. Indeed, there are many thousands of professing members of the Church of England, and even some of her faithful children, who have taken their religious tone from Nonconformists, a large and increasing number of whom hold (privately or avowedly) that "clergy are not necessary, but every man is his own minister."

Yet in England of the olden time, the importance of bishops was thoroughly recognized; for a practice, very little known in our times, though recently revived, existed long before the Reformation. I mean that of having suffragan or assistant bishops in large or populous dioceses. Of these, there was a regular succession during several generations; and greater facilities were afforded for appointing them, by the Act 26 Hen. VIII. cap. 14. This is the Act which had been in abeyance almost since the time of the Reformation, but which was revived in 1869, with the hearty concurrence of Mr. Gladstone, then, as now, Prime Minister.

Nor did Henry VIII. stop with the founding of six new Sees. He agreed with the Reformers, that a more minute ecclesiastical supervision was necessary; and his ideal was that as nearly as possible there should be a bishop in each county. We have actually reached that condition in Cheshire; the county and the diocese are coextensive. Accordingly, an Act was passed—31 Hen. VIII. cap. 9—the preamble of which the King wrote out with his own hand, and after making out a list of the new Sees with the means of their endowment,[1] he endorsed the whole "Bishops to be made."[2] There were twenty-seven dioceses then existing, not reckoning Man, of which we still possess twenty-five, besides twenty-six suffragans for whom also he had provided. The enlarged episcopate which the King then contemplated, would have given to us great ease and freedom of action during the present century, and would have prevented the growth of difficulties which will long press upon us, less or more.

c. The Last Half-Century.

When the census of 1831 was published, it created a feeling of alarm in several parts of the country. It was seen that the large towns had quite outgrown their spiritual provision; so

[1] The See of Lancashire was to have been founded out of the revenues of Fountains Abbey and Richmond, neither of them within the county itself, which was then very poor and thinly populated.

[2] It is described as "An Act authorising the King's Highness to make Bishops by his Letters Patents." Repealed 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, cap. 8, sec. 18.

that dense masses of population were growing up in practical heathenism. Then, the resources of the Church were virtually wasted; a rector with nothing to do from Sunday to Sunday had a large income, while a town incumbent, whose daily toil was one continuous act of indirect suicide, was left to starve. Accordingly, two separate Commissions were appointed, to consider generally the condition of the Established Church, with a view to its improvement, and on their report several valuable Acts of Parliament were drawn up and passed. One of these was the Act of 1836, referring to episcopal dioceses, revenues, and patronage, by which the diocese of Ripon was founded.

(xxvii.) RIPON.—The foundation of this diocese attracted great attention, as it was the first occurrence of the kind since the Reformation, and was therefore unexpected. There was, however, a practical difficulty, as there was great jealousy respecting the increase of spiritual peers; and we had not yet arrived at the solution of the problem, as to how bishops could be increased in number without such pre-eminence. It was necessary, therefore, to unite two dioceses in the thinly-populated south in order to give relief to the teeming north. Accordingly, Gloucester and Bristol were united that Ripon might be founded.

(xxviii.) MANCHESTER.—It was thought that the same process must necessarily go forward, and so it was proposed to unite Bangor and St. Asaph. This was in 1847. But popular feeling showed itself unusually averse to the destruction of either of those ancient dioceses, and fortunately a solution of the difficulty was reached. This was, that while the Archbishops and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester should retain seats permanently in the House of Lords, the other bishops should sit according to seniority—so as not to exceed the then existing number.[1] The youngest bishop, therefore, and in after times several of the youngest bishops, would not be lords of Parliament; for the principle was capable of indefinite extension. The foundation of these two dioceses gave great satisfaction, but in the suggestions which were made from time to time for the extension of the episcopate, the great question was how funds were to be raised if the ordinary grade of prelates was to be maintained.

In 1866, the Society was founded for the increase of the Home Episcopate; and the very next year it promoted a Bill for the creation of three new Sees, St. Albans, Truro, and Southwell. This passed through both Houses with little opposition, and yet it did not become law. The Commons thought that the new bishops should not have seats in the House of Lords,

[1] 10 & 11 Vict. cap. 108.

and that the new endowments should all be practically raised by voluntary subscription. There was no opportunity for a conference, so the subject dropped.

In 1872 the late Lord Lyttelton sent out a circular letter to all the rural deaneries in the kingdom, and replies were received from 450. (1) Of these, 441 were strongly in favour of dividing the dioceses into two or occasionally more smaller ones. (2) There were three great suggestions as to the mode of raising funds—viz., (*a*) from the episcopal estates in the hands of the Commissioners; (*b*) in this way, with or without a readjustment of episcopal incomes; and (*c*) from voluntary contributions. (3) On the subject of spiritual peers, 80 per cent. or four-fifths thought we had a sufficient representation in the House of Lords at present. Again the Bill was brought forward, but after passing the Lords without a division, and being cordially received by the Commons, it was found necessary to withdraw it owing to the amount of business.

(xxix.) TRURO; (xxx.) ST. ALBANS.—This want of success on the part of two bills, led to an attempt being made on a new plan. This was to get a separate Act for each new See. My impression is that the one respecting St. Albans was passed first, but that the Bishop of Truro was first appointed. Both of these are, in one respect, special cases. The minimum salary of each bishop is fixed at £3,000, which is the lowest sum except in the case of [Sodor and] Man.

In 1878, the Right Hon. Sir R. A. Cross, then Home Secretary, brought in an enabling Bill for the founding of four Sees, in the hope that this would meet the necessities of the case for several years. Besides Southwell in the southern province, which had been twice before Parliament and approved, the schedule contained the names of three places in the northern province, Liverpool, Newcastle, and Wakefield. The Bill became law at the very close of the session; and Liverpool had already begun to make preparations, calculating on the success of the movement.

(xxxi.) LIVERPOOL.—March 16, 1880: The forms having all been complied with, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were requested to issue their certificate, that Her Majesty might found the bishopric. March 18: They certified to Her Majesty that the salary has been secured. March 24: The bishopric was founded, the diocese was described, the cathedral announced, the position of the future bishops declared. April 19: The new bishop was gazetted. June 11: He was consecrated in York Minster; and, July 1, he was enthroned in his cathedral at Liverpool.

The diocese consists of the hundred of West Derby, except one parish; or of South-west Lancashire. It is in many respects

a very important district, and its population at the recent census was 1,084,844.

Within the present area of the diocese of Liverpool there were ten churches in 1292 (Taxation of *Pope Nicholas*). In 1541, when Chester became a separate diocese, there were twenty-eight. In 1650, when an inquisition was held at Wigan, thirty-seven. In 1722, when Bishop Gastrell compiled his "Notitia," thirty-eight. In 1803, according to the list referred to, fifty. In 1850, when the late Canon Raines wrote, 122. In 1880, under the new bishop, 215.

d. Conclusion.

My last words are naturally retro-spective, and yet they are pro-spective. It is permitted to us—for the law must sanction the Act—to found three new Sees yet, and these are as follow :—

(xxxii.) NEWCASTLE.—For this, the whole of the endowment has been raised, and the Rev. Canon Ernest R. Wilberforce has been nominated as Bishop.

(xxxiii.) SOUTHWELL.—An interesting diocese will be attached to this See when it is founded, consisting of the two counties of Nottingham and Derby; and there is a magnificent church ready as the cathedral.

(xxxiv.) WAKEFIELD.—This will probably be completed last of the three, as it has to encounter difficulties which were not known, or less known, at some of the other places.

It thus appears that from 180 to 1880, or in 1,700 years, there have been thirty dioceses founded on the large scale; one brought in with new population; and three others sketched out. This is not much for a rich and Protestant country like England, but it is something; and it is desirable and proper that the facts should be extensively known.

A. HUME.

Reviews.

Memories of Old Friends. Extracts from the Journals and Letters of CAROLINE FOX, from 1835 to 1871. Edited by HORACE N. PYM. Pp. 350. Smith, Elder & Co. 1882.

CAROLINE FOX, of Penjerrick, Cornwall, we read, "was one of the three children of distinguished parents—distinguished not only by their fine old Quaker lineage, but by the many beautiful qualities which belong to large hearts and minds." She was born in the year 1819. Her father, Robert Were Fox, was not less conspicuous from his public spirit and philanthropy than from his scientific acumen, his geniality, and the simplicity of his life. Her only brother, Robert Barclay Fox, married Jane Gurney, daughter of Jonathan Backhouse, of Darlington. In the year 1840 commenced her friendship with the Mills and the

Sterlings, much interesting record of which will be found in her Diaries. She was also well acquainted with the Carlyles and F. D. Maurice. She passed through much conflict. The editor of these Letters and Journals writes thus of her spiritual life:—"It seemed to those who knew her best that the intense reality of her faith gave a joyousness to her bright days, and sustained her through dark and perplexed times. Her quiet trust conquered all the doubts and conflicts which hung over her early years; and her submission to a Higher Will became even more and more confident and satisfying—nay, one may dare to say, more triumphant." In a paper found in her desk after her death, but which was written when she was but one-and-twenty years of age, she says that she fully believed in Christ as a Mediator and Exemplar, but could not bring her reason to accept Him as a Saviour and Redeemer. "What kept me (in the year 1840) from being a Unitarian was that I retained a perfect conviction that though I could not see the truth of the doctrine, it was nevertheless true, and that if I continued earnestly and sincerely to struggle after it, by prayer, reading, and meditation, I should one day be permitted to know it for myself." Acting in accordance, as it seems, with the Saviour's comfortable words (John vii. 17) "If any man will (is minded, *willeth*, to) do His will, he shall know, ..." she strove "to live a more Christian life," looking for brighter days, "not forgetting the blessings that are granted to prayer." Her sympathies with the poor and sick were active, and, no doubt, helpful. From comments on the 10th of Hebrews she learned much as to the atoning Sacrifice; and after a time, through grace, she was able to say, "I *will* believe in the Redeemer and look for His support in my contest with unbelief." With earnestness and faith she was able to make the petition, "Lord, increase my faith," and also to recognize the workings of the Holy Spirit in her heart. There were seasons of conflict apparently, in the course of her Christian life, and her insight into the great truths of the Atonement may have remained imperfect; but there was quietness, patient waiting, deep thankfulness, and a consistent desire that Jesus, her God and Saviour, might in and by her be glorified. In the year 1863 a journey to Spain was undertaken with her father, who had been chosen as one of the Deputies to plead for the freedom of Matamoros, and warnings of physical weakness followed. She became subject to chronic bronchitis. At the New Year, 1871, she took cold while going round to the cottages with gifts, and after a short illness entered into rest.

"Caroline Fox was unusually rich in friendships," says Mr. Pym, the editor of her writings, "and she had the power of graphically sketching scenes and conversations." Her criticisms are often bright, sharp and humorous, but they are never bitter or uncharitable; her "culture" was worthy of a Christian home,

> where,
> Supporting and supported, polished friends
> And dear relations mingle into bliss.

Open these pages where one may we find a quotable remark or anecdote. A few quotations may well be given.

On page 22 we find Sir Charles Lemon recording that Professor Airy was so shy that he never looked a person in the face. A friend remarked to him, "Have you ever observed Miss ——'s eyes? They have the principle of double refraction." "Dear me, that is very odd," said the philosopher. "I should like to see that; do you think I might call?" He did so, and at the end of the visit begged permission to call again to see her eyes in a better light. He, however, found it a problem which would take a lifetime to study, and he married her.

On page 46 we read:—

1839. *Nov.* 5. A pleasant visit to Carclew. E. Lemon told us much of the Wolffs: he is now Doctor, and has a parish near Huddersfield. She was Lady Georgina's bridesmaid, and the wedding was an odd affair indeed. It was to her that Lady Georgina made the remark after first seeing her future husband, "We had a very pleasant party at Lady Olivia Sparrow's, where I met the most agreeable, interesting, enthusiastic, ugly man I ever saw!" She is a clever, intellectual woman, but as enthusiastic, wandering, and desultory in her habits as himself.

A story is told of Chantrey (p. 226) that, after sustaining a learned conversation with Lord Melbourne to its extremest limits, the wary sculptor, to hide his embarrassment, said, "Would your lordship kindly turn your head on the other side and shut your mouth."

On page 230 (year 1848) we read:—

Read Carlyle's article on the Repeal of the Union. Terrible fear and grim earnest, such as a United or other Irishman would writhe under; it gives them such an intense glimpse of their smallness, their rascality, and their simple power of botheration.

Barclay dined at the Buxtons, and met M. Guizot and his daughter, Arthur Stanley, and others. Guizot expects sharper work in France. . . . . R. Buxton writes of a charming coterie she has been in at Lowestoft—Guizot, the Bishop of Oxford, and Baron Aldersen.

In 1849, Miss Fox writes:—

A large dinner party at Abel Smith's. C. Buxton spoke of a day's shooting in Norfolk with Sir Robert Peel, when he was by far the best shot of the party. He talked incessantly of farming, and with a knowledge far deeper than they had met with before; in fact, he was the whole man in everything, and yet so cold and unapproachable that they felt quite frightened at him.

Dined at Carclew, and met Henry Hallam. The historian is a fine-looking white-haired man of between sixty and seventy. Something in the line of features remind one of Cuvier and Goethe, all is so clear and definite. He talks much, but with no pedantry. . . . . He thinks the English infatuated about German critics.

Heard of a poor woman in Windsor Forest who was asked if she did not feel lonely in that exceeding isolation. "Oh, no! for Faith closes the door at night, and Mercy opens it in the morning."

In June, 1851, Miss Fox writes:—"Attended a Ragged School meeting; Lord Kinnaird in the chair, instead of Lord Ashley (who has become Lord Shaftesbury by his father's death). Dr. Cumming made an admirable speech."

In 1853, May 4, she writes:—"To the Bible Meeting. Dr. Cumming was most felicitous in language and illustration; Hugh McNeil very brilliant and amusing on Tradition *versus* Scripture; then an American Bishop and his friend spoke as a deputation."

Notes and Jottings from Animal Life. By the late FRANK BUCKLAND, M.A. With illustrations. pp. 410. Smith, Elder & Co. 1882.

THE late Mr. Buckland was a most enjoyable writer; and to many who knew or cared very little about Natural History his chatty and pictorial descriptions of animal life were always agreeable. The volume before us consists of some thirty papers which had been selected and arranged by himself, shortly before his death, with a view to their early publication. The substance of the papers had appeared in *Land and Water*. "Mr. Pongo, the Gorilla," "My Otter, Tommy," "My Suricate Jemmy the Third, Joe, the Tame Hare, and my Jackass," "Polar Bear

Cubs," "Lord Bute's Beavers," "London Birdcatchers," are the titles of some of the chapters. It is well stated in a prefatory note that these Articles "will recall to many the vivid and original power of observation and illustration, and the earnest love of Nature, with which their author was gifted." For ourselves, we had a great admiration for Mr. Buckland; his strong common-sense was as conspicuous as his skill in observing and describing; in not a few respects, indeed, he stood alone.

In reviewing such "Notes and Jottings from Animal Life" the temptation to make quotations is almost irresistible. But our space is limited; and besides, our desire is to whet our readers' appetite, and send them to the book. From the many passages which we had in view, therefore, we will select only two or three.

In the paper on Pongo, a gorilla, who arrived in the year 1877, Mr. Buckland makes several observations on the Darwinian theory. He says:—

I am afraid the disciples of Darwin will be greatly discomfited by the advent of this gorilla. If the reader will kindly put his or her hand to the ear, he or she will find a very slight little hard knob on the external edge of the fold of each ear, about a quarter of an inch from its highest point. The presence of this knob, according to Darwin, indicates "the descent" of you and me, my friends, "from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World." I was especially careful to examine the gorilla's ear, and I discovered that he *does not wear a knob on his ear.*

Pongo is but three and a half years old, and therefore quite a baby. I was most interested to see how his infantine instinct is more in accord with the human infantile rather than with the adult mind. He is respectful, grave, and towards adult ladies and gentlemen somewhat distant. A little boy and girl came in to see him while I was present. After a while they both began to play with Pongo. Gradually they fraternized, and began to play together after the manner of little children. Not being a child, I cannot enter into their funny sayings and doings about nothing at all. So these three, the little boy and girl and the gorilla played together after their own childish fashion for nearly half-an-hour, and I made the children experiment on him with ornaments, handkerchiefs, &c.; but no—the ape's brain could not understand the human. Pongo put everything in his mouth, and tried to bite it up.

When the two humans and the gorilla were sitting at play on the floor I could not help seeing the amazing difference between the countenances of the gorilla and the children; the one decidedly and purely monkey, the others decidedly human. I could not in fact help seeing what a vast line the Creator had drawn between a man and a monkey.

Moreover, the human lips are made for speaking; not so the gorilla's. They are the lips of a beast. Humans have hair on their heads; Pongo's hair is not hair in our sense of the word, but simply a kind of fur continuous with the other covering of the body.

Finally, Pongo's structure and manners confirm my conviction that Darwin's theory is here at fault, and that we are *not* descended from monkeys. In actual structure we resemble them somewhat, just as a watch that will wind up, as sold in the streets for a penny, resembles the finest chronometer ever tested at Greenwich by the Astronomer Royal. No, human beings are not monkeys.

Why not rest satisfied with the origin of our race thus revealed to us by the great Creator Himself? "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female, created He them." For centuries past this has been, and for centuries to come it will be, the standpoint of human intellect and faith.

Having lived with monkeys in my sitting-room for so many years, one thing I have learnt for certain is that monkeys will not intelligently imitate the actions of men; their sense of hearing, smelling and sight, far surpasses that of ordinary civilized human beings, but their brain is not sufficiently developed to imitate intelligently. For instance, a monkey will sit before a

fire till it goes out, but the monkey will never put a bit of wood or coal on the fire to keep it alight. I have tried this over and over again with my monkey the Old Hag, who was my constant companion at the fireside for so many years. I have placed a stick in her hand and guided her hand towards the fire, but her brain could not see the connection between the burning stick and the warmth produced therefrom. Now, I believe that a half-grown baby would put a stick on a fire that was fast burning away, and for the simple reason that the human brain would enable it to appreciate the connection between the lighted stick and the heat.

Mr. Buckland's suricate (*Suricata Zenick*) was a very pretty little beast, somewhat like a small mongoose or very large rat. An African animal, living in burrows on the plains, sometimes called the "prairie dog," the suricate has teeth half carnivorous, half insectivorous. "Jemmy the Third" followed two other Jemmys.

Mr. Buckland's "Jackass" was an Australian kingfisher—the giant kingfisher (*Dacelo gigas*), called by the natives "Gogera" or "Gogobera," probably from its note resembling the sound of the word.

The chapter on Polar Bear Cubs is excellent.

The chapter about Lord Bute's beavers is entertaining and instructive. In the year 1872 the Marquis wrote to Mr. Buckland that he was anxious to obtain some beavers to turn out in the Isle of Bute. After two years' inquiry, one pair from France and one pair from America, were procured; but unfortunately they did not live long. The usual price for beavers, it seems, is between seventy and eighty pounds a pair. In the year 1875, through the famed Mr. Jamrach, eight more beavers were obtained, originally captured in North America. "In September, 1877," writes Mr. Buckland, "I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity of examining Lord Bute's beavers in the beautiful home he had prepared for them. H.M.S. *Jackal* in her cruise anchored at Rothesay, and the morning after our arrival, Captain Digby, the officers of the *Jackal*, my colleagues and myself, chartered a carriage to pay a visit to the beavers:" —

At some little distance from Mount Stewart House there is a lonely pine-wood. Through part of this wood runs a natural stream. In the centre of the wood a stone wall has been built in such a manner as to keep the beavers perfectly quiet and undisturbed. As far as could be ascertained by the curator of the beavery, there were twelve beavers. There were certainly one or more young ones in the big house which these most intelligent animals had erected. These when born are about as large as rats; and from their size and other observations the curator thinks that beavers have two litters of cubs in the year.

On entering the enclosure one might easily imagine that a gang of regular woodcutters had been at work felling the trees all around them. Woodcutters had indeed been at work very busily, but they were not biped labouring men working with sharp axes, but fur-clad quadrupeds, armed by Nature with exceedingly sharp, powerful teeth.

The original stream, which flows gently down a small incline, is now divided out into one larger and two smaller ponds by means of dams or weirs, which the beavers have built directly across the run of the water.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to see these wonderful dam-makers at work, as they generally, I hear, are out at work at night, and are very shy beasts. From the structure they have made, it is evident that they work with a design, I may even say with a definite plan. The trees have been cut down in such a manner that they shall fall into the position in which the beaver thinks they would be of the greatest service to the general structure, generally right across the stream. The cunning fellows seem to have found out that the lowest dam across the river would receive the greatest pressure of water upon it. This dam, therefore, is made by far the strongest. They seem to have packed, repaired, and continually attended to the tender places which the stream might

make in their engineering work. A fact still more curious—the custodian of the beavers pointed out to us a portion of the work where the dam was strutted up and supported by the branches of trees extending from the bed of the stream below to the side of the dam—forming, in fact, as good supports to the general structure as any engineer could have desired.

The beavers' hut, made by themselves, looks like a heap of sticks or waste firewood, and presents nothing to attract much attention. Of course I could not disturb it, but it appeared to be composed of tree boughs and barked sticks. In *Land and Water*, March 28, 1868, a drawing is given of the "beavers' home," as seen by a correspondent who had an opportunity of taking a beavers' house to pieces; here is his report:—"The beavers' home looks like a huge bird's-nest turned upside down, and is generally located in the grassy coves of lakes, by the edge of still-water rivers or artificial ponds, and less frequently by a river side, where a hand or jutting rocks afford a deep eddying pool near the bank. The house rests on the bank, but always overlaps the water in which the front part is immersed, and as a general rule the bottom of the stream or lake is deepened in the channel approaching the entrance by dredging, thereby assuring a free passage below the ice."

Beavers were at one time common enough in North Wales. Giraldus Cambrensis, who wrote in 1188, says that they were found in considerable numbers near one of the Cardiganshire rivers. No record of the existence of beavers in the Emerald Isle has been found in the Irish annals. Dante mentions the beaver as existing in the Danube (Canto xvii. of "Inferno")—

Lo bevero s'assetta a far sua guerra;

but the poet was evidently at a loss to know what the beaver was waging war against. The beaver is not a fish-eater; he is a typical rodent or gnawing animal. The Italian name is now *castoro*.

We should add that this attractive volume is beautifully printed,

Short Notices.

Sport in the Crimea and Caucasus. By CLIVE PHILLIPPS-WOLLEY, F.R.G.S., late British Vice-Consul at Kertch. R. Bentley & Sons.

This is a readable book, and full of interesting information. The narratives of the author's sporting adventures are ably written and attractive; his remarks on the condition of the people in the portions of the great Russian Empire which he describes are well worthy of attention. "I believe that the whole of the misery of Russia," he says, "her political discontent, her Nihilism . . . . are due, not to the autocratic form of government under which she exists . . . . but to the utter want of religious training among all classes, and to that widespread corruption in the official world from which all who come in contact with it suffer continually." "In spite of the gorgeous apparel of their priests, and the splendour of their ceremonials, few educated Russians believe in anything; though the peasant is as truly religious as any peasant in the world." Less compulsory military service, greater encouragement given to agriculture, and more religious training, these are the chief needs of the Russian Empire. The peasants are thoroughly loyal to the Czar; but the injustices of petty provincial officials and the rottenness of officialism generally foster discontent.

In the chapter headed "The Black Sea Coast," occurs an allusion to hotel accommodation:—

One of a long corridor in the stable-yard, with only too ample ventilation, my room stands a whited sepulchre, with an iron bedstead, a wooden table, a mattress, short and dirty cushion, no washing utensils of any kind, no bed-

clothes, a wicker chair, a broken bottle half-full of doubtful water, and bare boards beneath.

This was at Ekaterinodar, a prospering town, which boasts of her cathedrals. Here, in a Kalmuck refreshment booth, he bought some little knobs of mutton, on skewers, hissing from the coals; and he drank some brick-tea, rather like soup, being flavoured with butter, pepper and salt. Here, also, he bought and clad himself in the sheep-skin garments of the country. After a day's journey towards the Red Forest, our author halted at a forester's cottage. Several rough-looking Cossacks were smoking and warming themselves before a huge fire:—

One thing [he adds] I ought to say for these men, uncouth as they appeared. When I knelt for a few moments before turning in, every one of them rose, left the vicinity of the fire, and remained respectfully standing till I was on my legs again. . . . . Wherever I have met Cossacks, I have found the same outward respect at any rate for religious observances; and it is my firm belief that, though prone to many vices, they have more faith, and a greater respect for the nobler qualities of humanity, than most of their more enlightened fellow-countrymen.

The food of the Russian peasant is at all events very cheap. Meat, of course, he seldom eats. In spring, black bread and an onion; in summer, black bread and arboose (water melon); in winter, black bread and cabbage soup, with a dry fish now and again as a *bonne bouche*, suffice for his simple wants. Frugal, now and then hard-working, always cheerful, though rather apathetic, he might do well enough, but for *vodka* and "prasnicks" (holy days). For three copecks (about a penny) the peasant can get nearly half an English tumbler of the abominable neat rye spirit in which he delights. Speaking of what he has seen in the Crimea and Caucasus, our author says that the peasant women are fond of *vodka;* too often are they to be found on their backs dead drunk in the street. At Tiflis he writes that shame on account of drunkenness does not appear to be understood.

This book, we should add, is printed in large clear type.

Light from the Cross. Sermons by the Rev. F. J. Scott. Pp. 280. Hatchards. W. North: Tewkesbury. 1882.

We gladly quote the Preface of this volume; it speaks for itself and for the Sermons which it introduces.

These Sermons are published at the request of many members of an attached congregation, and other friends, to whom the Author ministered for thirty-one years.

The Rev. Francis John Scott, M.A., was the grandson of the late John Scott, R.N., who held the office of Public Secretary to the Admiralty with the Fleet at the time of the French war, and was killed by the side of Lord Nelson (whose death took place an hour afterwards), on board the *Victory*, at the battle of Trafalgar. Born in London, 1820, at the early age of sixteen he received an appointment in a Government office in recognition of his grandfather's services. After filling this post for nine years he decided to devote himself to the work of the Ministry, and graduated in honours at Trinity College, Dublin.

On the last Sunday in Advent, 1848, he was ordained to the curacy of Holy Trinity Church, Tewkesbury, by the Right Rev. Henry Monk, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. He succeeded to the incumbency of that church, on the preferment of the Rev. E. W. Foley to the Vicarage of All Saints, Derby, July 27, 1849.

Mr. Scott was always identified with the Evangelical section of the Church of England, and for many years acted as Honorary District Secretary for the C.M.S. in the neighbourhood. He also warmly supported the Church Pastoral Aid, the Colonial and Continental, the Jews', and the Bible Societies. His

love for the younger members of his flock caused him to take the deepest interest in the well-being and growth of his Sunday and week-day schools, and in both his efforts were attended with unusual success. Though frequently offered other preferment, Mr. Scott was so attached to the congregation to whom he had long ministered that he declined it, devoting all his powers to a post rendered somewhat difficult by the inconvenience of its ecclesiastical arrangements. In every way it was the earnest labour of a suffering life to lead the people he deeply loved to the cross of Christ, having from the very beginning of his ministry "determined to know nothing among men save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," and to live by faith in Him.

This volume, it is hoped, may, by the help of God's Holy Spirit, speak to some who lovingly remember him.

The Hope of Glory, and the Future of our Universities. Two Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in Ascension-tide, 1882, by CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. Rivingtons.

These sermons are just what might be expected. The second contains some impressive paragraphs touching the prospects of Oxford and Cambridge; and we cannot refrain from quoting the pith of the honoured bishop's advice. Dr. Christopher Wordsworth is not of the mind of St. Jerome; *Quid salvum est, si Roma perit? in unâ urbe totus Orbis interiit:* he says,—"The support of venerable laws, the props of ancient precedents, are giving way beneath our feet. But when public protection sinks, private energies emerge."

No one can doubt that a new era has opened upon our colleges and universities. The new codes of their statutes, which have been lying on the tables of both Houses of Parliament during the present month, cannot fail to be fruitful in great results. Whether those results will be for good or evil depends, under God, mainly upon yourselves, and especially upon you, my younger brethren. They will be what you make them.

A breaking up of ancient principles, and an abandonment of time-honoured practices, is imminent—it is inevitable. Our forefathers did not look on the universities as mere secular emporiums, in which knowledge was to be bought and sold for temporal profit, or material advantage, or for earthly enjoyment and personal aggrandizement. No; they regarded them as holy temples, in which science and literature were consecrated to God, and were inspired with hopes full of immortality, and in which men ministered to Him with holy worship, wherein they looked upward to Him for the outpouring of His grace, in prayers, scriptures, and sacraments, and in which they looked forward to the advancement of His glory and the eternal welfare of mankind as the aims and ends of their existence, and from which successive generations went forth to serve God in the Church and realm of England, and to bring blessing and honour upon both.

The watchwords of our two universities—"*Dominus Illuminatio mea*," "*Hinc lucem et pocula sacra*"—are witnesses of this consecration.

But such sentiments as these seem to have found little favour with some who have undertaken the difficult task of reforming these venerable institutions. The results of their work will soon appear. Let us pray God that the Church and nation may not have cause to rue it, but be benefited by it.

But the question is, What is to be done by ourselves under such circumstances as these? One thing certainly ought not to be done. And what is that? Let us not despair.

Heralds of the Cross; or, the Fulfilling of the Command. Chapters on Missionary Work. By F. E. ARNOLD-FORSTER. Pp. 540. Hatchards. 1882.

These chapters on Foreign Missions cannot claim to contain much that is original; and thus they may fall under the same condemnation as those "manufactured" books of which Washington Irving, describing a visit to the reading-room of the British Museum, has written. Nevertheless, these chapters are very readable, full of information, and in

fervent suggestiveness all that could be wished; in short, they are admirably adapted for the purpose in view. "Heralds of the Cross" is intended for children, boys and girls from ten to fourteen years of age, or for reading aloud at village working meetings. The style, therefore, is simple, while hard words have been avoided; nothing is taken for granted but an ordinary elementary-school knowledge of geography; and the descriptions are not overloaded with qualifications and uninteresting detail. The Chinese proverb says, "A small boat must not have a heavy cargo;" and a book on missions for youthful or uneducated readers must be clear and attractive. Details, indeed, there must be, inasmuch as a "story" cannot be told without them: and a Defoe fashion has always charms for children. The book before us will also, as has been said, serve for mothers' meetings, and parochial gatherings of several kinds. Readers or listeners who are imperfectly educated like missionary books of the children's story sort. The present writer was asked by a working man to lend him Mrs. Morton's children's books, "The Story of Jesus," and "Stories from Genesis;" he wanted to read them, he said, to his wife, or his son could read them at the fireside gathering. Many speakers at parochial missionary meetings, we are persuaded, shoot above their listeners' heads; if more pictorial, more descriptive, they would not fail to win attention, and leave good impressions. Descriptions of missionary labour, which include descriptions of the manners and customs, social life, &c., of the native races, are always acceptable to a working-class audience. The story of "Heralds of the Cross," if well told, has an unfailing charm and power.

Of the missions specially mentioned in this work twelve belong to the Church of England (mainly C.M.S.); but a place has been given to Nonconformist Missions, after the plan of Miss Yonge's "Pioneers and Founders." The Hang-chow Mission, Miss Whately's in Cairo, Mr. Wilson's on Lake Superior, will gain from many readers a warm verdict of approval. The chapter, Fifty Years of Missionary Work, gives a pleasing summary of Dr. Moffat's remarkable career; and The Buried Seed brings out well the truth which Allan Gardiner, being dead yet teacheth, that "*failure*" often means suspended success.

We must add that this volume is admirably printed in large type. That it may be worthily circulated and, under God, do right telling service, we heartily desire.

The Theological and Philosophical Works of Hermes Trismegistus, Christian Neoplatonist. Translated from the original Greek, with Preface, Notes and Indices, by J. D. CHAMBERS, M.A., F.S.A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

In this volume there are three divisions: Part I. *Poemandres;* Part II. Excerpts from Hermes by Stobæus; Part III. Notices of Hermes in the Fathers. The "Hermaica" are little known in England; but the *Poemandres*, the principal work of Hermes, was translated into Latin and published at Treviso in 1471. Of this work G. Parthey published at Berlin in 1854 an entirely new edition, from a MS. in the National Library at Paris. A complete translation of all the works attributed to Hermes was published in Paris by Dr. Louis Ménard, in 1866. Few readers of *Il Penseroso* probably understand the line of Milton:—

> Where I may oft outwatch the Bear
> With thrice great Hermes,—

"Thrice great," as he was Philosopher, Priest, and King. The original Hermes, worshipped as a god by the Egyptians, was confounded by the majority of the Fathers with the Christian writer. Mr. Chambers, following Casaubon, Ménard, and others, reckons it certain that, whatever

may be said as to the legendary Hermes, the author of *Poemandres* was a Christian living in Alexandria subsequently to Philo-Judæus and Josephus. Mr. Chambers has given in the notes illustrative extracts from Plato and other writers. To the doctrines of these ancient and curious writings we may return.

Evening Communion. A Sermon by RICHARD THURSFIELD, M.A., Rector of St. Michael's-in-Bedwardine. Church of England Book Society, 11, Adam Street, Strand, W.C.

A thoughtful, timely discourse. One quotation from the Bishop of Worcester's Charge runs thus:—"Nor should we hesitate, I think, to "administer the Holy Communion in the evening when occasion "seems to require it, as in large towns, the occupations of family life "leaving no other time so free for the enjoyment of quiet in devotion. "Many who have tried the practice of Evening Communions have often "assured me that the effect of them is highly beneficial, and that the "loss of them would be felt, especially by the poor, as a great and irre-"parable evil."

Changes and Chances. A Tale. By Mrs. CAREY BROCK, Author of "Sunday Echoes in Week-day Hours," "Working and Waiting," &c. Seeley, Jackson & Halliday.

Mrs. Carey Brock's writings are so well known and so greatly valued that but few words are necessary in recommending a book written by her which may be said to be worthy of its companions. Her instructive series, "Sunday Echoes in Week-day Hours," has been a very great success; and such Tales as "Children at Home," and "Margaret's Secret," are favourites with many who justly dislike much of the popular fiction of the day. The book before us shows no falling off whatever. It is specially suitable for girls; it describes the chances and changes which befell Hope, the heroine, in early womanhood until her happy marriage.

The Imperial Dictionary of the English Language. A Complete Encyclopædic Lexicon, Literary, Scientific, and Technological. By JOHN OGILVIE, LL.D. New Edition, edited by C. ANNANDALE, M.A. Vol. III. Blackie & Son, 49, Old Bailey, E.C.

The two preceding volumes of this noble work, as we received them, we recommended with hearty praise. The volume now before us, so far as we have examined, is in every way worthy of its predecessors. Throughout, the work is thoroughly well done, and reflects great credit on all concerned. As a rule, the definitions whether on scientific, theological, literary, or other subjects, are admirable, and the quotations are apposite and choice.

Christianity and Modern Scepticism. By the Rev. A. G. GIRDLESTONE, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Clapham Park, Author of "The High Alps without Guides." Pp. 210. Hodder & Stoughton. 1882.

This is a thoughtful and ably written work, likely to do good service, The opening chapters are Defects in our Methods of Presenting Truth, and Defective Principles in Ascertaining and Teaching Religious Truth. Then follow:—Revelation Appeals to the Reasoning Faculties, and The Moral Character of Scepticism. Mr. Girdlestone shows good judgment as well as literary power.

Alms and Oblations. A Criticism. By F. T. SIMMONS, M.A., Canon of York, Rector of Dalton Holme. Elliot Stock.

This "Criticism" is a reprint from the June CHURCHMAN. Many of

our readers who, like ourselves, were thoroughly satisfied with the essay by the Dean of Chester (reprinted by Mr. Stock) were glad, no doubt, to see what could be advanced on the "other side" by a learned and judicious scholar such as Canon Simmons. A reply by the Dean will appear in the CHURCHMAN before the close of the year.

The Latin Prayer Book of Charles II.; or, an Account of the Liturgia of Dean Durel. By CHARLES MARSHALL, M.A., and W. W. MARSHALL, B.A. Oxford: James Thornton. 1882.

This is a really interesting book and we hope to notice it, at leisure, as it deserves.

Cora; or, Three Years of a Girl's Life. The Girls' Own Paper. Office, 56, Paternoster Row.

This is an attractive gift-book; an interesting, cleverly-written story, well printed, with a tasteful cover.

Those of our readers who are interested in the subject of work by Deaconesses may be glad to hear of two excellent publications: *A Sermon upon Deaconesses,* by the Dean of CANTERBURY (Maidstone: Vivish, 28, King Street), and an essay, *Deaconesses in the Church of England* (Griffith & Farran), recommended by the Archbishop of Canterbury, revised by the Dean of CHESTER. The valuable essay is dedicated to Dean Howson, "the foremost advocate of the deaconess cause in our country," whose paper on the subject in the *Quarterly Review* (1860) was reprinted. In his interesting sermon the Dean of Canterbury says:—

How slow has been the progress of this work, and how little the encouragement given to it. Not that women are less ready to give themselves to Christ's work now than they were at first. There are few works of charity which are not zealously carried on by English women. But their work is usually done in an unsystematic way, and its continuance depends upon individual energy. In most cases the clergyman's wife and daughters do the work of deaconesses with womanly devotion. Nor could I wish to see this altered, or defraud them of one iota of their just meed of praise. But it was found in the early Church that there were numerous widows and unmarried women—for such alone were admitted into the order of deaconesses—willing to devote themselves to Christ's work, and able to serve Him usefully. And soon every parish had its deaconess as a matter of course, and the powerful city churches had each of them several of these holy women, and it was by their aid and the aid of laymen that the Church of Christ grew strong and prevailed over heathenism, and ignorance, and sin.

I trust that this institution [the Deaconess-Home at Maidstone] will grow and flourish, and become the fruitful mother of many a similar home. It still needs help and your fostering care and liberality, and it deserves it. For it is formed on no mediæval model, but upon the rules of primitive times. It lays no snares for weak consciences by exacting vows. It ministers to no personal vanity, and recommends no asceticism. But it labours for Christ, earnestly, simply, with self-denial, and devotion of heart.

In the *Quarterly* (Murray) appear ably-written articles on "The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I.," "Natural Scenery," "Italian Literature of the Renaissance," on "The State and Prospects of Agriculture." On "Medieval Hymns" we shall touch hereafter: the *Quarterly Review* justly remarks that in the translations of Dr. Mason Neale, "there is a vein of disengenousness." Of the article headed "The Paralysis of Government," we may quote a specimen passage. The *Quarterly* says:—

We admit that Mr. Gladstone is sincere. No doubt he was so in 1881, when he assured the nation that his Land Act was "another great and redeeming

measure," necessary for "the strength and solidity of the United Kingdom." He was so in February last, when he declared that the same Act—then seen by all men to be a hopeless and calamitous failure—was "an infant Hercules, that could struggle with the serpent that endeavoured to grapple with its life, and extinguish it." What hope can there be of any change for the better in our affairs while dreams and visions take the place of realities and facts? We may all easily understand why Englishmen of a former generation trusted in Pitt, or why Germans of the present day trust in Bismarck, for both these men, whatever may be said of their faults, added power, renown, and greatness to their country. Mr. Gladstone has given the nation no such excuse for trusting in him. The long course of Irish legislation, which he began in 1868, and is continuing in 1882, has served only to increase enormously the dangers and difficulties which previously existed. And as it has been in the past, so it will be in the future. There is no new mine of wisdom to be discovered in Mr. Gladstone. What he can do for us we already know. The extent of his resources has been sounded. We must assume that he has given the nation the benefit of his best services and his highest talents, and we see the results before us to-day—law and order trampled under foot, class enmities envenomed, the rights of property overturned, a country entering within the very shadow of civil war, and a vast empire threatened with disruption.

An esteemed correspondent desires that attention should be called in the CHURCHMAN to the *Revised English Bible* (Eyre & Spottiswoode), published some four or five years ago. It is a valuable volume; we ourselves have made good use of it, and can thoroughly recommend it. With the R.V. or without it, this revision of the New Testament will prove no small help to Biblical students; the revision of the Old Testament also is exceedingly good. Beautifully printed and "got up," this volume is a choice and precious gift for any who desire to increase their reverent understanding and intelligent appreciation of the sacred oracles.

We can cordially commend a sermon by the Rev. F. A. C. LILLINGSTON, M.A., *The Ascended Christ*, preached in aid of the Thames Church Mission (E. Stock) and *The Forgiveness of Sins*, a pamphlet by the Rev. T. S. TREANOR, M.A., expounding John xx. 23. (Hatchards.)

Archdeacon HANNAH'S writings are always well worth reading. His Charge now before us contains much that is interesting. *Addresses*, May, 1882 (Brighton: Treacher.)

The *Church Quarterly Review* (Spottiswoode) is a very good number; but we must return to it.

After Twenty Years (R.T.S.) is a capital little story of patient hope; a very cheap and interesting gift-book.

THE MONTH.

DISCUSSION IN THE CENTRAL COUNCIL ON A LAY DIACONATE.

ON the 7th was held a very successful meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences. As our readers are aware, the CHURCHMAN from the first has watched the progress of this movement with lively interest. The Canterbury Diocesan Conference, we note with pleasure, resolved to send representatives to the Council, which has now secured the co-operation

of twenty dioceses. Between seventy and eighty delegates were present on the 7th. An interesting report was read by Archdeacon Emery, touching the constitution of the Council and its prospects. The Dean of Bangor made an effective speech in moving the following resolution :—

That this Council is of opinion that the time is come for giving practical effect to the views, repeatedly expressed in Diocesan Conferences and other assemblies of Churchmen, in favour of the more systematic employment of the spiritual gifts and energies of laymen in Church work.

Dean Edwards proceeded to say :—

As long as the population increases, there must be an extension of the Church's agencies. How do matters now stand? When the parochial system was first formed the people of England and Wales were probably less than two millions. They are to-day probably more than twenty-five millions. The population of the whole country is increasing at the rate of 264,000, and that of London alone at the rate of sixty thousand a year. Thus, as has been said by some one, in every twenty-five years a new nation equal to Belgium comes into existence in this island. To minister to twenty-five millions the Church has probably less than twenty thousand clergy in full service—that is, if all were evenly distributed, less than one clergyman to every 1,250 souls. But, in fact, there are many districts that have hardly one clergyman for twelve thousand souls. The Church of England has about thirteen thousand parishes. Of these about ten thousand are rural, having a population of seven or eight millions. About three thousand are urban, having a population of seventeen or eighteen millions. The wealth of endowments and the number of clergy is greatest where the population is least and the work lightest. Many of the great town parishes, with their huge populations, have neither the means nor the men that are needed. What is the result? That alienation of the working classes from divine worship revealed in those censuses that have recently caused so uneasy a feeling. In Rome the un-Christian masses were called pagans. In England they may, perhaps, ere long be called urbans. But the towns continually influence the country. From the towns the cheap newspapers and cheap literature go forth. The country sends its aspiring youth to crowd the towns, and the towns send out their ideas to poison or to purify life in village and hamlet, in farmhouse and cottage. These labouring masses in town and country are destined to shape the future of this empire. The day of the democracy has dawned. The reign of a democracy, unguided by the light and unsobered by the self-restraint of religion, will be destructive of much that makes Britain proud of her past. Therefore, the Christianization of the masses is a work that appeals to us not only as Churchmen, but as patriots.

Dîs te minorem quod geris, imperas,
Hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum.

With the increase of population and the extension of political power there has also been a growth of material wealth and a diffusion of

knowledge. Wages are higher, and elementary schools are more. These two conditions, if wisely met, will be in favour of the Church's work. She will more easily find teachers to deliver and disciples to receive her teaching among a people of softened manners, blessed with physical comfort and intelligence, than among masses blinded by ignorance and made savage by the daily struggle for mere animal existence. The towns, as intimated, are the strongholds that command the country. To win and occupy those strongholds is a necessity of the Church's warfare. But how are her forces directed? Her strongest men often face the feeblest foes. Her weakest men are often sent to force the strongest positions. Many of the richest livings are in the country. Some of the ablest men in early life, when anxious to marry, are tempted into their inglorious ease. Thus, many of the Church's most stalwart soldiers go not where her battle is hottest, but where her commissariat is fullest. Again, the Church is powerless in the presence of new demands. In mining and manufacturing districts new masses of population are rapidly formed. . . . . To hold her present ground, to occupy new positions, and to beat back the inroads of heathenism, the Church wants more men. That cry is heard in all the diocesan conferences. But to multiply clergy without multiplying benefices is a course full of danger. . . . . The Church wants a strong and learned clergy, no less than a popular ministry. The mysteries and the parables, the profound learning and the popular preaching, are alike necessary to her life. Therefore, the cathedral stalls and the rich country livings, which, when rightly given, are to be the prizes and the resting places of learning, ought not to be made fewer. But in some way or other the popular ministry of the Church must be made stronger. To reunite the religious forces of this land around the Bishop's throne as the fountain of orders and the centre of unity in every diocese; to compass and support that throne with the Church's intellectual aristocracy, the lords of her spiritual learning; and to broaden its base by the democratic power of a popular ministry that can reach and sway the masses—that is the triple problem for the statesmen of the Church to solve. The laity seem to have realized the danger of unduly multiplying a badly paid assistant clergy. The two societies for maintaining additional curates have done and are doing an invaluable work, worthy of all support. But they complain of inadequate revenues. Why are larger funds not forthcoming? The laity are liberal when they believe with all their heart in a cause. Have they in this case instinctively arrived at the conclusion that, to increase the number of badly paid and discontented curates is not the best way of extending the Church's spiritual influence? What, then, is the cause of the Church's present deficiency of popular power? It will, I believe, be found in the neglect of her own Divine constitution. In the Preface to her Ordinal she tells all men in words that there have always been three orders in her ministry. But in fact she has to-day only two orders, or, at the most, two and a fraction. A diaconate, which is only an embryonic stage of the priesthood, is all but an unreality. What follows? The spiritual and social forces which would find their natural play in a real diaconate are lost to the Church, and sometimes assumes strange forms on the outside of her system. What a multitude of earnest, devout, naturally gifted men

has the Church lost because she would give them no part in her ministry. The local preachers and class-leaders of Wesleyanism would once have gladly served under her banner as volunteers, self-supported deacons, if only she would have given them her permission.

Mr. T. Collins, M.P., said he thought the motion hardly went far enough. He moved the following amendment:—

That it is advisable to repeal the civil disabilities imposed upon deacons by statute or common law in pursuing their secular calling, and to supplement the labours of the clergy by voluntary lay-help under the licence of the bishop of the diocese.

Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P., earnestly deprecated anything that would raise an impression that the Council was going ahead with startling rapidity; and he therefore moved the previous question. Canon Money was thankful to hear the speech of the Dean of Bangor, and to feel that Churchmen were at last awakening to a sense of their responsibilities; but he thought they should try what they could do with the law as it stood. If changes in the law were really necessary, the matter should be undertaken with far greater deliberation. Mr. Bushell expressed a similar opinion, and insisted upon the importance of good reading. He would have the churches opened on one or two evenings a week in order that laymen might give Bible readings. Mr. Gedge urged the importance of reviving a real diaconate. He said:—

St. Paul rejoiced to preach the Gospel free, and to minister to his necessities by the labours of his own hands; whereas our clergy only rejoiced that they were maintained by the Church. It appeared to him that the present state of the law, whereby a man could not be ordained unless somebody would undertake to pay him, was an absurdity, and that it went a great deal nearer the sin of simony than many things that were simoniacal in the eyes of the law.

Mr. Cropper, M.P., said:—

The experience which the House of Commons had had of one or two members who were deacons, and of half a dozen who were Dissenting ministers, would not induce it to take any very active steps for removing disabilities in that direction—but as regarded the other disabilities which had been referred to, it would, no doubt, be important to abolish them. He thought it would be very dangerous to the Church if she stood aloof from the Salvation Army movement. We had often wondered why our forefathers had not embraced the opportunity which was offered by the Wesleyan movement; and he hoped we should give those who came after us no reason for repeating the remark concerning ourselves. The Salvation Army had proved itself a great power for temperance, and he believed that, if rightly directed, it might also become a great power for religion.

Archdeacon Emery suggested the following resolution:—

That this council, being deeply impressed with the sense of the need of an extension of the diaconate, earnestly requests the diocesan

conferences to take into their consideration the best means of carrying such extension into effect, and of supplementing the labours of the clergy by voluntary lay-helpers, under the licence of the bishop of the diocese.

This was seconded by Mr. Hope, and unanimously agreed to.

An extension of the diaconate has been pleaded for in THE CHURCHMAN on several occasions during the last two years. The paper in our last number calling attention to the report of the York Convocation Committee, as we are glad to know, has excited much interest. Such a speech as that of the Dean of Bangor, supported by such representative men as Mr. Sydney Gedge and Canon Money, cannot fail to strengthen the forces of a most important movement.

At the Central Council was also discussed the "Bishop of London's Rubrics Bill," 1874. The Dean of Lichfield moved the following resolution :—

That the draft Bill which was approved by the Convocations both of Canterbury and York in July and August, 1879, be recommended for consideration by the diocesan conferences as based upon sound constitutional principles, and likely to prove of great service to the Church.

Mr. Beresford Hope moved to omit all the words after "conferences."[1] Mr. Gedge supported the resolution, observing that he should move, further, that the Bill should be postponed till the Convocations are reformed. On a division the numbers were equal; and the Chairman gave his casting vote against Mr. Hope's proposal to omit the words. The Dean's motion, therefore, was carried. Mr. Gedge's rider found few supporters ; but Mr. Collins's words, "till *the Lower House of Canterbury* has been reformed . . . ." gained sixteen votes. For ourselves, although we rather agree with the limitation proposed by Mr. Collins, inasmuch as the Lower House of Canterbury—to quote Canon Trevor—is "pretentious and distorted," we must see a real Convocational reform before we can support such a motion as Dean Bickersteth's.

There have been several pronouncements against the Salvation Army. The venerable Earl of Shaftesbury, who has a unique right to criticize evangelistic movements, has spoken strongly.

At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference Canon Hoare spoke some weighty words. The veteran Dr. Close, whose pen seems to have lost none of its power, has written to the *Record* :—

If any one doubts these heavy charges let him read the admirable paper of Mr. Kitto in the CHURCHMAN of this month. It ought to be republished immediately as a pamphlet and widely circulated; it is full of information, its tone is solemn Christian charity, and its ex-

[1] See CHURCHMAN, vol. iii. p. 135.

posure of the entire system (after the personal experience of one who is perhaps as well acquainted with the working classes as any man in England) is complete and convincing.

The Duke of Argyll's Bill for allowing Members of Parliament to make an affirmation of allegiance in lieu of an oath was rejected in the House of Lords (138 to 62).

In the course of the twenty-three hours' continuous sitting, which began at 9 P.M. on Friday and lasted till 8 on Saturday evening, the Home Rule members met with determined and successful opposition. First sixteen, and afterwards nine more of the principal offenders, were suspended for the remainder of the sitting. Rapid progress was then made in the Prevention of Crime Bill,[1] which on Tuesday was declared *urgent*. The Bill passed quickly through the House of Lords, and received the Royal Assent on the 12th.

The reports of several lay and clerical gatherings have appeared in the *Record*. At Folkestone, a very successful annual meeting of the South-east Lay and Clerical Church Alliance on the Principles of the Reformation was held, the Dean of Canterbury, the President, in the chair. Papers were read by the Rev. F. Gell, Prebendary Wace, Dr. Flavel Cook and the Rev. J. F. Kitto. An interesting speech on the South-eastern College, at Ramsgate, was made by the Rev. E. C. d'Auquier. At Blackheath, Mr. N. Bridges presiding, in the absence of Lord Midleton, a vigorous paper was read by the Rev. J. W. Marshall.[2]

---

[1] On the question whether the power to search houses under the Crime Bill should be limited to the daytime or not, the Government was defeated by a majority of 13. Mr. Gladstone had held out a threat that he might resign; but having at leisure reconsidered his position, he accepted the defeat.

[2] In considering "the Duty of Evangelicals with regard to Diocesan Organization," Mr. Marshall said:—"Diocesan organization is a fact. How are Evangelical Churchmen to deal with it? I must begin by calling attention to the policy which has been pursued by the Evangelical party for the twenty-five years during which diocesan organization has been gradually attaining its vigour and administrative efficiency. That policy has been a policy of abstention."—Referring first to Ruri-decanal Chapters, and then to Conferences, the esteemed speaker said:—"It must, I think, be a matter of wonder to most people that the Evangelical party, one of whose most important principles is that the laity are an integral part of the Church, should have held aloof from places which restored to laymen, to some extent at least, their inherent right, as I conceive it to be, to a voice in all matters affecting the Church of which they are members; but with a fatal inconsistency, which I am unable to explain, the majority of the Evangelical clergy looked very coldly upon these Ruri-decanal Conferences, and took no pains to interest their people in them or to induce the most able of their laymen to become parochial representatives." Mr. Marshall proceeded to refer to Diocesan Conferences and also to the Central Council. Opinions will differ whether Mr. Marshall was accurate in speaking of *the general policy* of abstention . . . . as regards Evangelical Churchmen and Diocesan meetings. But there

At Brighton the pressing subject of Middle-class Schools was introduced by the Rev. W. Walsh.

At York, the Dean of Ripon made some valuable remarks on the Lay Diaconate, a subject on which the Dean (with Canon Jackson) is known to take a keen interest. The Very Rev. Dr. Fremantle said:—

He felt thankful that the subject of the extension of the diaconate was fairly ventilated, and had found its way into the House of Convocation, as well as into the minds of the bishops; and he thought it was no breach of confidence if he said that several of their bishops, some of those who were highest in dignity, quite felt with those who advocated the extension of the diaconate. They ought to draw a very clear distinction between the expression, the extension of the diaconate, and the appointment of a sub-diaconate. If they were to follow upon ecclesiastical lines the appointment of a sub-diaconate would not meet the exigencies of the case. A sub-deacon was never allowed to minister in the way in which a deacon ministered in the Church, and it would in point of fact be the institution of a new order altogether, and he did not think there was Scriptural authority for it. The necessity had arisen that the Church did not meet the requirements of the day, and the Dissenters did not meet the requirements of the day. There was a vast number of people growing up in heathenism around them, for whom there was not sufficient religious organization to meet their wants. That statement had given offence to their Nonconformist brethren, but it was no cause of offence that they should state a simple fact.

One result of the Egyptian crisis has been the weakening of the Ministry by the retirement of Mr. Bright. The right hon. gentleman "could not concur" with his colleagues in regard to Egypt. Alexandria lies in ruins. Its forts were destroyed in a bombardment of a few hours. The Khedive is protected in the city by Marines, while Arabi Pasha, at the head of an army, maintains his lawless rule over the country.

By the death of General Scobeleff the Panslavist cause has sustained a serious loss.

The Rev. J. C. Robertson, author of "History of the Christian Church," Canon of Canterbury; and the Rev. William Harrison, Rector of Birch, Hon. Canon of St. Albans, have entered into rest.

Dr. Reichel, one of the most distinguished theologians of the Church of Ireland, has been promoted from the Archdeaconry of Meath to the Deanery of Clonmacnois.

The Rev. R. W. Enraght and the Rev. J. De la Bere have been again rebuffed in the Courts.

---

has been great apathy. Rash and unsympathetic leading articles, no doubt, did much mischief. Mr. Marshall's paper, we hope, will be published.