---

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

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

THE

# CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1882.

## ART. I.—THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

THE Ecclesiastical Commission has been well described as "the largest, the most wealthy, the most widely-operating and the most dignified Corporation under the Crown." It has long since attained its majority. Of its scope, its administrative powers, its resources, and of the funds at its disposal, the public in general entertains that vague sort of idea which invests the unknown with gigantic proportions. And yet in reality there is no similar institution, the whole truth relating to which is so entirely accessible to any one who cares to inquire into it. Periodical Blue-books, the Reports of Commissions, continual discussions in Parliament, have left no secrets to be revealed, and have afforded ample statistics to be tabulated and arranged by any one who will take the trouble to do so.

We propose to give in outline some of the leading facts, obtainable from the ordinary sources of information, which may serve as a basis to the inquiry of how far the Ecclesiastical Commission has, or has not, answered the ends for which it was originally instituted. The fifty-two great personages to whom was entrusted the working of the Act of 1843, had the control of far smaller revenues and were saddled with much less responsibility than their successors of the present day. The majority of them were members of the episcopal Bench. Five Ministers of State, including the late Lord Palmerston, figured on the roll; other prominent statesmen were added; but the judicial Bench would appear to have been represented only by Sir Stephen Lushington, the great civilian. By the terms of the Act the Commission was to be started by a loan of £600,000 from the funds of Queen Anne's Bounty, and full powers of sale were given over certain lands (formerly the property of the Church) now to be vested in the new Commission. We may observe *en passant* that the loan has long since (in 1868)

been repaid, as a large sum of money in the Three-per-Cents would seem now to be standing to the credit of the Commission. It was not until seven years later, in 1850, that the Commission was entrusted with the duty of taking over the estates which then belonged to the Bishops and Deans and Chapters. More than 500,000 acres were thus thrown into their hands. Indeed, the Sees of Llandaff and Bangor would seem to be the only old foundations the occupants of which have not thus surrendered their estates. On the other hand, nine Bishops would appear to have handed them back, after being re-arranged, to the Commissioners. There is reason, however, to believe that in more than one instance "agricultural depression" has worked a change of views in this respect, and that those who, when land was rising, did not object to find themselves land-owners, are now more enamoured of the "beautiful simplicity" of the Three-per-Cents. The idea of course was, that those who were only life-tenants with successors and not sons to inherit after them, would not have much inducement to effect extensive improvements, which could be better carried out by a body possessing larger powers of management and more ample funds under their control. So matters stood at the time when the Committee of 1863 inquired into the working of the Commission which it was then fondly supposed would complete the bulk of its labours about the year 1870.

The figures given in evidence before this Committee were certainly sufficiently startling. The Commissioners were in receipt in round numbers of a rental of £880,000 per annum. Of this magnificent income about £300,000 would have appeared to have been received from agricultural holdings; tithes figured for £270,000, houses for £150,000; while manorial and mining rights swelled up the total. About 250,000 acres were at the time under the direct control of Lord Chichester, the then chairman of the Commission. The two leading conclusions at which the Committee would seem to have arrived were, first, that it was undesirable that estates should remain "permanently" invested in the hands of the central body; and secondly, that management of estates by such a body was necessarily expensive. Upon this point Mr. Arnold, in his recent attack upon the Commission, dwelt very forcibly. He talked of "respectable extravagance" as evinced by the charges of solicitors and land-surveyors—which he estimated as amounting in all to £170,000, equivalent to a charge of about 20 per cent. for agency alone. It is fair, however, to say that upon this part of the case Sir John Mowbray's reply was tolerably conclusive. No less than 416,000 odd acres have been enfranchised by the Commission, and are now in the hands of lay-owners. The land now held directly under

the Commission is not 250,000, but 190,000 acres. The expenditure upon buildings was £52,000 in 1880 and £47,000 in 1881, out of a total of no less than £1,032,000 expended under that head by the Commission since its establishment. Within the same period £243,000 has been laid out in drainage. It is obvious that the management of estates upon such a scale must be a costly matter; but the Commissioners would seem not to have lost sight of the fact that under the circumstances a very moderate per-centage would suffice to meet the requirements of the case. The scale of surveyors' charges orginally settled in 1851 was revised and reduced successively in 1857, in 1864, in 1873, and in 1881. Mr. E. J. Smith, for many years the able manager of that important portion of the estates of the Commission which were situated in the North of England, so raised them in value that the sum total of his charges did not amount to more than one year's increased income, which was realized by the change of system which he inaugurated. In answer to the report relating to the Commission of 1863 a statement containing full details was laid before Parliament in the course of the following year.

It appears that more than one hundred separate Acts of Parliament have been passed since the constitution of the Commission, increasing and extending the original powers confided to the Commission. Successive Ministries have thus seen their way to show marks of increasing confidence within the last eighteen years. The object of the Commission was, as we are all aware, to augment, by judicious management, the existing revenues of the Church, and so to apportion them as to meet, to the utmost extent of their capacity, cases of special spiritual destitution. How far this has, or has not, been accomplished, our readers can judge for themselves, after a perusal of the subjoined statistics, extracted mostly from the statement of Sir John Mowbray.

The work of the Ecclesiastical Commission, since its commencement, has been as follows:—

In the first place, out of the 15,000 benefices, throughout England and Wales, 4,700 of the poorest class have already been augmented.

In the second place, within the last forty years, £23,000,000 in gross value has been added to the property of the Church.

In the third place, an annual income, now little short of £700,000, and likely to increase by some £20,000 a year for several years to come, has been secured to the Church from this source. Here we must remark upon the marvellous elasticity which this item has displayed since the report of the Royal Commission in 1836. That estimated the probable gain to the Church at the modest sum of £134,000. The Committee of 1863 ventured

to raise their expectations so high as £146,000. Mr. Spencer Walpole, then one of the Church Estates Commissioners, speaking at a later date, expressed a hope that nearly £300,000 would ultimately be added. The result has proved accordingly how far, in this instance, the estimates have fallen short of the reality.

In the fourth place, the scope of the Commission has been very largely widened. One of its main duties was to put an end, as speedily as possible, to the evil system of Church leases. Lands so held were almost invariably let on lives, sometimes renewable for ever. There was the strongest possible inducement to the life-tenant, especially as he advanced in age, to make a bad arrangement for the Church with his immediate lessee, in the fear that if he did not come to terms the life might not be renewed until after his own death. We know of one instance, in which the lessee of Church lands, having a bad opinion of the life of an episcopal landlord, positively refused to name fresh lives and pay the customary fine for so doing, until he was driven into a corner by the unexpected death of two out of the three lives named in the lease. We know of another, in which a Canon of some fifty years' standing, drew during all that time about half of what should have been his income, because an enormous fine had been exacted for a lease of tithes half a century before, by the then members of the Chapter. Take again such a case as the Vicarage of Rochdale, with its present income of £25,000 a year. Can it possibly be contended that its incidents could have been properly dealt with by an incumbent of the living?

Large sales have been made whenever an opportunity offered of lands vested in the Commission; and since 1881 the Estates Committee have discontinued the allowance of 5 per cent. previously made to agents for expenditure on farm buildings. In the case of copyholds also, special instructions have been given with respect to the stewards' fees, which constitute so unsatisfactory an item in manorial accounts. These have all been steps in the right direction, and prove that the Commission have not been unmindful of the suggestions made before various Committees, and especially before that of 1868, by Lord Grey and other competent authorities. We suspect that the extinguishment of leaseholds for lives, and the enfranchisement of copyhold tenures, have been the most important of all the multifarious duties which have been assigned to them. But although much has been accomplished, yet at the same time this part of the work of the Commission is not yet completed. But in addition to freehold and leasehold property, they find themselves the owners of tithe rent-charges, manorial rights, foreshore rights, mineral rights, including coal and lead

mines, fisheries, stone quarries, agricultural buildings, house property, and woodlands. In Durham alone, Mr. Pease, who ought to know, estimates that the Commission now possesses 40,000 acres, with an income of over £109,000 a year. Such are the dimensions of the property, and such have been the results achieved. That the decisions of the Commission have always been wise, and their management always economical, it would be too much to assert. There is the oft-quoted instance of Lord Palmerston, and some other Ministers, having been outvoted at the Board by an unusual gathering of Bishops mustered to support a particular scheme for the Deanery of York. Nor can it be contended that a large corporation can develop a valuable property with as much ease or at so small an expense as resident owners, who are looking after their own interests upon the spot. On the other hand, Mr. Arnold is quite right in his assertion that glebe lands, and indeed Church lands of any description, were probably worse managed than any other kind of property. The reason for this we have already indicated—namely, the want of adequate interest in the life-tenant. Nor must it be forgotten that an ecclesiastical owner has other and more important duties to perform than those of looking after landed property—duties which, as a rule, are not left undischarged by those who are bound to perform them. We very much doubt whether, under any other circumstances, or by any other proprietors, £120,000 would have been spent in buildings, and £70,000 in drainage, even on an estate of such magnitude as that owned by the Commissioners in the county of Durham. Mr. Gladstone only did justice, therefore, to the general aptitude of the Commissioners, when he expressed his opinion that, had Mr. Arnold's motion been assented to, they "would not have come badly out of the inquiry." It is to be remembered that Parliament desired, in its original constitution, to secure the services of persons of many duties and of large experience. On such a Board there must be numerous absentees at each meeting. The episcopal members, in particular, for the most part rarely attend, except upon special occasions. It is quite a moot point whether, in the distant future, ecclesiastical persons are likely to wish to own land in preference to receiving their incomes from some other source. Manchester, Truro, Liverpool, St. Albans, and we may now add Newcastle, the most recent accessions to the number of episcopal Sees, have no landed estates attached to them. Agricultural depression has induced many incumbents, with the sanction of their Diocesan, to sell their glebe lands to some neighbouring proprietor. Some of the Bishops, as we have seen, have voluntarily handed back their estates, preferring a certain income; and several Chapters would be only too glad to do so, if they could get the opportunity. We can quite

believe that, in some instances, payment by salaries would be preferable to payment by fees, and that a Commission, acting as it must upon general principles, has to make larger reductions in times of pressure than would be conceded by individual owners. Still, looking at the question as a whole, with the facts and figures before us, it is impossible to deny that a great work has been done, and well done, and that the Church has benefited largely, both by the accretion of its resources and by a more equitable distribution of them.

This, however, is only a part of the whole question. As Mr. Gladstone remarked, two points are raised by such a discussion as that initiated by Mr. Arnold. The first and narrower one is the question of administration, to which a very satisfactory reply has, upon the whole, in our opinion, been given. This deals with the past and present. The second point, which is more a question of the future, is, whether the tenure of land by great corporations is desirable in the interests of the nation at large. Mr. Gladstone expresses an opinion that such corporations have "not that independence on the face of them, which attaches to private owners." Mr. Goschen takes much the same view.

There can be no question that the pursuit of agriculture, especially under existing circumstances, is a very difficult business; it is one which not only requires a special knowledge of the subject, but in which success depends largely upon personal attention and constant supervision. Looked at from this point of view, land is unquestionably a less desirable property for corporations to hold than other investments; but we are inclined to think that it is also less desirable for the country that land should be held in large masses in mortmain. The most obvious result of such a system is the subtraction, from the districts in which it prevails, of the important residential element. We doubt whether this drawback can be really compensated by any system of management, however liberal and business-like. Of the many grave mistakes which have been made by the promoters of the Irish agrarian movement, none is more grave than the attempt to drive away from the country resident owners by rendering their position intolerable. It is quite a moot point whether the uniformly generous management of the great absentee estates makes up for the absence of personal influence and personal example. Yet this want is practically perpetuated by the permanent retention of large tracts of land in the hands of corporations. Mr. Goschen quotes the instance of the Greenwich Hospital Estates, as one in which their gradual dispersion has benefited both the charity and the country. Probably the time will come when a somewhat similar process may be applied with advantage to the

Estates now under the control of the Ecclesiastical Commission. The Commissioners themselves have not shut their eyes to such a possibility; where sales and enfranchisements could be judiciously effected, they have been so: a beginning has already been made, and progress in the same direction will not be difficult should Parliament and the country desire it.

In the meantime, however, it would be unfair in the extreme to underrate the great work which has been done by the Commission. Previously to its existence, Church property had been managed upon the worst, the most wasteful, and the least beneficial of systems. Those who owned Church lands rarely realized their full value; those who occupied them did so upon a tenure the incidents of which were uncertain, and the conditions of which often stood in the way of substantial improvements being effected. There was an utter absence upon the part of the owners of the time, the knowledge and the capital requisite for the proper development of their property. They were, from circumstances, very much in the hands of their tenants, who drove hard bargains with them, and treated the land very much as they pleased. These were evils which could only be remedied by a complete change of system. Nor could that change have been carried out except through the medium of a central body endowed with full powers, and treating the questions submitted to them upon certain definite principles. That the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have occasionally been somewhat hard upon those with whom they have had to deal, is, we suspect, the fact; but it must be remembered that such must sometimes be the case where great laxity of practice has prevailed for generations. The old slipshod method of managing Church lands doubtless recommended itself to many who had an interest in its indefinite prolongation. Any departure from it was sure to cause an outcry, loud in proportion to the loss entailed by its abandonment upon the particular complainant.

In the face of the figures presented to our readers, three facts stand out prominently. The first is, that an urgent need existed for a severe and sweeping change in the management of Church property. The second is, that such a change has not only been carried out by the Ecclesiastical Commission, but that its results have been profitable to the Church far beyond all the estimates which had been hazarded as to its probable results. The third is, that those under whose auspices this change has been carried out can point to the steady enlargement of their powers as an evidence that the confidence originally reposed in them has been steadily continued by the nation, and that successive inquiries have only tended to vindicate the general correctness of the principles laid down, and of the methods by which they have been pursued. That there are

administrative drawbacks inherent to the constitution of such a body, we have already pointed out. Great changes can rarely be carried out without great expense, even if their final economical results be satisfactory. A corporation can never fill the place in all respects of an individual owner. There is always a danger that subordinates will arrogate to themselves too much authority. But after all this has been said, the fact still remains that a great work for the Church has been done by the Ecclesiastical Commission, and that in doing that work they have deserved well, not of the Church alone, but of the country. Nor will this fact be altered, should it be found advisable as time goes on to direct their attention to the gradual dispersion of the property which has come, from various sources, into their hands. Should such a course be adopted, it will be from motives of public policy alone, and not from any desire to cast a censure upon a body who under circumstances of peculiar difficulty have loyally discharged the trust which was committed to them by the nation.

MIDLETON.

## ART. II.—VIVISECTION.

THESE pages are written in consequence of many requests that I should state my opinion on the much-disputed question of Vivisection, and its influence on man.

The task is not so simple as it appears to be. Nothing can be easier than uncompromising denunciation on the one side, or equally uncompromising advocacy on the other. It is easy for the one side to describe vivisectors and their advocates as fiends in human form; or for the other jauntily to sneer at their opponents as "humanitarians who would rather see thousands of human beings perish from preventible diseases than that a frog should suffer half an hour's pain, or a guinea-pig a day's inconvenience."

This sentence, by the way, is a marvel of ingenuity, as it compresses into the smallest possible compass the greatest possible number of fallacies, and "begs the question" no less than five times. I will revert to it presently.

Again, it is very easy to observe an attitude of neutrality, and to say that as doctors cannot agree upon the subject, an outsider has no right to form an opinion, and that the doctors must fight it out among themselves.

The difficulty is further increased by the evidence given before the Royal Commission of 1876, and printed in the "Blue-Book" of that year. It is about the most bewildering evidence

that ever puzzled a human brain to understand. I have read it repeatedly from beginning to end, and out of those who are really competent to give an opinion on the subject, can only find two classes of witnesses who have the courage to say boldly what they mean.

The first are the physiologists pure and simple.

They say openly that they are neither surgeons nor physicians, nor do they concern themselves in the least about the cure of human ailments, nor the amount of pain which they inflict upon the living objects of their experiments, and that they never use anæsthetics except for convenience. Their only object is the advance of physiological science, and they are absolutely indifferent as to the means which they employ.

As teachers of physiology, they furthermore say that they must repeat their operations (experiments no longer) whenever they give lectures to students, because it is necessary to let the students see for themselves, and not to take their teaching from mere hearsay.

Whatever may be our ideas as to this theory, its upholders are at least honest.

On the other side, we have those members of the medical or surgical professions who at one time believed that operations on living animals would enable them to be better surgeons and physicians, who have found that they were mistaken, and have had the courage to avow their mistake.

But between these two extremes all is vague, obscure and uncertain. Non-committal seems to have been the primary object of the witnesses, and their evidence, like the proverbial ferry-boat, only serves to go from one side to the other. Qualifications and fencing with the real question are the rule. A plain categorical answer to a definite question is scarcely to be found, and the real meaning of the speaker is so enveloped in a cloud of such terms as "if," "perhaps," "might," "not aware," and the like, that it cannot be definitely ascertained. On reading the bulk of the evidence, we are irresistibly reminded of Thackeray's Jeames Yellowplush, whose "Mar rapped his buth in a mistry," or of Dickens' Mr. Gregsbury, and his speech to the deputation that asked him to resign his seat in Parliament.

Some say that the average amount of pain caused by vivisection is no more than the pang of a pin-prick, and speak of these experiments as scratching a newt's toe or a tadpole's tail, pricking a mouse with the point of a needle, &c. &c. Others go as far as to admit that the experiments are "severe;" while others openly avow that they intentionally inflict the most exquisite agony that remorseless human ingenuity can produce, in order to see what effect it has upon the animal.

Some boldly assert that all vivisections are conducted while

the animal is insensible from the action of anæsthetics. Yet we read of "the twenty-third day of the experiment," an exceptionally severe one, and are asked to believe that a cat or dog can be kept for twenty days under the influence of chloroform.

Some admit that the screams and groans and struggles of vivisected animals are evidences of pain, while others coolly deny this obvious conclusion, and assert that the cries and struggles in question are nothing but "reflex action," such as may be seen in a severed limb when galvanized, or a paralyzed limb when irritated.

See what contemptible quibbles some of the promoters of these experiments are forced to employ.

When animals are placed in a close vessel and slowly baked to death, when they are put into cold water and boiled alive, when turpentine is poured over them and set on fire, they decline to recognize these experiments as vivisection, because, forsooth, the skin is not cut in either of the cases.

Then, they object to the word "baked" alive, because the vessel in which the animals were placed was not an oven, but a glass box. They object to the word "boiled," because the temperature of the water was below 212° Fahr. As in the one case the animals died of the hot air, and in the other of the hot water, they were to all intents and purposes, baked and boiled.

Another defence of the boiling was remarkable for its audacity, the ground being that the frequenters of the Turkish bath are subjected to a much higher temperature than that of the water, and suffer no harm.

So they do. I have repeatedly endured a heat of nearly 250° Fahr., suffered no pain at the time, and felt all the better for it afterwards.

But, in the so-called Turkish bath, the bather is surrounded with heated, but dry air, whereas the animals in question were immersed in heated water.

If a man, who was perfectly comfortable in the Turkish bath at a temperature of 250°, were to be immersed in water of 100° less temperature, he would be scalded to death. The man who could put forward such a defence as this must either be crassly ignorant or wilfully deceptive.

Then, there are controversies within controversies upon the point of anæsthetics. Some reckon curare (or wourali) among the number, while others say that it does not destroy the sense of pain, but that it has the effect of paralyzing the voluntary nerves so as to prevent movement, and destroys life by causing respiration to cease. If respiration can be kept up artificially, the poison will work itself out of the system, and the nerves will gradually regain their power.

Many years ago the late Charles Waterton tried the experiment of wounding an ass with curare-poisoned arrows. The

creature seemed to be dead, but by long-continued artificial respiration, she recovered, and lived to a good old age.

Whether she felt the process of artificial respiration, and retained consciousness while she had lost the power of motion, we cannot tell; but there is one celebrated case mentioned by Lionville and repeatedly quoted, in which a man who had received an overdose of curare, and was restored by artificial respiration, was perfectly conscious, and retained the senses of feeling and hearing. I do not know of other cases, and doubt whether a single instance ought to be accepted as of universal application.

Chloroform has a precisely similar effect on some persons, while in others it annihilates the sense of pain, as well as the power of voluntary movement, though consciousness remains intact. We might multiply such instances to any extent, but our limited space prevents us from doing so.

Now we will revert to the passage which was quoted at the beginning of this article. It was undoubtedly written in good faith, and many medical men with whom I have conversed on the subject, have expressed very similar opinions.

In the first place, it is assumed (No. 1) that all dissection of living animals is made for the purpose of assisting surgeons and physicians in their treatment of the human body.

Next (No. 2), it is assumed that drugs and surgical operations have the same effect on man as on animals.

Next (No. 3), it is assumed that vivisectors avoid giving pain as much as possible, "half-an-hour's pain to a frog or a day's 'inconvenience' to a guinea-pig" being the measure of pain suffered by the animals.

Next (No. 4), it is assumed that diseases are preventible (!) by knowledge gained from vivisection.

Next (No. 5), it is inferred, if not directly stated, that the results of these experiments are final, and not to be gainsaid.

Suppose that we take these assumptions in their order.

First comes the assumption that experiments on living animals are made for the improvement of surgery and medicine, and are therefore intended for the benefit of man.

Is this really the case? I do not mention the foreign experimenters, who are alternately disclaimed and petted according to the occasion, but will take a portion of Dr. S. Wilks' article in the *Nineteenth Century* (December, 1881), p. 945:—"There is an important part of the question which has not been sufficiently dwelt upon by physiologists. They have defended their cause by showing the benefits which have accrued from experiments on animals. All they have said is perfectly true; but it must be remembered that these good results were not immediately in view, *nor were they always the chief object for which the physiologist performed his experiment.*"

"Every fact in Nature, being of necessity the exemplification of

a general law, has its meaning; and thus the most important consequences have resulted from an observation of the most trivial phenomena. Illustrations of this truth abound in every chapter of the history of science. It is therefore only the single object before him at which the experimenter is aiming—he is seeking after truth, and if he finds it he is satisfied." (Note here that the word "truth" is first used in its general, and next in its particular sense.) "Indeed, the true scientific worker is known by the singleness of his purpose, for it is certain that if he is looking to some splendid ulterior object, his eyes become dazzled and he misses his mark. *How absurd then for experimenters to be asked by the Government official before he permits them to commence their work, what good object they can foresee in pursuing their researches! The only answer I, a really scientific man, could give would be 'knowledge.'*"

The same writer then proceeds to compare chemical analysis and botanical anatomy with experiments on living animals. "In animal life, the same method must be adopted to unlock the secrets of Nature. The question of the animal being sensitive cannot alter the mode of investigation."

Here, at least, is plain speaking, and how, in face of such statements as these, vivisection can be defended on the grounds of its utility to man, passes my comprehension.

Contrast Professor Owen in the same magazine, and on the same date. He says that the opponents try to prevent "every effort which the choicest intellects of such small class (the vivisectionists) may make to *add to the power of the beneficent healer, as applied to the prevention, alleviation, or removal of human suffering*"—*Nineteenth Century* December, 1881, p. 395. Which of the two is telling the real truth? With the greatest regret, I cannot but think that Dr. Wilks speaks the truth, and Professor Owen does not.

Not only do these writers contradict each other, but they contradict themselves.

Take for example the article by Dr. S. Wilks in the *Nineteenth Century*, p. 938. He writes as follows:—

"It is no exaggeration or misstatement to affirm that the real question turns not on the cruelty, but on the *utility* of 'vivisection.' I have looked in vain for any speech delivered by cardinal, bishop, peer, judge, or member of Parliament, who has not made this the staple of his argument—the *inutility* of experiments on animals."

Yet, in the very same article (p. 947) the same writer makes the following statement:—"The ostensible reason offered for the suppression of vivisection is its *cruelty*, but when it is objected that other forms of cruelty are unmolested, we are met by the answer that it is useless cruelty."

As to the astonishing statement about cardinals, bishops, &c.,

I wonder where his eyes could have been. If any anti-vivisectionist ever made a speech without putting cruelty in the foreground, I never heard of it. Possible utility is necessarily mentioned as the sole excuse that could be offered for the cruelty.

Others try to raise false issues, and dilate on the cruelties of field sports, pigeon shooting, ill treatment of horses, &c.; and assume that, as the opponents of vivisection make no mention of these cruelties, they approve of them. This mode of argument may be best described as "trailing a red herring across the track." It may be ingenious, but it is certainly disingenuous.

So much for assumption No. 1. Let us pass to assumption No. 2, namely, that drugs and surgical operations have the same effect on man as on animals.

As to drugs, nothing can be more misleading. It is generally assumed that the effect of a drug is in inverse ratio to the dimensions of the animal. Yet, Dr. Richardson gave to a pigeon a dose of opium sufficient to kill a strong man, and the bird was not at all affected by it. Calomel has but slight hold on the system of the dog, and the rabbit can eat belladonna as if it were parsley. The horse will take with impunity half a pound of tartar emetic, though forty grains will kill a man or a dog. Hemlock is no poison to the goat, so that if Socrates had only been gifted with the digestive system of the goat, he might have defied the poisoned bowl.

As to injuries, every one knows that animals vary, according to their nervous structure, in their capability of resistance, and that of all animals, man, as possessing the highest organization, is the least capable of enduring pain or recovering from injury.

Even with human beings, the influence of race upon their capability of endurance is enormous.

Take two extreme types, the Negro and the Caucasian.

The nervous system of the negro is so constituted, that he does not feel pain as does a European; and sustains with indifference bodily injuries which would kill the strongest European that ever lived.

The late Mr. T. Baines (of the Diamond Fields, South Africa) gave me some most remarkable instances of this physiological fact. While I was engaged on my "Natural History of Man," he was good enough to place at my disposal all his diaries and sketches of African life. While we were looking over them, sundry sketches reminded him of incidents that had occurred in the course of his travels, and among them were the following:—

One of his numerous negro attendants had broken his thigh. It was a simple fracture, and Mr. Baines, being skilled, as every traveller should be, in practical surgery, set the broken bone and put up the leg in splints. The sufferer took the operation of setting very quietly, and was then carried by relays of bearers.

Now, a negro always carries everything on his head. If you

employ negro workmen in making a railway cutting, and provide the usual wheelbarrows, native industry leisurely scoops two spadesful of earth into a wheelbarrow, puts the wheelbarrow on its head, and thinks itself a prodigy of intelligent labour. Accordingly, these negroes carried on their heads the litter on which their injured companion was stretched.

While on the march, the procession suddenly stopped, and all the negroes crowded round one spot, shouting and laughing with the loud guffaws peculiar to their race. On going to the scene of excitement, Mr. Baines found that the bearers had carelessly tilted the sufferer off the litter. In his efforts to save himself, he alighted on the injured leg, snapped the splints, and re-broke the bone. The force of the fall, moreover, bent the thigh at right angles, and drove the sharp end of the broken bone through the skin, thus converting the single into a compound fracture of the worst kind.

None of the negroes showed the slightest compunction for what they had done, nor did they exhibit the least pity for their comrade. On the contrary, they were immensely tickled at the ludicrous appearance of a thigh bent in the middle, and with a bone sticking out of it. It was really too funny, and peal after peal of laughter showed their appreciation of the joke.

This seems strange enough to us of the Caucasian race. We should have been sick with remorse; and if we should live to the extremest age of man, should never forgive ourselves for the result of our negligence.

But, odder still, no one seemed more amused than the patient himself, and no laughter was louder than his own.

The leg was again set, and healed with wonderful rapidity. The broken bone united easily, and the wound soon closed. There was, however, the usual "proud flesh" which had to be removed by caustic. If any of my readers have undergone the process of "removing," as the surgeon blandly remarks, the proud flesh, he knows what pain can be. I have undergone it, and know what it is.

The sufferer can hardly endure even to see a finger pointed at the spot, and the idea of having it touched at all is horrible. But, when the surgeon produces from his pocket a neat little silver tube, takes off the cap and begins to stroke the proud flesh with something that looks like a semi-translucent slate-pencil and feels like red-hot iron, pain seems too feeble a word to express a very ecstasy of torture.

So Mr. Baines offered the patient a shilling—*i.e.*, boundless wealth in the eyes of such men—if he would submit to the operation quietly. He took his shilling, behaved like a man of honour, and neither struggled nor even uttered a cry.

Subsequently, Mr. Baines found that the man had thought the whole business a capital joke, and had been holding up Mr.

Baines as an object of derision in being so soft as to part with his money at so easy a rate.

The man had not suffered at all throughout. He had not felt any pain from the fall nor from setting the bone, nor from the consequent wound, nor from the lunar caustic. On the contrary, life was a holiday to him. He did no work, was fed luxuriously and carefully tended, and he drew his pay just as if he had been working like his less fortunate companions.

The same traveller told me of another example of insensibility to bodily injuries.

He described a conspiracy among the negro followers to murder all the white men for the sake of getting at the brandy. The lives of the few whites being in peril, a halt was called, a court-martial convoked, and the ringleader condemned to death. He was shot through the head with a Colt's revolver, the rest of the mutineers, now subdued to obedience by the swift justice, were marched round the corpse and the journey was resumed.

Two days afterwards the corpse presented himself at the camp, and asked Mr. Baines for a stick of tobacco, on the plea that Massa had given him such a bad headache! The bullet had actually flattened against the man's skull, and he had only been stunned for a time.

The skull of the native Australian is of similar thickness. When two natives fight a duel, each brings his thickest and heaviest club, and they deal alternate blows on each other's heads. A white man's brains would be scattered by the least of these blows.

So, supposing that the negro and Australian had been selected for the subjects of experiments upon the human skull and its capability of resisting injuries, or the human capability for feeling pain, it is very clear that these experiments would have been worse than valueless if applied to the skulls of white men.

Then, as regards the question of pain, any one who has even a slight acquaintance with ethnology is aware that the negro and negroid races are not nearly so susceptible of pain as the white races. We have already seen that the nervous system of the dark race suffered no pain from injuries which would have caused the keenest agony to a white man.

The Kaffir, a man of much higher race than the negro, is almost equally insensible to pain.

"My Kaffir, Matakit," writes Mr. Baldwin, in his work on African hunting, "upset the kettle of boiling water over his bare foot the other day, and took almost as much notice of it as I should have done with a strong shooting boot on. They have regular hides, not skins at all."

Now we will see his capability of enduring pain as inflicted through the unpoetical medium of the whip.

In Southern Africa, all transport is performed by waggons, each drawn by twenty oxen or even more. The oxen are managed by two men, one is the driver, who sits on the box and wields an enormous whip. This whip is called a sjambok, and is made of hippopotamus hide fixed to a huge bamboo handle.

There is also a shorter whip called the "after-sjambok, for the benefit of the oxen next the driver. It is made of the same material, is all of one piece, and measures some four or five feet in length. At the butt end it is about an inch in thickness and tapers gradually to the tip. It may rather deserve the name of weapon, and has been used effectually for that purpose.

A Kaffir servant belonging to Mr. White, the celebrated elephant hunter, once saved his master's life with this whip. Two Boers set upon him and were doing their best to murder him, when the Kaffir seized the after-sjambok, and used it with such terrible effect that he drove them off. A blow from the after-sjambok, when wielded by practised hands, will cut a deep groove in a deal board, so that the discomfiture of the Boers is no matter of wonder.

The driver has nothing to do with guiding the oxen. This is done by the "fore-louper," who walks in front, picking out the best path over the roadless country. As the path often leads down steep declivities, one of the chief duties of the fore-louper is to stop the waggon when it comes to a declivity, lock the wheels, fasten branches to it by way of drags, and so lower it very slowly down the slope.

The fore-louper is almost invariably a Bosjesman, one of the tiniest races of men. These people are not black, but dark brown with a yellow tinge, and even the men seldom exceed five feet in height.

An African traveller was on his first journey, the fore-louper being a young Bosjesman, scarcely four feet high. The waggon arrived at the brow of a steep hill, when the fore-louper, from sheer mischief, sent oxen and waggon down the hill at full speed. In some extraordinary way, they reached the bottom uninjured. The traveller, a very powerful man, leaped out of the waggon, seized the after-sjambok and thrashed the fore-louper with all his strength. The blows of this terrible instrument had not the least effect for some time, and after beating the lad until his arm was tired, he only succeeded in eliciting one indication of pain. Had he felt it, he would have shown it.

Now, a single Kaffir, armed with a similar weapon, drove away two powerful and fully-clad white men, whereas the tiny half-naked Bosjesman seemed almost insensible to the strokes.

So here we find that experiments as to the capability of enduring pain would be absolutely useless if applied to different races of men.

In a lesser degree we find a similar diversity even among human beings of the same race.

Take, for example, two boys of the same age at the same school. One is timid, sensitive, retiring, reticent, fond of books, unsuited for rough sports, deficient in physical courage, though perhaps a very hero morally. The other is robust, overflowing with animal spirits, noisy and pugnacious, self-reliant, hating the very sight of books, and never reading but when he is forced to do so.

Suppose that the same flogging were administered to each of these boys, the effects would be very different upon them. The latter cares little for a flogging, and would infinitely rather be flogged "and get it over" than write an imposition or be kept from the playground on a half-holiday. Of course he feels the pain of the flogging, but not nearly so severely as the boy of more delicate nerves, and as soon as the pain has gone off, he thinks no more about it.

Whereas, his schoolfellow will nearly faint beforehand at the very idea of a flogging, he will suffer infinitely more at the time than his hardy companion, and the remembrance of it will rankle in his mind as long as he lives. For the imposition he cares little. It costs him hardly any trouble to write a theme or a copy of verses, and, as he has not the physical capacities for the playground, he is rather glad to be taken from it and allowed the society of his congenial companions—namely, the books which his robust schoolfellow detests and avoids.

So let us suppose that the flogging in question had been employed as an experiment for determining the capacity of boys to endure pain. It is evident that the experiment, if made upon either of these boys, would not only have failed in ascertaining the effect of pain upon boys generally, but that it would have misled any schoolmaster who acted upon it. In the one case he would have inferred that a "good caning" is the best punishment for all boys, and in the other, that it was the worst.

Now, these are facts which cannot be denied, and they prove that pain is not suffered alike in all animals, but that it differs according to the development of the nervous system, and is not always identical even in two individuals of the same species. The argument, therefore, which is based upon the theory of equal pain must be abandoned.

But this very diversity shows that experiments which involve pain cannot be applicable to all animals alike.

No one would take the dragon-fly, the wasp, or the shark, as a proof that a man might have the whole of his digestive organs torn away, and yet suffer no loss of appetite. Nor would any one but a lunatic venture to adduce Mr. Rymer Jones's experiment, or rather experience, with the crabs as a proof that a man

would be able to eat his dinner while he himself was being eaten. Yet, as we shall see, these are facts and not inventions.

Nor would any one argue that nitrate of silver caused no pain to man generally because Mr. Baines's follower did not suffer from its application. Nor that a European would suffer no more inconvenience than a headache from a Colt's revolver bullet, because an African native experienced no worse results. Nor that a European skull could withstand the blow of a heavy club wielded by a strong man, because the Australian skull can do so, and its owner be none the worse for it.

Nor would any schoolmaster think himself justified in using a sjambok in lieu of a cane, and wielding it until his arm was tired, because the Bosjesman lad could endure the infliction almost without wincing.

And no schoolmaster, who is worthy of his post, would consider all boys to be alike in their nervous organization, and administer the same punishment for the same offence.

Mr. H. C. Barkley, in his "Five Years in Bulgaria," has some thoughtful remarks on this subject.

A railway waggon, carrying about two tons' weight of stone, was propelled a little too hard, and was passing its proper stopping-place. Mr. Barkley, seeing a Tartar standing at the spot where the waggon ought to have been brought up, called out to the man to stop it—*i.e.*, to put on the brake.

The waggon was going very slowly, and so the Tartar thought that he could stop it by putting his foot in front of the wheel; of course, the waggon went its way, and crushed off the whole of the toes.

"I called to some one to carry him to his hut close by, but he laughed and said, 'That he had not come to that yet,' and marched off with scarcely a limp. We had the wound bathed for hours with cold water, and bound it up in wet linen. For some days all went well, but then tetanus set in, and the poor fellow died.

"From the first moment the accident happened until he died he showed no sign of pain, and let me dress the wound without flinching. I am quite sure that different men have different capacity for feeling pain, and that what would be torture to one would scarcely be heeded by another.

"I have often noticed this in Englishmen, and have now in my mind a great rough blacksmith, with lots of courage and 'go' in him, but who, if he knocked the skin off his knuckle, would sit on his anvil and writhe with pain, and do little more work all day. This man was sensitive to pain.

"Again, I can mention three English gentlemen, who each deliberately pulled out a firmly fixed double tooth with a pair of common pincers, because the aching annoyed them. These

men had not the same power of feeling pain as the blacksmith. All the people of the East feel pain much less acutely than Europeans, and through this have gained a character for stoicism."

So much for No. 2.

No. 3—*i.e.*, that vivisectors give as little pain as possible, and that the average of pain is a pin-prick, is sufficiently answered by the open avowal of Klein and others, that they pay no regard whatever to the pain which they inflict.

As for No. 4—*i.e.*, that diseases are preventible by knowledge gained by vivisection—it is almost too absurd to need refutation. It is very true that several diseases can be communicated by inoculation, but that they should be prevented by it is absurd.

Some upholders of vivisection are disingenuous enough to class vaccination as a "vivisection." They know well enough that it is an unworthy play on words, and that the slight prick of the lancet which is used for the benefit of the individual, has nothing in common with the protracted tortures of dogs, cats, and other animals, simply to satisfy the curiosity of the operator, and to gain for himself a scientific reputation.

Lastly (No. 5), the results of these operations are anything but final. On the contrary, in proportion to the number of vivisections is the confusion of results; and, moreover, the operators not only dissent from each other, but are perpetually correcting and often reversing the results of their experiments on living animals.

There are the inevitable references to the circulation of the blood, and the new system of employing ligatures in certain operations.

Now the assertion that Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood by means of dissecting living animals has been disproved over and over again. He is said to have *demonstrated* it by means of vivisection, but he did not discover it by such means. And there was not the least reason for him to have dissected living animals for demonstration, as the ordinary injection of the dead subject would have demonstrated the truth of his theory quite as well as vivisection.

Then we have the equally inevitable reference to a certain operation which was once considered fatal, but which, by means of experiments on a dozen rabbits made insensible with chloroform, has been robbed of its terrors, and hundreds of human lives saved.

Had this really been the case; had even one human life been saved by the sacrifice of a few rabbits, there would not have been, or at least ought not to have been a word said against experiments which produced such lasting results for the benefit of man, and inflicted no pain upon the animals. On the contrary, it would have been impossible to find words which could

express our gratitude to the man who made so wonderful a discovery.

But was this the fact?

It is difficult to explain the precise bearing of the case without diagrams, but I will try to do so as far as possible. The reader may, perhaps, be aware that the internal organs are divided into two distinct portions by a flat transverse muscle, called the diaphragm. N.B.—Convulsions of the diaphragm are popularly known as "hiccups." Above it, in the breast, lies the heart, clasped in the embrace of the two lungs, and below it are the rest of the vital organs.

Now, all the organs below the diaphragm are enclosed in a membrane, which is appropriately termed the "peritoneum"—*i.e.*, that which surrounds the intestines. It clings closely to them, dips in and out of the intestinal folds, and is brought in contact with some portion of each of the important organs of the abdomen.

If, therefore, any part of the peritoneum be injured, and inflammation take place, the mischief will not only spread over the whole peritoneum, but will affect those organs with which it comes in contact. Scarcely any constitution can resist peritonitis, as this inflammation is called, and the results are almost invariably fatal.

While attached to the surgical wards of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, I saw several cases of this terrible attendant on the surgeon's knife, and do not remember one instance of recovery when the peritonitis had fairly set in.

It is evident that, when it is necessary to get at any of the organs of the abdomen, the peritoneum must be opened, and equally evident that, after the operation is over, it must be closed again. The only way of doing so is by stitches or "sutures" as they are called in surgical language, and the question was, how to manage these sutures with the least danger of setting up inflammation. Was the peritoneum, as well as the muscular walls and common integument, to be pierced with the needle in addition to the cut made by the knife, or was it to be omitted?

In order to settle this question, a similar operation was performed upon a few animals, and it was found that the safest plan was to include the peritoneum in the sutures. Chloroform was employed, and the animals were nursed as carefully as if they had been human beings, so that no solid accusation of cruelty can be brought against the operation.

But to what purpose were the experiments made?

We put aside for the present the fact that healthy dogs or rabbits were not diseased human beings, and that therefore the results of the operation might not be the same in both cases.

Why, many years ago, it was known that in wounds of the abdomen, it was necessary to include the peritoneum with the sutures, if only to avoid the danger of pus making its way into the cavity of the abdomen.

I have before me a letter written by a military surgeon, who has treated many cases of wounds of the abdomen. He writes as follows:—"Long before ovariotomy was performed, I and thousands of others have seen the peritoneum wounded and divided by accidents and sword-cuts in battle. The peritoneum was placed in apposition, serous surface with serous surface, and mucous surface with mucous surface, and the patients all, or almost all, did well." The sutures, of course, included all the structures.

As we are on the subject of sutures, I may mention that the material of which the thread of either sutures or ligatures is made is necessarily an important element in successful operations. Various materials have been tried, and a short time ago we were told that by means of vivisection, the use of carbolic acid and especially the carbolic ligature, was demonstrated to be "one of the greatest boons to humanity in modern times."

Certainly, the carbolic ligature answered admirably with various animals, but when applied to man it utterly failed, and caused the loss of many human lives. Carbolic acid was, in fact, found to poison both the patient and the operator, and has been therefore abandoned by those who had naturally anticipated the greatest benefit from its use.

It is only fair, while trying to take a dispassionate view of the case, to say that the opponents of vivisection too often injure their own cause by rash assertions, by substituting rhetoric and epithets for calm reasoning, by giving too ready credence to any charge that is brought against the opposite side, by imputation of wrong motives, and by ignorance of physiology and even anatomy.

Both sides err equally in this respect. On the one hand, we have the story of the Girton lobster, and the practical lectures on vivisection supposed to be given to fashionable ladies by Dr. Aveling; on the other, we have the ridiculous myth of Miss Cobb's Bird of Paradise muff. Then, if on the one side, we find that the leading vivisectors are denounced as only seeking their own aggrandisement, on the other, we find Professor Owen descending so low as to denounce his opponents as "hired scribes."

As to ignorance of the subject, the most rabid anti-vivisectionist, in the heat of platform speaking, never made a mistake so outrageously flagrant as did the *Lancet*, the professedly scientific surgical journal of the day, when it calmly classed the frog as an invertebrate animal.

Let us try to eliminate the criminations and recriminations on either side as unworthy of the cause, and especially unworthy of our own.

Equally necessary it is that we should try to avoid false issues, and not to base our arguments on fallacies which can be easily disproved by the opponents.

Just as the vivisectionists have proceeded on the assumption that drugs and surgical operations have the same effects on man and the lower animals, so have the anti-vivisectionists assumed that all living creatures have equal sensitiveness to pain, and that man is the standard by which pain must be measured.

Now, as pain is due to the nerves, it must be evident that the capacity for pain must be dependent on the structure of the nerves, and that in proportion to the development of the nervous system must be the power of feeling pain.

Nothing but the knowledge of this fact can reconcile any thinking person to the seeming reign of cruelty among the lower animals.

Take the inhabitants of the waters, whether salt or fresh. They are almost entirely carnivorous, and feed upon creatures which they eat while living, and in their turn are eaten by others. Or take the bird tribes. By far the greater number of them feed upon living prey, and even the hard-billed birds which, when adult, live on seeds, are fed by their parents on living insects until their beaks are strong enough to crack the hard shells of seeds.

If any of my readers have bred canary birds, they will know that unless soft animal food be provided for the newly-hatched young, they will die. As they pass an artificial existence, they must have artificial food, and so we furnish the parents with mixed egg and bread-crumbs instead of the insects which the birds would have brought to the nest had they been wild in their native land.

Then there are the whole of the eagle and stork tribe, which feed upon living birds and beasts, and there are the cormorants, penguins, puffins, guillemots, and their kin, which feed upon living fish.

Again, we have, on land, the whole of the cat tribe, the weasels, many of the dog tribe, some of the bears, the bats, the hedgehog, mole, and many others, which feed upon living animals.

Judging by ourselves, we should naturally think that the Creator must be strangely insensible to the sufferings of the creatures to which He has given being.

If Shakespeare's aphorism were true, and that the beetle when trodden upon suffers corporeal pain as keenly as if it were a dying giant, there is but one inference that any reasoner could draw from animal life. Out of the countless millions of fishes, insects, and many other creatures that annually come into the world, there is not one in a million that is not eaten alive, or does not die by what we call a violent death.

Did, then, all these creatures possess the same capacity for pain as man does, they were created for the purpose of suffering pain, and not for the enjoyment of life.

Take, for example, the common thrush, which remains with us all the year.

In the autumn it prefers ripe fruit to almost any food, but during the rest of the year it is as much a predacious bird as the eagle or falcon, and seems to be far more cruel than either. If any of my readers have watched a thrush eat a snail or a worm they may have felt horrified at the cruelty of the bird, and the pain suffered by the victim.

The thrush finds a snail, carries it to a convenient stone, bangs the snail against the stone until the shell is smashed, and then pecks to pieces the living and writhing inhabitant of the shell.

Or, it catches a worm. Now, a thrush cannot swallow a large worm entire. So it holds the worm down tightly under its feet, tears it into convenient lengths, and so swallows it piecemeal. If the worm could feel pain as man does, the force of cruelty could no further go, and it would be hard to believe that a God of Love could have gifted the thrush with such an instinct.

But, when we bear in mind that the capacity for pain is proportionate to the development of the nervous system, all these difficulties vanish. Moreover, we shall find that the mode of killing is always proportioned to the capacity for pain in the animal that is killed.

In the case of the hawk tribe, the prey is almost instantaneously killed, or at least stunned, by the shock of the swoop —the "divine dexterity" of a modern writer.

Some years ago, a curious and instructive example of this beneficent provision was exhibited at the Zoological Gardens.

An unlucky cat happened to make its way into the cage of the Harpy Eagle. The bird was sitting motionless, after the habit of its kind. But, as soon as the cat was within reach, the eagle pounced upon it. With one foot it seized the cat by the head and dislocated its neck, while with the other, it seized the animal by the chest, and drove the sharp talons into its heart. Death was instantaneous, and in all probability the cat had no time to be aware of its danger, much less to feel pain.

We all know that between the infliction of an injury, and the consequent sensation of pain, an appreciable time intervenes. If, then, life be extinguished simultaneously with the injury, pain would not be felt. A relative of mine was once struck down by a runaway horse, and suffered concussion of the brain. Yet he felt no pain, and his only recollection of the accident was the sensation of the warm breast of the horse coming against his face.

So with the guillotine, life is extinguished so instantaneously, that not even a finger or a toe quivers when the axe descends.

As to the cat tribe, although man is not their natural food, and therefore might be thought liable to more suffering when attacked than is felt by their ordinary prey, it has been repeatedly proved that the first shock of the lion or tiger onset deprives the man of fear or pain. So, where the victim possesses a highly organized nervous system, there is a merciful provision that the nerves are temporarily paralyzed, as regards pain and fear.

Perhaps it may be objected by persons ignorant of practical zoology, that the statements as to the insensibility to pain which is evinced by animals of low organization are assumptions and not facts.

Suppose we accept the position that man is the standard by which we measure the capacity for pain.

When we are in severe pain, we cannot eat. Even when pain is unaccompanied with injury to structure, as in headache, earache, sciatica, or neuralgia, it will deprive us of all appetite during the paroxysms of agony. But, the lower animals will sustain the severest injuries without losing their desire for food.

There is, for example, Mr. Rymer Jones's story of the shore-crabs, to which reference has already been made. These creatures, like the pike, are confirmed cannibals, and there is no food so grateful to a large crab as that which is afforded by a smaller crab. The story is, perhaps, familiar to many of my readers, but it will bear repetition.

One day, Mr. Jones saw a crab about as large as a crown-piece catch a smaller crab, break it up and devour it. N.B., when crabs eat, they always hold their food with one of their pincers, pull it to pieces with the other, and with the same claw put a morsel into the mouth.

So absorbed was the creature in its meal, that it did not notice a much larger crab which came on it from behind, seized it, and proceeded to break it up and eat it. The victim took no notice of the injuries which it was sustaining, but calmly went on with its own meal as long as there was enough left of it to work the pincers and jaws.

Insects, being of a lower organization than crustacea, display equal insensibility to pain, more is impossible.

On one occasion, I thought that a common "dor" beetle (Geotrupes) "wheeled its drowsy flight" rather awkwardly, and captured it in order to ascertain the reason. I found that some bird had attacked the beetle, had torn off the upper surface of the abdomen, scooped out its entire contents, and pulled off one of the wing cases. As soon as it was caught, the beetle folded

its wings and the remaining wing case, and walked about as unconcernedly as if nothing had happened to it.

Even if the whole abdomen be destroyed, the insect seems to think little of it. A dragon-fly, whose abdomen had been knocked off the body by the edge of the insect net, lost none of its natural voracity, but ate any number of flies in succession, though it had no stomach to put them into, and finished by eating its own abdomen.

One of my artist friends was worried by a wasp, and at snipping at it with a pair of scissors, he cut it asunder. Knowing nothing of entomology, he thought that the insect would die on the spot, but found that the head, throat, wings, and legs were in full movement, while the abdomen was lying in the place where it fell. Out of curiosity he gave the insect some red syrup, which, as it imbibed, gathered into a large ruby head just behind the wings (where the stomach should have been); but really, the creature's pleasure seemed to be only augmented by the change in its anatomy, because it could drink ten times its ordinary fill of sweets, without getting any the fuller.

Worms possess a still lower nervous organization, and consequently little, if any, sense of pain. I have already mentioned the mode in which the earthworm is eaten by the thrush, and indeed, it is the lot of this creature to furnish food for a wonderful number of animals belonging to most of the orders in zoology.

There are worms of the sea as well as worms of the land, and the former often attain a considerable length. They are restless beings, twining in and out of the rocks, and pushing their heads into every crevice in search of food. One of these worms was thus engaged, when the observer, in trying to detach it from the rock, broke off a large portion of the tail, or rather, tore away a considerable number of segments. The creature seemed perfectly unconscious of the injury, and continued its search for food as if nothing had happened to it.

Even creatures that are very much higher in the scale of creation seem to be almost devoid of the sense of pain, as we understand the word. The pike, for example, which feeds entirely on living fish, and which, like the crab, is sure to become a victim to a larger pike, if the two should meet, will seize the angler's bait, even though its stomach be nearly filled with the hooks and leaden weight it had broken from a line, only a few minutes previously.

The shark again, which has been hooked, dragged on deck, apparently killed, opened, the whole of its viscera removed, and then flung back into the sea, has been known to recover almost as soon as it sank below the water, to follow the

ship again in search of food, and to be recaptured with another bait, though the fish had no stomach to put it into.

With the evidence of those facts before them, the more advanced operators have now openly acknowledged that the vivisection of living animals affords no guide to the physiology of man, and have begun to throw out hints that condemned murderers ought to be given up for dissection while still living, and not to be wasted by being swiftly put to death and immediately buried.

Even should this desire be gratified, little, if any, dependence could be placed on the results, partly on account of the difference of race or constitution; and partly on the ground that to cut into living tisues, especially when the nervous system is involved, alters the natural conditions, and makes the experiment worthless. I intentionally avoid the religious and moral views of the case, and only deal with those parts which the hardest hearted materialist would accept.

Some years ago, I thought that vivisection, if carefully restricted—*i.e.*, the animal kept under chloroform or other anæsthetic, and killed before it recovered consciousness—might be useful in treating human ailments.

But, the evidence given by the upholders of vivisection, and recorded in the Blue Book, has convinced me that such restrictions cannot be enforced, and that, if they could, they would nullify the results of the operations.

So, after much thought and long consideration, I am driven to the conclusion that the dissection, hacking, scalding, and otherwise torturing of living animals, is utterly valueless to science, does not forward the welfare of man, and ought to be unconditionally prohibited.

J. G. Wood.

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

(*Concluded from page* 346.)

OUR next dates are the 25th of July, when the Savoy Commission expired, and the 30th of July, when the Convocations ceased to sit till the 21st of November, because Parliament was not sitting. But we know, from Lord Clarendon, that "the Bishops" were at work throughout this interval, at the revision, which *they* wished to make of the Prayer Book; and there can be no reasonable doubt that this occupation of theirs was a continuation of what they had begun to do, before the adjourn-

ment of the Convocations on the 30th of July. Still, however, there was no formal "authority or requisition" from the King, either to the Bishops or to "the Convocation;" and, as Lord Clarendon tells us, "*that* did not sit during the recess of the Parliament, and so came not together till the end of November;" and, therefore, the King's "authority and requisition" to the Canterbury Convocation, although dated the 10th of October, could not be read till the 21st of November; *and, as regards the "authority and requisition" to the York Convocation, it was not even dated till the 22nd of November.*

On the 21st of November, the revision was taken up by the Canterbury Convocation, nominally as an original proceeding under the King's letter, then for the first time produced; but what was really done, then, was to give an air of Convocational authority to the Bishops' revision, then in progress; and thus it came to pass that, in accordance with the reality of the facts, the Upper House of Canterbury delegated (as we have seen) to eight Bishops, *or any three of them*, the whole of their powers—"*commisit vices suas.*" But one of these Bishops, Cosin, was not a member of the Canterbury Convocation; and even if the Upper House could, under ordinary circumstances, thus delegate their entire functions to a Committee, (which seems highly *im*probable) it must be supposed that it was to a Committee of *themselves*, and no others, that the delegation must be made; and if the Bishops of the Convocation of Canterbury had not known that the King's reference to them was merely illusory, how is it possible that they, twenty-two in number, could have felt themselves justified in answering the King's demand of *their* opinion "for his further consideration," by transferring, "*vices suas*," in that respect, to a quorum, which might consist of two of their number, with one of the Province of York added, inasmuch as they might be the three, representing the eight, representing the twenty-two?

The next dates are the 23rd and 27th of November, on the first of which, part of the revised Prayer Book was sent down by the Upper House of Canterbury to the Lower House of the same body, and on the latter of which, the rest of the revised Prayer Book was sent down in like manner, with the exceptions which Lord Selborne mentions, of "the Prefaces and Calendar, the Psalms, the Ordination Services, the General Thanksgiving, and the Prayers for Use at Sea, which were afterwards added;" so that, as Lord Selborne truly says, the parts thus sent down on the 23rd and 27th of November, were "the whole Liturgy, properly so called." The parts thus sent down on the 23rd and 27th of November included not only the Daily Services and the Litany, but the Collects for Sundays and Holydays, the Communion Service, and all the Occasional Services, exclusive of

those for Ordination and for use at Sea, but *inclusive* of the new Occasional Service for the Baptism of Adults; and any one who compares the present revised form of the Collects, the Communion Service, and the Occasional Services, thus sent down, with the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, will see that the verbal alterations in them are extremely numerous and minute; and that the alterations and additions, thus made, could not *possibly* have been made between the 21st of November, when the King's reference to the Canterbury Convocation came into force, and the 27th, when the alterations and additions had thus been sent down to the Lower House.

The revision thus made, therefore, must have been made at meetings of Bishops, in the way already described, and not in the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation, otherwise than nominally.

But, probably, the most curious of all these dates, is that of the 23rd of November, on which the Bishops of the Province of York, on the very next day after the date of the King's "authority and requisition" to *them*, to review the Prayer Book and Ordination Services, and make such alterations and additions as, "after mature consideration," should "seem meet and convenient to them," to be presented for the King's "further consideration," write to their Lower House, who must have been at York, to tell them that "all possible expedition was necessary, and that the ordinary course of proceeding would be too dilatory," and therefore asking them to appoint three particular members of the Lower House of Canterbury, and some other members of the same House, to be the proxies of the whole Lower House of York, "to give your consent to such things as shall be concluded *here*, in relation to the premisses:" "here" being the Convocation of Canterbury, in London or Westminster, where the same letter states that the York Bishops were sitting in consultation with those of Canterbury. In accordance with this letter, the Lower House of York did appoint (as we have seen) the three specified members of the Lower House of Canterbury, *and one other member of the same House*, to be their proxies to give their consent to whatever the Canterbury Convocation should "conclude." Is it possible that this was the "mature consideration" which the King had required of "the *Clergy* of the Province of York," as well as of their Bishops? And if this *could* be considered as a Convocational act of the Lower House of York, could such a *delegation by delegates* possibly be within the scope of the authority given to them, at their election, by the general body of the Clergy of the Province, whose "proctors" they were?

A startling revelation, made by these dates and this letter, is, that there was never any revision by the Convocation of York

at all, or even any judgment of the Convocation of York at all. It is impossible to say that the Convocation of York, as a whole, either revised, or judged of the revision, when *the whole of the Lower House* of that Convocation deliberately abstained from both the revision and the judgment upon it, and yet authorized other persons (not of their body) to say, as is said in the first Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, that the revision which the revisers had made "hath been, by the Convocations of *both* Provinces, *with great diligence* examined and approved." The absence of truth from this statement, so far as regards the *Lower* House of York, would be quite conclusive against the propriety of saying that "the Convocations of both Provinces" had done what is here said of them; but the statement is not even true of the *Upper* House of York. They were, then, a body of only four men, against twenty-two of Canterbury (Sodor and Man being, most probably, vacant, as before mentioned, and at all events not appearing); and, even if there had been any real revision by the whole joint body of Bishops, the opinions of the four would, in all probability, have been absorbed in the opinions of the twenty-two, or of the majority of them; and if the four actually voted with some of the twenty-two, and turned the scale of a division, their act, in so doing, would vitiate that particular proceeding of the Upper House of Canterbury, without being itself a proceeding of the Upper House of York. We have seen, however, that, in fact, there was no revision by the whole joint body of Bishops, and that the whole joint body "*commisit vices suas*" to a committee of eight, seven of Canterbury and one of York, of which eight a quorum of three only, *not necessarily including the York member*, might act for the whole joint body of the Bishops of the two Provinces.

The true explanation of all these irregularities is to be found in the haste, which the York Bishops stated, in their letter, to be necessary; a haste essential to satisfy the impatience of the House of Commons.

After this conclusive evidence that the Convocation of York neither revised the Book, nor examined the revision of it, and that even the *Upper House of Canterbury* did not, in its collective capacity, either revise, or examine the revision, but, on the contrary, adopted, without examination, at least a great part of the revision which a small committee of themselves had made, it would be hardly of any importance to investigate the manner or the extent of the examination, *by the Lower House of Canterbury*, of the work sent down to them by their own Upper House; but it seems that such an investigation has been made almost quite impossible, in consequence of the destruction of the records of the Lower House in the Fire of London in 1666.[1]

[1] See Swainson, p. 13.

It may, however, be as well to notice, that the parts sent down to the Lower House, on the 23rd and 27th of November (as before mentioned), contain so many very small alterations as would have occupied several days even to *read* without comment, and that their nature cannot have admitted of their being made the subjects of detailed discussion. The same observation applies, with equal force, to those parts of the Book, particularly the Ordination Services, which (as before mentioned) were sent down to the Lower House *after* the 27th of November. It is true, however, that such things as the alteration of the Daily Lessons, by adding the stories of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon, *were* capable of being voted upon; and *that* addition is accordingly said to have been voted upon, in the Lower House. (See Mountfield's "Church and Puritans," 79, 3rd Ed., 1881, quoting Andrew Marvell).

The 20th of December was the last day of the sitting of Parliament before the Christmas vacation, and, consequently, the last day of the sitting of the Canterbury Convocation; and it was the day of the date of the formal approval of the revised Book by the Heads of that Convocation, or some of them; and, consequently, the approval, by the Lower House, of the Bishops' work, must have been given, in some form or other, by that day, if given at all, which it probably was; but a considerable part of the interval between the 27th of November and the 20th of December must have been spent by the Bishops in the extremely minute alterations which were made in the Ordination Services, before sending them down to the Lower House; and thus the Lower House could not possibly examine them with exact appreciation of their meaning and value.

Although the revision purported to have been formally and finally concluded on the 20th of December, 1661, the revised Book was certainly not forwarded to the King until some weeks afterwards: and great doubts have been suggested whether the revision was really completed as early as the 20th of December, and whether the signatures to it were not appended on that day, to an incompletely revised Book, or to a Book in which the alterations and additions were, at the time, *in*completely transcribed; because it seems to have been ascertained with certainty that the Book to which the signatures of the date of 20th of December were attached was the Book actually presented to the King.[1] It seems impossible to ascertain with certainty whether in fact any of the additions or alterations appearing in the Book sent to the King were really made *after* the 20th of December; but, *if any of them were so made, there appears to be no trace of their having been submitted to either House of the Convocation of Can-*

[1] See Swainson, p. 17.

*terbury.* It is *possible* that the Book sent to the King was signed upon the faith of the amanuensis of the Bishops, Dr. Sancroft, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, transcribing, into the signed Book, the alterations and additions which had been already agreed to. *It is not till the 24th of February, 1662, N.S., that we find any evidence that the revised Book was in the King's possession.* That is the day on which it was formally approved by the King in Council, "with the amendments and additions as it was presented by the Lord Bishops," whereupon an Order in Council was made for transmitting it to the House of Lords. Nothing seems to have been then said of the Convocations.[1]

Professor Swainson has given us the dates of a great many meetings of the *Upper* House of the Convocation of Canterbury from the 21st of November to the 20th of December, both inclusive; and in a few instances we learn from him some particulars of what was done on such days; but the only date which seems of importance for the present purpose is that of the 2nd of December, on which he tells us that "the Preface was introduced and considered;"[2] and, by "the Preface," he must mean that which is now the first of the three Prefaces; the other two being merely reprints of former Prefaces of Elizabeth's Book, originally appearing in the *first* Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth. *This date makes certain the fact, that "Convocation" did not claim to have made the revision, but only to have "examined and approved" the work of the revisers, who are an anonymous body, there.*[3]

The Order in Council was turned into a Royal Message to the House of Lords, transmitting the Book, and dated on the 24th of February, 1661–2. The language of this Message forms part of the present Preamble to the Act of Uniformity, with but very few verbal alterations, the only material one of which is, that the Preamble omits the word "consideration" from the recital that the reference to the Convocations was expressed to be (as in fact it was) for the King's "further consideration, allowance, or confirmation."[4]

Between the two Messages, from the Commons to the Lords, of the 16th of December and the 28th of January (*ante*, 339, note), the Lords had read the Commons' Bill of Uniformity a first and second time, and had referred it to a Select Committee; but nothing practical was done, until the King's Message of the 24th of February was brought to the House of Lords on the 25th, with the Book mentioned in it, which Book was then

---

[1] See Swainson, pp. 18 and 19. [2] P. 16

[3] See the words of our present First Preface to the Prayer Book.

[4] See the Message in full in Swainson, p. 19, from the Lords' Journals.

referred, by the House, to "the Committee for the Act of Uniformity."[1]

On the 13th of March, the Lords' Committee reported, to their House, that they had made amendments in the Bill, and had made the Bill "relate to the Book *recommended by the King* to this House, and not to the Book brought with the Bill from the House of Commons."[2]

Professor Swainson gives details (pp. 20, 21) which seem to show that this Committee made certain alterations in the revised Book itself, and that some of the Bishops (probably being on the Committee) hastened to get the concurrence of the Convocation of Canterbury in them, in a singular manner; but, as already intimated (*ante*, 293), these observations are not intended to deal with those alterations, or the particulars of them, or the evidence for them. It is sufficient, for the present purpose, to say that, upon the Report of the Committee being read in the House on the 13th of March, the House made an order, in these terms—viz., "that the alterations and additions in the Book of Common Prayer, *as it came recommended from His Majesty*, be read, before the alterations and amendments in the *Bill* are read" (*Ibid.*).

This was accordingly done, on the 13th, 14th, and 15th of March; and then the House "gave the Lords *the Bishops* their thanks for their care in this business."[3] These thanks, although given only to the Bishops, who were themselves part of the House, were very naturally reported by them to "Convocation," probably for the information of the Lower House of Canterbury. This seems to have been done on the 18th of March (*Ibid.*).

The reading through, in three successive days, of the alterations made in the revision, would itself be enough to show that the Lords had no intention of adopting the alterations, without knowing what they were doing.

On the 17th of March, the Lords' House proceeded with the discussion of the Bill, as amended by their Committee, and on that same day, and subsequent days, they discussed a proviso, then first recommended to them by the King, for a Dispensing Power, to the effect presently mentioned. They continued these discussions from time to time, partly in the House and partly by means of re-commitment, until the 10th of April, by which time they had determined to insert the King's dispensing proviso, with some variations, and also to insert another dispensing proviso of their own, which will also be stated presently.[4]

On the 10th of April, the House of Lords made an order, the terms of which were—

---

[1] Swainson, pp. 18, 20.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-25.

That the Book of Common Prayers, *recommended from the King*, shall be delivered to the House of Commons, as that being the Book to which the Act of Uniformity is to relate (Swainson, p. 25).

On the same day, 10th of April, 1662, a Conference between the two Houses is held, in which the Lords explain their amendments to the Commons; and then Serjeant Keeling, the Manager of the Conference for the Commons, reports to his own House—

upon the Bill of Uniformity, that the reason of the delay of the said Bill, was, that the Book of Common Prayer had, *by reference from His Majesty*, been under the consideration of the Convocation, who had made some alterations and additions thereunto; and that the Lords had perused the same, and also the Bill sent from this House; and had returned the same, together with the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is amended, *and by them agreed to*, and some amendments and provisos to the Bill, to which they desired the concurrence of this House (Commons' Journals, as quoted by Swainson, p. 25).

The original enactments of the Commons' Bill had been adopted by the Lords, except that they were made to relate to the King's revised Book, instead of to the Book of the Commons.

The Lords, however, had made various additions to the Bill. They introduced so much of the present Preamble as states the Savoy Commission, the reference to the Convocations, with its results, and the King's approval and allowance of them; following, in these respects, almost entirely, the terms of the King's Message of the 24th of February, as already mentioned; beginning this additional preamble after the present words, "hazard of many souls," and prefacing the addition by the words:—

For prevention whereof in time to come, for settling the peace of the Church, and for allaying the present distempers, which the indisposition of the time, *and tenderness of some men's consciences*, have contracted, the King's Majesty, according to his declaration of the five-and-twentieth of October, &c. &c. (See the Bill, "as it left the Lords," set out in Swainson, pp. 29, 30.)

The Commons refused to allow the words, "*tenderness of some men's consciences*," to remain in the Preamble, for reasons which will presently appear; *but they seem to have overlooked the fact that the same expression occurred in the then newly added Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, as we have it to this day.*

The Lords had also added the precise terms in which assent to the use of the Book should be expressed, for which the Commons had not prescribed any particular terms. The Commons acquiesced in this addition; *and thus arose the inconsistency (lately repealed) of requiring that the assent to the* USE *of the Book shall be*

*signified in terms which express assent to every part of the contents of the Book itself.*

The Lords had also introduced the Threefold Declaration of (1) Non-resistance, (2) Conformity to the Liturgy, and (3) Condemnation of the Covenant; but the only persons upon whom they had imposed it were present and future incumbents of parsonages, vicarages, and benefices with cure. The Commons now extended it to all Church dignitaries (except Bishops) and to all the heads of houses, professors, and fellows in the Universities, and to all schoolmasters and private tutors; and they added a punishment of three months' imprisonment to the penalty of deprivation already provided.

The Lords had also required that all existing incumbents should receive Episcopal ordination, if they had not received it already; and that none but priests, made such by Episcopal ordination, should "consecrate and administer the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." The Commons adopted these additions.

The Lords had also introduced some minor and some subsidiary enactments; and they added the two provisoes already alluded to. The first of them enabled the King to dispense with the use of the surplice, and with signing with the sign of the cross in baptism, in favour of incumbents who were in possession of their benefices on the 29th of May, 1660, and still remained so; provided that, in the case of signing with the cross, another minister should be allowed by the incumbent to do it, if the parents of the child to be baptized should desire it. The second proviso enabled the King to assign one-fifth of the income of any benefice to the support of any existing incumbent, whose non-compliance with the Act should cause a forfeiture.

The first proviso stated that the dispensing power contained in it was given

*in regard of the gracious offers and promises made by His Majesty before his happy restoration, of liberty to tender consciences, the intention whereof must be best known to His Majesty, as likewise the several services of those who contributed thereunto,* for all whom His Majesty hath, in his princely heart, as gracious a desire of indulgence as may consist with the good and peace of the kingdom, and would not have a greater severity exercised towards them than what is necessary for the public benefit and welfare thereof.

The Commons wholly rejected both these provisoes.

The Commons confined the renunciation of the Covenant to the next twenty years; and they supplied an accidental omission of the Lords, for translating the revised Prayer Book into

Welsh; following the precedent of a statute of 1563–4, as to Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book.[1]

The Commons considered whether they should debate the alterations which had been made in the revised Prayer Book; and they determined, by 96 to 90, not to do it; but they immediately passed a resolution declaring that they might have debated those alterations if they had chosen to do so.[2] No doubt, this resolution was passed to prevent the *possibility* of its being afterwards said that they thought themselves precluded from debating them, upon the ground of their having been approved by the Bishops, who were the revisers, or by the Convocations, or by the King. *The resolution, therefore, absolutely prohibits our supposing that they thought themselves precluded by the fact of the alterations having been sanctioned by the Convocations.* If the House *had* thought itself so precluded, it would have committed a grave error (as already intimated); because, inasmuch as every word of every form and every rubric is part of the Act of Parliament to which the Book containing them is annexed, the insertion of every word of every such form and rubric is the doing of the Parliament whose "act" it is; whatever may be the advice or recommendation upon which Parliament proceeds. There is no reason, however, to suppose that the House of Commons, as a body, *troubled itself at all about the contents of the revised Book*, further than to ascertain that it was no more likely to be assented to by the Presbyterians than the Book which the Commons themselves had sent up to the Lords, as the Book to which they insisted that all existing incumbents should assent, upon pain of deprivation. A cursory glance at the revised Book would show that this was the case. There seems no evidence that any members of the House of Commons read the Book carefully at all. It is true that it was discovered, before the Book was returned to the Lords, that the word "persons" had, by mistake, been inserted instead of the word "children," in the Rubric about the safety of baptized children who die before they are old enough to commit actual sin; but this discovery is more likely to have been made by the transcriber, Dr. Sancroft, than by a member of the House of Commons; and if he found it out, he would ask some member to correct it. The rest of the sentence shows that the error was merely clerical.

These amendments, by the Commons, to the amendments of the Lords, in the Commons' Bill of Uniformity, were communicated to the Lords, in a Conference between the two Houses, on

[1] See and compare the Forms of the Bill, in its different stages, as given by Swainson, pp. 29–46.

[2] See Swainson, p. 51.

the 5th of May, 1662. On this occasion, the Conference was managed, on the part of the Commons, by Serjeant Charlton, instead of Serjeant Keeling, the former manager; and very ably managed it was. The manager was the same Charlton who was afterwards known as Sir Job Charlton, Speaker of the House of Commons, made a judge of the Common Pleas by Charles II., and a baronet by James II.

The reason which the manager assigned, on the part of the Commons' House, for striking out from the Preamble the words, "tenderness of some men's consciences," was, that "the Commons were loth to give so much countenance to an abused phrase."

The Commons assigned, at great length, their reasons for "rejecting" the proviso for giving a dispensing power to the King as to the surplice and the cross in baptism. The most prominent of these reasons were as follows:—

"1. It is a proviso without precedent:

"2. It would establish schism:

"3. It would not gratify such for whom it was intended."

The manager for the Commons added:—

> Those for whom it [the proviso] is intended . . . . chiefly reject it upon these grounds [this ground] that things indifferent ought not to be enjoined, *which opinion* [he said] *took away all the weight of human authority, which consists in commanding things otherwise indifferent.*
>
> As to the reasons given by their Lordships to the Commons [said the manager, meaning the reasons in the King's proviso], the King's engagement at Breda, as to tender consciences, . . . . *it would be very strange to call a schismatical conscience a tender conscience.* . . . . There could be no inference of any breach of promise in His Majesty, because that declaration had these two limitations, first, a reference to Parliament; secondly, such liberties to be granted only as consisted with the peace of the kingdom.

Several reasons were then assigned for rejecting the proviso for allowing a fifth to excluded incumbents.

The manager then said that he did, "from the House of Commons, desire their Lordships, that they would recommend to the Convocation the directing of such decent gestures, to be used in Divine Service, as was fit. *This suggestion had no reference to the Prayer Book*, and it came to nothing: it was intended merely to suggest to the Lords, that inasmuch as the Convocation of Canterbury were understood to have then received license to review the *Canons* (*ante*, p. 302), they should be recommended to insert in them some directions as to the behaviour of the clergy or laity, or both (it does not seem clear whether both, or which), at the time of Divine Service; probably upon the principle upon which the canons of 1603-4 had attempted to act, in giving some directions for the behaviour of all persons present at Divine

Service; it not then being understood, as it is now, how limited the force of canons is, and that, in particular, canons have no authority whatever over the laity, or their rights or behaviour.

The manager for the Commons then mentioned the clerical error of "persons" for "children;" and ended by "giving the Commons' *consent* that their Lordships should annex to the Bill that Book sent to the Commons by their Lordships."[1]

On the 8th of May, the Lords accepted *all* the alterations of the Commons, and corrected the clerical error which had been suggested; and thus the Bill of Uniformity, with the King's Book annexed, which the Commons called the Lord's' Book, became ready for the Royal Assent: which assent the King gave, in solemn form, on the 19th of May (1662). It is not the immediate object of these observations to compare the King's conduct, in giving this assent, with his declaration from Breda, or with any of his other promises or obligations. It is well, however, to mention, at this place, that the King's uneasiness about his promises was manifested, not only by the proviso which he tried in vain to induce Parliament to insert in the Act of Uniformity, but by the engagement which he made, between the passing of the Act and St. Bartholomew's Day, to the London Presbyterian Ministers, that he would by his own (supposed) dispensing power, extend the time for conformity beyond that day; an engagement which he persuaded Lord Clarendon to contend that he was able to perform, although Lord Clarendon knew, *as he himself tells us*, that it could not be performed; which very distinctly appeared, when certain Bishops and lawyers attended a meeting with the King and Lord Clarendon, and showed that the Act had already given to the patrons of non-conforming incumbents a vested right to fill up the incumbencies immediately after St. Bartholomew's Day, in all cases of nonconformity before that time.[2]

These details conclusively show that the revision of the Book of Common Prayer was not an object desired by either of the two Houses of Parliament in 1661 and 1662, and that their only object as regards the Book, which was to be annexed to the new Act of Uniformity, was, that it should *not be less objectionable* to the Presbyterian incumbents than the Book already in force; and if they did take the trouble to compare the revised Book with the *un*revised Book, *a single hour's comparison would be enough to show them that the old objections were all substantially retained*, and that there could be no possible use in examining the minute verbal alterations in the Services of only occasional use.

[1] Lords' Journals, as quoted by Swainson, pp. 52–61.

[2] See the second volume of Lord Clarendon's own Life, p. 143, &c. Oxford ed., 1827.

It would be seen that the only alteration which could have been intended to remove any objection of the "tender consciences" to the former Book, was the introduction of the word "the" before the word "Resurrection," in that part of the Burial Service which speaks of "sure and certain hope;" which made the expression ambiguous, without removing the objection.

On the other hand, the Prayer for the Clergy, in the Litany, was now restricted to "all bishops, priests, and deacons," instead of "all bishops, pastors, and ministers of the Church," which had been the form used in the Litany of the Book of Elizabeth, and of both the Books of Edward VI., the only Prayer Books hitherto set forth by Parliament.

The Calendar of Daily Lessons had also been made, now, to include two *additional* Lessons from the Apocrypha—namely, the history of Susanna and the Elders, and the Story of Bel and the Dragon.

In the new Prayer for the Parliament, King Charles II. was described as "most religious," at the very time at which his then living in adultery with Lady Castlemaine *was both open and notorious;* as we know from a great many entries in Pepys's Diaries.

It is impossible but that these things must have been painful trials to the "tender consciences," who were required to express their formal assent to them; *and it is perfectly obvious that they were wholly unnecessary.*

The obligation to "sign with the sign of the cross," in Baptism, was *continued* in the old Service for the Baptism of Infants, and it was *inserted* in the new Service for the Baptism of Adults.

The second half of the Catechism seems to have been now first added to the Parliamentary Prayer Book; although it is probable that it was inserted in the Book of 1604, called King James's Prayer Book.[1] Some new Collects for Sundays and Holydays were inserted in the place of old ones, and some additional unobjectionable forms were added.

The other variations from the Book of Elizabeth may, with truth, be said to be of not much more than verbal importance; but their number was so large, probably five hundred at least, that a great expenditure of time and attention was necessary to enable any one to judge whether they were objectionable or not. They varied slightly, the language of many of the Collects retained, and they altered the language of some of the Occasional Services and of the Ordination Services, in a vast number of small particulars, *so minute and so hair-splitting, as must be incredible, to any one who has not taken the trouble (which the*

[1] See 2 Rapin, 163, note, folio ed.

*writer of this account has taken*) *to alter the language of one book by substituting the language of the other.*

To recapitulate the principles upon which it is earnestly desired that the questions stated at the beginning of these observations shall be investigated:

The circumstances attending the original enforcement of the Book of Elizabeth, which was now revised, and which was intended to be enforced in its revised shape, not only by the new Act of Uniformity, but by Elizabeth's own Act of Uniformity, *which was expressly kept on foot,* are *most conclusive evidence* that the constitutional principle upon which the nation enforces the use of a particular Service Book, in the national houses of prayer, is, that the nation, as a whole, quite independently of the assent or dissent of its Bishops and clergy, prescribes such Book and such directions for Service as it thinks fit. Nothing is more absolutely certain than that, when this was done at Queen Elizabeth's accession, it was done *not only without the concurrence of the Bishops and clergy, but in direct opposition to both of those orders.* This is not only one of the most absolutely certain facts of the history of those times, but it appears on the very face of Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity itself, which studiously *omits,* throughout, the concurrence of "the Lords Spiritual" in the enactment of its provisions, although it was as much the practice then, as it is now, to express the fact of the concurrence of "the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled." It is part of the very earliest constitutional instruction that every lawyer, and every statesman, gets, that this Act of Parliament is conclusive evidence to show that the concurrence of the Lords Spiritual is not necessary to any Act of Parliament, *and that the dissent of them all will not invalidate it.*[1] But the fact of their dissent is also conclusive to show that the consent of the Convocations of the Clergy is not essential to the passing even of an Act in which they may be considered to have a greater interest than in any other Act of Parliament; for the Lords Spiritual constitute the whole of the Upper House of both Convocations; and there is no pretence for saying that, in the absence of their assent, the Lower House of either Convocation could give an assent which could in any sense be called the assent of "Convocation."

If it were necessary to go back to pre-Elizabethan times, it would probably be found that there is no evidence of any such constitutional principle as that the assent of the two Convocations, or either of them, was necessary for any Act of Parliament at all, other than the *Parliamentary* taxations of its

[1] See 1st Blackstone's Commentaries, p. 156.

Clergy, which, as before mentioned (p. 300), proceeded upon the basis of the *Convocational* taxation; *but, in truth, it is neither necessary nor constitutional to go back beyond the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity.* The great principle of that Act was, that, *then, and for the future, the nation, by its Parliament, undertook the duty* of prescribing the manner, the forms, and the terms, in which the public worship of the Almighty should be conducted; in opposition to the notion of allowing the ecclesiastical servants of the nation, whether they claimed to be independent of the nation or not, to prescribe to the nation how Divine worship should be conducted, and how all other Divine offices should be performed. No doubt, the nation, on that occasion, availed themselves of whatever clerical assistance they thought fit. They might have consulted all or any of the clergy, almost all Roman Catholics as they were, or both or either of those representative bodies of the clergy then in the habit of meeting for taxation; but if they had waited till the majority of the clergy, or of their two representative bodies, had approved of the Service Book which the nation adopted, the nation would have waited till this day.

*Nothing could be more simple or more obvious than this Elizabethan settlement upon which everything since has depended.* Nothing could be more honourable than the reciprocal relations in which the nation, on the one hand, and its ecclesiastical servants on the other, were to stand to each other. It was, in principle, the present constitutional relation of the Sovereign, on the one hand, and the nation on the other, as finally established by the Revolution of 1688—namely, a relation of reciprocal duties and promises. The great glory of a constitutional Sovereign is, to limit the exercise of his power within the bounds prescribed by the Constitution, and, while keeping within these bounds, to "preserve the people committed to his charge in wealth, peace, and godliness." The glory of the nation, on the other hand, is to obey the Sovereign, in all respects in which the Sovereign's powers can be constitutionally exercised; and to afford the Sovereign honour, emoluments, and affection, as the reward of the Sovereign's constitutional conduct.

It is in no respect obligatory upon any man to enter the ecclesiastical service of the nation, any more than to enter any other branch of the nation's service; but all national service is, necessarily, offered upon certain conditions; and if those conditions are accepted, they must be performed; and it is not competent to the person accepting them to assert that he alone has the right to construe them, a result which would be fatal to all the laws of every nation under heaven.

If it were established that the concurrence of the Convocations of the Clergy, or of either of those Convocations, is necessary

to any legislation affecting the order of Divine Service, or to the means of enforcing the existing national rights as to the conduct of it, the effect would be, to give to the Convocations a veto upon ecclesiastical legislation, equivalent to the power which the Crown has, of withholding the Royal Assent, and much more likely to be exercised than that Royal power is, and much more liable to unconstitutional abuse, inasmuch as it would be exercised without any responsibility; whereas the Ministers of the Sovereign may be impeached, if they acquiesce in the Sovereign's unlawful acts of State.

The possession of a veto, by the Convocations, upon all the ecclesiastical legislation of the Parliament, would *practically amount to giving to them the whole legislative power*, in all ecclesiastical matters; for it would be impossible but that some such matters would occasionally require legislation; and if the Convocations could put a veto upon it, by refusing their assent to it, *they could make whatever terms they pleased, as the price of withholding the veto, and giving the assent;* and that price might be, from time to time, such alterations in the public worship of the nation, and in other religious offices, and even in the Articles of Religion, as should, eventually, involve the whole power of prescribing the principles of religion and forms of public worship: *and thus the whole Reformation might be undone.*

The pretext for saying that, in matters affecting religion, the Convocations, and not Parliament, represent "the Church," by which seems to be meant, not only the clergy, but the nation itself, is probably derived from the declaration in the 139th of the Canons of 1603–4, which affirms that "the sacred Synod of this nation, in the name of Christ, and by the King's authority, assembled, is the true Church of England by representation"—a declaration absurd on the face of it, to any one who knows that the whole legislation of the country, from the accession of Queen Elizabeth (and even before) had proceeded on the assumption that the nation and the Church were absolutely *identical;* and not only absurd, but ridiculous, because it was a declaration of a body which was *self-elected, as far as the nation at large was concerned*, and yet presumed to declare that it represented the nation, which had had no share in the election of it, and had sent no representatives to it, and therefore was, in every sense, an absent body. To declare, in the absence of a body, that you represent it, when it has given you no authority to do so, is as great an absurdity as can well be supposed.

But what is "the sacred Synod of this nation"? This nation has had no such Synod since the days when Papal Legates were allowed to hold councils here. The English Constitution, since the Papal power in England ceased, knows of only one national Synod—namely, Parliament; but, evidently,

*that* is not the Synod which this canon calls national. The persons in whose name the canon speaks are merely a representative body of the beneficed clergy of the province of Canterbury. They are not even the clergy of the whole realm: nor do they represent the clergy of the whole realm. And even if the representative bodies of the beneficed clergy of the two provinces of Canterbury and York assembled themselves together in one Synod, they would derive no national authority from the fact of such an association; for the Constitution of the country recognizes neither the association nor the authority.

It is quite possible for inaccuracies of language to creep into authoritative documents, and even into Acts of Parliament; but such inaccuracies will easily be detected by comparison with those public documents which lay down fundamental principles; and one of the most clearly obvious fundamental principles which they do lay down, is the identity of the nation and Church of England; the consequence of which, necessarily, is, that "the Church," of which we have heard so much from pulpits, and read so much in books, as a body separate from "the State," or "the Realm,"—"bidding" us, "teaching" us, "instructing" us, "commanding" us,—is merely "the fabric of a vision;" and that the English Constitution recognizes but two Churches—namely, the "particular or national Church" of the 34th Article of Religion, which is identical with the nation, and the "Universal" or "Catholic" Church, which one of our prayers describes as consisting of "all they that do confess the holy name" of the Almighty, and another of them describes as "all who profess and call themselves Christians."

The national Prayer Book, with all its faults, few or many, real or supposed, is *our* property, as the people of the nation. What right can the Convocations of the Clergy have to take from us this Book, or any part of it, either by omission, alteration, or addition?

R. D. Craig.

## ART. IV.—MIDDLE CLASS EDUCATION.

MIDDLE Class Education is a very comprehensive expression; so comprehensive that many persons use it without realizing, in any practical sense, what it actually involves. No doubt, some vagueness must always attach to expressions which deal generally with social classification. Speakers and writers unwillingly fall into the error of Lady Georgiana, a charming hostess, who to some remonstrance

respecting the relative precedence accorded to certain guests, candidly replied, "I always regard that class of people as being all equal."

Masters of schools, on the other hand, find amongst that large portion of the English nation which is glibly spoken of as "the Middle Class," such variations of pecuniary means, and such *nuances* of social status, as render educational questions complex and difficult. Between the wage-earning and smallest shopkeeping classes, whose children are cared for by the Elementary Education Act, and the least wealthy of those who can afford to send their children to public schools, called First Grade Schools, the variety of grades and classes is astounding.

Practical men, however, can always be made to understand by figures such distinctions (whether relating to the Upper or the Middle Classes) as must ultimately be brought to the monetary test. Vague notions respecting either one or the other can thus be set right. Why, for instance, do we not accept, as a fair witness respecting the expenses of education at Eton, our wealthy acquaintance, Mr. Midas, when he boasts that his two boys there cost him £900 a year? Because we happen to know from our friend Sir John (who complains of the increased cost of Eton since he was there himself), that, for one after another of his sons, he secures the advantages of that ancient and religious foundation, at a cost of £210 per annum. Cautioned on one side, we must beware also of an opposite method of viewing matters. It is cheering to read the letter of an advocate of Middle Class Education, who points to an admirable school where lads can be boarded and taught for £40; while the religious teaching is definitely modelled upon the lines of the Church of England, in accordance with our own views. How abruptly are such cheerful prospects dashed to the ground, when we find that he is speaking only of a few clever lads, who can obtain scholarships at Trent College; and that the average inclusive cost of an ordinary lad there is £60 per annum. In fact, this admirable College is not a Middle Class School at all, in the proper sense of the term.

With the larger portion of Middle Class parents the monetary consideration is, and must be, a primary one. If the Church of England is to maintain any hold upon the great bulk of the Middle Classes, we must face the difficult task of providing boarding schools in which definite and distinct Church teaching may be secured, and at which the total expense to a parent may not exceed £18 or £21, in third-grade schools; nor be more than £40 to £50 per annum in those of the second grade. These sums should be thoroughly inclusive. Parents find, unhappily, how deceptive are those figures which state in guineas, separately, what is the charge for board, and

what are the tuition fees; without saying anything about the various charges for such necessities as washing, books, stationery, and a number of other items, which, although seldom quoted, find their way into the majority of bills sent to parents.

First-grade, or Public Schools, as they are commonly called, abound. Consequently, when a new one is started upon reasonably low terms, there is invariably a tendency to increase the charges as time goes on. This happens not merely because expenses increase, but because the school stands at the bottom of its class, and its status is bettered by higher terms. In Canon Woodard's first-grade school at Lancing, a boy's expenses may vary from £60 to £120, or more. Those Churchmen whose views are advocated in these pages have, now, one First-grade School which forms a parallel to Lancing; we mean Trent College. At present, while the average cost of a lad at Trent is £60, we do not hear of any higher *maximum* than £70. It is to be hoped that the customary advance in charges may not occur there.

Churchmen have now also an opportunity of establishing, as a Second-grade school, the *South-Eastern College* at Ramsgate, in which work has been actually commenced through the energy and generosity of the Dean of Canterbury, and a few colleagues in the South Eastern Clerical and Lay Alliance. There, distinctive Church teaching is a primary feature in the course; and the total cost to parents varies from £45 to £50 per annum. This school, if Churchmen come forward to make it permanent, will form only one small parallel, to the three large schools which Canon Woodard and his friends have established (at a cost exceeding £100,000) for nearly 700 boys at Hurstpierpoint, Denstone, and Taunton. In those three schools a very good education is given, coupled with the advanced Sacramental teaching of Canon Woodard and his coadjutors,[1] at a total cost

[1] The following extract from the pamphlet of Canon E. C. Lowe, Provost of Denstone, may be instructive to our readers:—"So much has been said about the system of Confession practised in our schools, that it is time in plain words to put on record a protest against the misstatements that are persistently made. The lawfulness of confession on occasions of scruple and doubtfulness before Communion was and is recognized by us as a Society that seeks neither to go beyond nor below the law of the Book of Common Prayer. The suspicion that might arise of undue influence over youthful minds, we have endeavoured to guard against by the following restriction, self-imposed from the very first, and only as such permissible, in view of the wider liberty allowed by the Church to her priesthood. No priest in our Society is allowed to hear boys' confessions except the Chaplain (unless for special reasons approved by the Provost), and his appointment is approved by the Bishop. Nor is the Chaplain at liberty to receive a boy's confession unless with his parents' knowledge and assent. Systematic confession has never been encouraged. I have known cases where a special confession has seemed

to parents of about £40 to £60 per annum. These are really "Middle Class" Schools.

Those who sympathize with the views advocated by THE CHURCHMAN, have never yet attempted to establish a Third-grade School, in which distinct Church teaching should form a marked feature of the school course. Yet Canon Woodard has been able to establish such schools, in the interest of those Church views which he holds: at Ardingly for 500 boys, and at Ellesmere for 200. In each of these schools the total cost of a boarder's education varies from £18 to £25 per annum. Such schools are greatly needed for the Middle Classes. Are Churchmen of our views justified in allowing Canon Woodard's schools to be the sole representatives of the Church of England, among that large and powerful section of the Middle Classes for whom such Third-grade Schools are required?

Here some readers may exclaim, "You are forgetting the Grammar Schools." Why ignore those old endowed schools, which are, in some cases, actually connected with our cathedrals, and must be bound to give religious teaching upon pure Church principles? Although the large endowments of Eton College have been so diverted to the use of the rich that it ordinarily costs about £210 per annum to keep a lad there (as it does at Harrow), yet surely their endowments must keep the Grammar Schools within reach of the Middle Classes? The monetary test, unfortunately, affords a reply which is both unsatisfactory and conclusive.

In very few, if any, of the Endowed Grammar Schools will a boarder cost his parents so little as he would at Trent College. In the majority of Grammar Schools, the annual inclusive charge will amount to £70 or £80 per annum. A few clever lads, by obtaining scholarships and exhibitions, lessen the expense to their parents; but they are merely exceptions. As a rule the Grammar Schools are above the reach of those who need Middle Class Education, properly so called.

The increase during the life of one generation alone, in the cost of education would, *primâ facie*, seem to be almost incredible.

---

to result in the grace of conversion. While on grounds of law and grace we are bound to make provision for this ordinance, we have not unfrequently, as a fact, been called upon by parents to see to their children following at school habits of confession which they have learned at home. These cases we treat as others. We adopt no special system for such; they are free to come to confession with their parents' consent, if they cannot otherwise communicate with a quiet conscience. No more inaccurate charge, I may say no more untruthful charge, was ever made against us than that systematic confession is encouraged among the boys of our schools."—"St. Nicholas College and its Schools; a Record of Thirty Years' Work in the effort to Endow the Church of England with a System of Self-supporting Public Boarding Schools," p. 27.

Forty years ago lads passed through Eton College, ordinarily, at a cost to their parents of about £90 per annum. Now, a boy at Tunbridge or Repton Schools, or at Marlborough College, or on the Britannia Training Ship, generally costs more than £100 per annum. At many of the more fashionable schools the expense is much larger.[1]

Thus, Middle Class Education is like the unfortunate man who between two stools comes to the ground. Parliament, by the Elementary Education Acts, has, with modern endowment, raised mainly among the middle classes (in rates and taxes), placed the wage-earning class upon a wide and comfortable stool for educational purposes. On it, however, the middle classes can find no place themselves. The other platform, or stool, of ancient endowment has, by the force of circumstances, mainly social, been elevated above their level. Nor is there any hope of its being brought within their reach; the tendency is quite the reverse.

The great need of doing something towards helping the cause which falls through, has been felt for a long period, on every hand. Nonconformists naturally, like the Society of Friends and others, took it in hand for their own religious bodies, more than a hundred years ago. On behalf of the Church of England, the Rev. Nicholas Woodard was the first to put his hand to the work, in 1848; and he was soon assisted by the Rev. E. C. Lowe. Those who differ widely from his theological views cannot but honour Canon Woodard's self-devotion to the cause of Middle Class Education, and ought to emulate his untiring industry. Would that they could rival his success. Thirty-four years ago, he commenced his work at Shoreham, in all humility. Now, he can point to buildings and land, worth more than half a million sterling, with which his untiring efforts have endowed the cause of High Church Education, among the Middle Classes.

The Charity Commissioners have done what they can; by diverting surplus funds from certain charities towards the endowment of Middle Class Education. At Borden, in Kent, for example, from the superabundant fund of Barrow's Charity, they have diverted above £12,000 to the erection of school buildings, laying out the surrounding grounds and roads of approach, and providing some endowment for the master.

[1] From an average struck between the two highest, the two lowest, and the two middle bills sent in during one year, we are told that the following sums show the annual average cost of a lad at: Wellington College, £132; Marlborough College, £127; Winchester College, £126; Uppingham School, £126; Rugby School, £123; Charterhouse School, £110; Repton School, £100; Rossall School, £89; Haileybury College, £80; Dover College, £72.

The scheme of this Barrow school at Borden is a good one. Religious teaching forms part of the *curriculum;* the masters are graduates of Oxford or Cambridge; and a sound education is given, which boarders secure at an inclusive charge of about £40 per annum; whereof £30 is for board. In cost and grade, therefore, this school is a parallel to those of Canon Woodard at Hurstpierpoint, Denstone, and Taunton. Its success, however, has been hindered by two unfortunate circumstances. The first of them tends to show that we must never expect much to be achieved for Middle Class Education by the Charity Commissioners. They requested certain gentlemen of position to act as Honorary Governors, and to superintend the whole work of building the school and carrying out the scheme. Unhappily, when the work was completed, these gentlemen resigned in a body, being unable to endure the treatment they received from the Commissioners.

Through some laxity or stupidity of the solicitor who first acted as paid secretary to the governors at Borden, more money was expended than the Commissioners had actually authorized. Although the funds of the Charity were ample, the Charity Commissioners positively forced these honorary governors to pay out of their own pockets the sum so expended, in excess, upon the school buildings and grounds. Thus, nine gentlemen found themselves involved in Chancery proceedings, and each of them was compelled to pay £87. As they were clergymen, and magistrates (one of whom represented the county in Parliament), all of them acting gratuitously, in the most disinterested manner, this action of the highly paid Charity Commission has caused so strong a feeling against the Commissioners that in the neighbourhood of the school no gentlemen of position have yet come forward to serve under them as governors. Consequently the school suffers. The second hindrance is one which can easily be removed. The middle and lower *strata* of the great "Middle Class" of society, will not send their children to a school which is "ticketed" as a Middle Class school. Canon Woodard has learned their feeling, in this matter; and, with his usual practical wisdom, his later schools, of the second grade, have been called "St. Chad's *College,* at Denstone," and "The King's *College,* at Taunton;" while the earlier school, founded as "St. John's Middle School, at Hurstpierpoint," is now spoken of as "St. John's College." The Barrow school at Borden must be called a college if it is to succeed. With all its great advantages of costly buildings and endowment it has only fifty-two scholars, while the newly-started South-Eastern College at Ramsgate, struggling under great difficulties, in hired houses, has already ninety scholars entered for its next term. If those who seek to educate the children of the Middle Classes, in

public schools, will not consult the feelings of the class which they desire to benefit, they had better leave the matter alone. To the old question, "What's in a name?" the reply, in this case, must be, "the difference between success and comparative failure."

Next in importance to the efforts made, by Nonconformists, and by the Charity Commissioners, to endow Middle Class Education, we may rank that undertaking which has effected such vast improvements in the teaching given in private adventure schools for the Middle Class. Probably no words can convey an adequate idea of the revolution produced, in such schools, by the work of the College of Preceptors, and by the Local Examinations of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In a similar way but, naturally, within a somewhat different area, the encouragement afforded to Middle Class Education by the Government Department of Science and Art, located at South Kensington, has been very great. The classes, lectures, and examinations, called into being by that Department, now form an attractive portion of the *curriculum* in many private adventure schools for the Middle Class.

In London and some large towns, day-schools for Middle Class children are beginning to arise under official, or semi-official, auspices of school-boards and other bodies; but in this article we are concerned more especially with Boarding Schools.

The Proprietary, or Joint Stock Company, principle has been utilized in Canon Brereton's scheme for establishing "County Schools," of the Second Grade. In these schools religious teaching is given upon a "Protestant" basis; but of such a character that Nonconformists and Churchmen can alike accept it without offence. The cost of board and education at these County Schools averages, in some about £35, and in others £40 to £45 per annum. The shareholders receive a dividend of about three per cent. Successful county schools of this nature have been established, for nearly twenty years in Devon (at West Buckland), in Suffolk (at Framlingham), in Surrey (at Cranleigh), in Bedford, in Norfolk, and in Dorset.

These Second-grade schools, upon the Proprietary system, are of great service to Middle Class Education generally; and Canon Brereton deserves our hearty thanks for his work as an educator of the people. Can Churchmen, however, be content to leave the religious teaching of the middle class—the class in which the power and government of our country is becoming centred, more and more, every year—upon such a basis that Nonconformists and Churchmen can alike accept it? Probably Canon Brereton, when he propounded his scheme, despaired of arousing Churchmen of moderate views to emulate Canon Woodard's admirable example. Consequently, rather than do

nothing for the cause, he would prefer to adopt the neutral Protestant platform.

Events have marched rapidly since his scheme was elaborated. The efforts of our Nonconformist friends have been untiringly directed, through various channels, in one uniform direction. We need not mention any other results than the Elementary Education Act, with its School Boards; and the Burials Act, with the various Bills by which efforts are already being made to "follow it up."

In view of things as they now exist, are moderate Churchmen satisfied with doing nothing? Can they remain, as they have been, inactive in the cause of distinct Church teaching for the children of the Middle Class? Can they, on the one hand, be justified in leaving the Church teaching of that class in the willing and able hands of Canon Woodard and his active coadjutors? Can they, on the other hand, be content that the Middle Class should have only that vague and colourless Protestant teaching, which is so skilfully manipulated by political Nonconformity to its own advantage; while secularism and sacerdotalism alike gather from it many victims?

Years ago, Mr. John Martin saw the need of action on our part. He commenced a movement, by which Churchmen who sympathize with us might have taken their due share in Middle Class education. A central fund of £20,000 was guaranteed; but no local effort could be aroused or stimulated; nothing was done. On the other hand, Canon Woodard, who began with his own local efforts, gradually aroused an interest among his fellow-Churchmen, which has attracted a central endowment, amounting in the whole to half a million sterling.

Churchmen who sympathize with us are now pursuing a better course. The local effort has been actually begun, in the diocese of Canterbury. A central fund must be gathered around that local effort, first, and then extend its operations into other dioceses, which can commence like local efforts. The central fund must, however, be rapidly raised, or the opportunity will be lost. The South-Eastern College, at Ramsgate, has been open for two years, under the auspices of the Dean of Canterbury, and his friends of the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Alliance. It is now struggling bravely for existence as a Second-grade school. It is making rapid progress; but it lacks, as yet, all that can give it permanence. The five houses which it occupies are all hired; its large schoolroom (50 feet by 35), its five class-rooms, its dormitory for 50 boys, and other accessory rooms, have been put up in a temporary manner only. Yet it had 74 boys during last term, and fresh entries for September will bring the number up to 90, most of them being boarders. Thus the need of the school, and the appreciation

of its work, are fully demonstrated. The Rev. E. D'Auquier, its energetic head, has gathered around him an efficient staff of eight assistant masters, and there is every encouragement to make the work permanent. For this purpose, however, more land must be purchased, permanent buildings must be erected; and, to provide for the reception of 200 boarders, at least £10,000 must be expended. The generosity of those who have enabled this "South-Eastern College" to be started, has already provided nearly one-third of this sum. It remains for those who sympathize with the views advocated in THE CHURCHMAN, to come forward energetically, and generously to raise the remainder. It behoves especially the various Clerical and Lay Associations, throughout England, to show their vitality by following up this movement for giving distinctive Church education to the Middle Classes. When they have set the South-Eastern College upon a firm foundation, by providing for it land and buildings, they must, from a central fund, do the same in other willing dioceses. The diocese of Liverpool, for instance, should be the site of such a school; and other dioceses would follow, in which local efforts may invite assistance from a central fund. If in any diocese so good a beginning can be made as has been achieved at Ramsgate by the South-Eastern College, there will be every encouragement for Churchmen, like-minded with us to support a central fund, which may form a nucleus whereby such schools may be endowed with buildings and land according to their requirements. A striking feature of the work already done at Ramsgate, as noticed by all visitors, is the happiness of the boys. Their frank, fearless look, their gentlemanly and Christian bearing, their courtesy to each other, and to all, have been remarked by many. One of the boys being asked why he was so happy in the South-Eastern College, replied, without a moment's hesitation, "Because we are a Christian school." Surely Churchmen who value the principles of the Reformation will gladly come forward with means for establishing and for extending a system of Middle Class schools, which, with definite Church teaching, produces so good a spirit in the boys.

Unhappily, the apathy hitherto displayed by our friends has been, perhaps unwittingly, encouraged by the recent letters of so good a Churchman as Lord Fortescue. The noble earl has at length acknowledged that he sympathizes with the effort to establish the South-Eastern College, and wishes it "God speed." His arguments, however, put forth in various forms during the past two years, will have been read and pondered by many who have not seen his more recent acknowledgment of the need of this school, and other such schools or colleges. It therefore becomes needful to examine those arguments, although Lord

Fortescue himself will, probably, not urge them again; certainly not in their wider and more general application. Others will take up the positions which he has generally abandoned.

In his pamphlet upon Middle Class Schools, put forth in 1880, Lord Fortescue enunciated two sentiments, which have pervaded his recent letters and arguments against the present movement made by Churchmen who value the principles of the Reformation. He spoke of

> the exclusive Church character to be given to schools as tending, in the first place, to increase the separation caused by religious differences between boys of much the same age and social standing, instead of accustoming those boys to grow up harmoniously together from childhood; and tending, in the second place, to provoke Nonconformists to establish equally narrow and sectarian schools for themselves (p. 13).[1]

With respect to the latter sentiment, surely, in the year of grace 1882, no one needs to be informed that our Nonconformist friends, so numerous among the middle classes of society, have long ago, most wisely, established schools for themselves. They cannot learn from us, if we set up schools on distinctly Church principles, nor can they be provoked by us in that matter. It is rather we who must learn from them; we had almost said it is we who should be provoked by their successful example in this respect. They, many years ago, solved for themselves the question of Middle Class education; to a very great extent Second and Third-grade schools are in their hands. At the close of this article we will give some statistics of their schools.

With respect to Lord Fortescue's advocacy of the neutral Protestant platform, on which, for instance, the County Schools are established, thoughts of a graver and more saddening kind crowd upon our memory. What do we learn from the events of the last forty years? Whence have come many leaders of a movement called the Catholic Revival; from what nurseries, from what schools? How often have we been, how often are we still, pained to see children of distinguished Evangelical Churchmen, clerical or lay, leading religious movements to which their sires were or would have been vehemently opposed? When perversions to Rome were more common than happily they now are, was it not saddening and perplexing to see such harvests reaped in soil which we had supposed would receive nothing but Protestant seed. Surely such deviations from paternal example, such desertion of the colours beneath which childhood and youth had been spent, betoken some great lack of definite religious training, either at school, or at home, or in both. Cannot the

[1] "Public Schools for the Middle Classes," by Earl Fortescue, Patron of the Devon County School, and a Trustee of Cavendish College, Cambridge. London: W. Ridgway. 1880.

changed opinions of men who were bred in homes where Reformation principles were valued, be traced very often to the fact that (as Lord Fortescue wished) they were accustomed to grow up harmoniously with lads of other views, in comparative ignorance of the vital points on which Churchmen differ from those outside her pale, on one side or on the other? Did not many thus become an easy prey for those who, in the strongest light, put before them certain points on which they had not been taught to value our Church above the religious sects outside her? They experienced the natural revulsion from one extreme to the other, and were carried on to an undue and exaggerated regard and reverence for those matters respecting which they had not been duly instructed in youth. When thinking of the effect of neutral Protestant teaching upon our lads, we are forcibly reminded of an expression recently used by the Bishop of Ballarat, at a meeting over which the Archbishop of York presided. He begged that the Church at home would refrain from sending out to his Australian diocese any clergymen who were either mentally or physically "flabby." If the religious training in a Middle Class school be such that it can be accepted by Churchmen and non-Churchmen alike, must it not be of that nature which the Bishop of Ballarat characterized by the expressive word we have quoted? Certainly it must with respect to Church principles.

In two great centresof Middle Class population Dr. Hook and Canon Miller worked contemporaneously. Both of them secured the respect and goodwill of Nonconformists; but at first their methods were utterly diverse. Dr. Miller found, however, that his harmonious working with non-Churchmen was, like England's free trade, without reciprocity. His friends never missed a chance of scoring against him off their own bat, because he often assisted their score with his. Dr. Miller consequently withdrew from the position and method which he had at first adopted. In the matter of Middle Class education, should we not rather be influenced by Dr. Miller's experience and example than by the arguments put forth two years ago by Lord Fortescue.

May it not be true that many good Churchmen who value Reformation principles are too apt to ignore or undervalue the progress of events? In many things in the past, and with many even now, as in the elections for Convocation, so in other matters, by standing aside and refusing to use the powers placed within their reach Evangelical Churchmen permit a current of influence contrary to their own to carry everything before it. Devoutly is it to be hoped that Midddle Class education may no longer be allowed to furnish an instance of such shortsightedness. The passive apathy of large numbers of Churchmen who value Reformation principles has often paralyzed the active influence

of the whole body. Lord Shaftesbury long ago illustrated the effect, by comparing their action to the dispersion of marbles turned out from a bag. Surely in the matter of Middle Class education this tendency may be overcome. The time for discussion has passed. A rallying point has been found. Let the South-Eastern College be rendered a permanent institution by means of "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether." Then will that active principle spread and extend itself in other directions, until in the next generation the bag of marbles will be found to be influenced by centripetal forces instead of wasting all energy in centrifugal weakness. Let us ever remember that the successes of Churchmen who hold views opposed to ours in doctrine and Church polity have been obtained, not by force of numbers, but by cordial co-operation, by perfect organization, by unfaltering use of every opportunity, by keeping well abreast of the spirit of the age, by heeding and striving to guide incipient currents of feeling and opinion.

We have already seen what Canon Woodard has effected, during his own lifetime, for the cause of High Church teaching among the Middle Classes. We have observed that he can now point to buildings and land occupied by his schools, upon which half a million sterling, raised by his energy, has been expended. Let us now seek to ascertain what has been done, on the other hand, by Nonconformists for their own religious systems. It is difficult to arrive at clear and undoubted facts and figures respecting multitudes of Second and Third-grade Schools in England, but there is one religious body which seems to surpass all others in supplying methodical records and analytical statistics of their schools. We mean the Society of Friends. That body possesses twelve Middle Class schools,[1]—eight in England and four in Ireland—accommodating altogether 1,152 children—mainly, if not entirely, consisting of boarders.

These Quaker schools have sent forth many alumni who have achieved high distinction in the world. Leading men at the bar (including one who is now a judge in Her Majesty's High Court of Justice); physicians of eminence; architects and antiquaries (like Rickman, who devised the popular nomenclature of Gothic architectural styles); authors, like William Howitt and Amelia Opie; Members of Parliament in numbers far beyond the proportion borne by their Society to the population of the kingdom; have sprung from these schools. Prime Ministers, like Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone, have been glad to call to the innermost recesses of Government alumni of

[1] At Ackworth, Saffron Walden, Sidcot (Somerset), Wigton, Rawden, Penketh, Sibford, Ayton, Waterford, Mountmellick, Lisburn, and Brookfield.

these Quaker schools. Mr. Bright's name occurs to all, but we believe that Mr. Forster also received his education at one of those schools. Thus we can all judge respecting the efficiency of the training they give for practical life. Let us examine the admirably analyzed and published statistics.

Ackworth School, in which Mr. Bright and other distinguished "Friends" received their education, has been 103 years in existence, and during that period nearly 10,000 scholars have passed through the school. It now accommodates 290 boarders (170 boys and 120 girls). During the past year its total expenditure averaged only £31 19*s.* 1*d.* for each child. We thus see how little a school can be worked for, when once it has its site and buildings provided as an endowment. The preliminary expenditure of large capital upon site and buildings is, however, a *sine quâ non*.

The payments made by parents were proportioned to their means, according to a fixed scale, comprising five different rates. The highest charge did not exceed that of a Second-grade School, £40 per annum. The lowest is that of a Third-grade School, £15 per annum. Between these, however, there are other rates—viz., £20, £26, and £32. Nearly 100 of the children paid the lowest rate, £15, and about 50 paid each of the higher rates. The average sum thus received, per child, was therefore £24 9*s.* 8*d.* The deficit of £7 10*s.* per child (amounting altogether to about £2,175) was supplied by income derived from the school's invested property, and by voluntary contributions, in nearly equal proportions.

To keep their teaching well up to the mark, the Ackworth Committee devoted £40, in 1881, to the cost of a Cambridge Examiner, and of a special inspector nominated by the Senate of the London University. Latin and French are taught, while for technical education and science there is a boys' workshop and a laboratory. Yet this school is practically nothing more than what we should call a Second and Third-grade School amalgamated into one.

The "Friends" schools at Saffron Walden and at Sidcot, which are smaller than that at Ackworth, accommodate 150 and 115 scholars respectively. In the Sidcot school the average of the payments made by parents was £27 14*s.* 10*d.* per child; and the expenditure at this school averaged £33 5*s.* 6*d.* per child. The actual payments made by parents for each child seem to have been graduated on the same scale as at Ackworth; and the deficit was supplied from similar sources.

These figures are valuable as showing the minimum cost of such an education as those very practical people, "the Friends," consider that every child of the Middle Class ought to receive. During 1881, on the Third-grade scale of £15 to £20 per

annum, no less than 352 children were received. Sums varying from £20 per annum up to their actual cost were paid by 437 children. Only 80 paid more than the actual cost of their board and education.

Thus, the majority of those children are being positively elevated in the social scale; and society at large reaps the benefit of this good leaven thus sent forth from the Quaker schools at Ackworth, Saffron Walden, Sidcot, and elsewhere.

To accomplish this, however, the members of the Society of Friends have been obliged to subscribe liberally, from the commencement of their schools, a century ago, up to the present time. The school at Ackworth possesses an estate worth £34,810. It comprises 269 acres of land, part of which is let as a farm. On the other portion stand the school premises and buildings, which alone are worth £11,100; and there is also a boarding-house and other premises, worth £7,580 more.

In the Annual Report on Ackworth School, dated "fifth month, 1882," we find the following sentence—remarkable alike for the sentiment enunciated, and for the terms in which it is couched. The Quaker Committee says: "The Church owes a duty to its members in providing a sound education for their children, fully abreast of the requirements of the times, combined with a moral and Christian influence, which shall re-act to the advantage of the Church herself."

No words could better convey the opinion which we earnestly desire to impress upon those Churchmen who sympathize with us in their devotion to Reformation principles. We venture to ask whether our neglect of such direct influence, upon the education of Middle Class children, has not already re-acted to the disadvantage of the Church. We would press upon our friends the duty, before it is too late, of striving to rescue the rising generation of the Middle Classes from merely neutral Protestant teaching, as well as from that so-called Catholic teaching which the Woodard schools so generously supply.

To those who sympathize with us we would say: "If the Friends have endowed Ackworth School with more than £34,000; if Canon Woodard has raised £500,000 for the schools set on foot by him, will you allow the present opportunity of establishing your own Middle Class schools to pass away, for lack of the comparatively paltry sum of £7,000 or £8000, needed for establishing the South-Eastern College on a permanent basis? Will you not rather supplement that Second-grade School by another of the Third-grade in the same district; and then proceed to extend the effort by groups of such schools in other districts, wherever local effort can be stimulated? Surely in various dioceses our friends will follow the energetic example of the Dean of Canterbury and Mr. Deacon, of Mr. Campbell

Colquhoun and Mr. C. S. Plumptre, by boldly starting schools similar to the South-Eastern College, and thus wipe away from our brethren the reproach of neglecting the education, on Church lines, of the middle classes. *Bis dat qui cito dat;* may God speed the good work.

W. A. Scott Robertson.

## Art. V.—THOUGHTS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE.

THE forthcoming Congress (at Nottingham) of the Association for the Promotion of Social Science, suggests, as being opportune, the title of this paper. A reason should be given, no doubt, for what at first may seem to require explanation. Why choose the pages of The Churchman for such a subject as Social Science? What has Social Science to do with the Church, or the Church with Social Science? These are reasonable questions; and a reply will be forthcoming.

But, first of all, a misapprehension respecting the scientific character of this subject must be challenged. There are those who deny that Social Science is a science at all. It is, however, essential to that serious consideration of the question which I desire for it, that its scientific character should be considered as at least possible. Those who deny this can quote high authority, but authority as high can be quoted against them. It certainly looks rather formidable when, at the twenty-third anniversary of the Association for the Promotion of this Science (1879), the president, no less a person than the Bishop of Manchester, and he no mean authority on social questions, was careful to disown its scientific character. The term, Social Science, said he, is

> A misleading one, as claiming a measure of certainty for your conclusions, and a predictive power for your principles, which has not been attained, and I do not believe to be attainable.

Another authority, however, can be quoted on the opposite side. Fortunately, it is again a Bishop who speaks. On a similar occasion, in a sermon delivered to the members of the same Association assembled in Birmingham, the Bishop of Worcester spoke with equal confidence on this very point. His words are almost all that I could wish:—

> There are laws of social science [said he], moral laws established by the Creator, to regulate the well-being of men in communities.

Omit the word "moral" as likely to be misunderstood, and as limiting too much, and therefore injuriously, the range of

social forces. Also for the same reason read "being" instead of "well-being," so as to include *all* being, whether well or ill, and I need ask no more. His lordship went on to say of these "laws of social science":—

> They are as simple, as sure, and uniform, as those which govern and keep in order the physical world—laws as capable of being discovered as physical laws, and by the same method, collecting facts with care, arranging and classifying them, finding out sequences of cause and effect, and testing by experiment—pursuing this course patiently and perseveringly, slowly it may be, but yet wisely, and with cautious steps, until, if God so bless their labour, they will at length be rewarded by the moral certainty of a well-established law.

These weighty sentences are a testimony that is not doubtful on the question at issue. The opinion being also that of one who was the Senior Wrangler of his year, makes it certain that he knew the meaning of the word Science. Let me make but the two slight verbal alterations that I have indicated, and I will accept this as a full statement of all that I contend for. Nevertheless, since this exalted position for Social Science is at present called in question, I am not at liberty to do more than adopt it as my own conviction. The probability—the almost certainty—is that, if not from the presidential chair on this the coming twenty-fifth anniversary, yet by the press as representing public opinion, the Bishop of Manchester's view will be the one almost universally accepted. Social Science will be tolerated as a convenient means of airing hobbies but nothing more. For this reason, and also because the subject is so vast in its range, and because a thoroughly satisfactory exposition of it is far beyond my powers, though I cannot do otherwise than speak positively as being my own conviction, I shall not pretend to do more than offer some "thoughts" for consideration. My ambition is not higher than this—to induce thoughtful men to think. If I succeed thus far I shall be abundantly satisfied.

Five-and-twenty years ago, nay more, for it was before the formation of the Social Science Association (1857), this was my own position. I began to think—Perhaps there is such a science as Social Science. If, then, this thought is seriously awakened in others, I can anticipate nothing less than that in them also in due time the thought will ripen into conviction as firm as mine. The conviction not only that Social Science is a science, but that amongst the sciences it holds a very chief place; last in order, 'tis true, but only last in time of its birth, and in comprehensiveness, in importance, in practical utility, in wondrous exhibition of the wisdom of God, second to none! This will be the best place for saying that in selecting the pages of THE CHURCHMAN for these "thoughts" a more than possible advantage is looked for.

First, for the Church itself. Social Science is a subject for all thinkers; but there are none whom it more concerns to think about, and I will add, to believe in "Social Science," in these perilous times, than sound "Churchmen."

Yet, again, for the sake of the science itself, I wish to gain the ear of true Churchmen. None are in a better, none perhaps are in so good a position to supply to Social Science an element —the religious element—thus far, too often conspicuous by its absence. I desire nothing more earnestly in regard to Social Science than that the religious element should be supplied. It would tend more than aught else to give stability to the science, and to advance it to its rightful position of pre-eminence.

I shall best adapt myself to the present condition of public opinion on the subject, and yet be able to speak with all confidence, if I assume towards my reader the relation of guide, inviting him to follow me over the course which I myself have travelled during the last five-and-twenty or thirty years. I shall tell how it was that I was first led to think upon the question, and then how, by imperceptible degrees, by steps almost identical with those indicated by the Bishop of Worcester, I found myself in possession of laws—laws which could be tested, and which, when necessary, were modified by further observation and experiment.

At the outset, let it be noted, that a certain preparedness of mind, a mental aptitude to seize upon Social phenomena is a pre-requisite. In this, as in other sciences, there are "eyes and no eyes." This "social" faculty of observation is, however, easily acquired, but not so easily as not to require care. Even now I find it necessary to be careful, or I should make mistakes in regard to what are social phenomena, and what are not. At the time to which I look back as being my first step in Social Science, this faculty was very feeble. Lord Derby—then Lord Stanley—was my first preceptor. I have no means at hand of refreshing my memory as to the date nor as to the exact words that he uttered. It is enough to record the fact that at a gathering of savants at a meeting of the Statistical Society, his lordship pointed out some of the great uses of statistics. Instead of depreciating them by saying, as many do, that a man may prove anything by statistics (a remark which, after all, does not amount to more than saying that it is possible to make a bad use of good tools), Lord Derby took the opportunity of encouraging his hearers and dwelling upon the value of their labours. Accordingly his remarks left upon my mind the impression that even bare statistics might be made useful to an extent little dreamt of by the most sanguine; that, in fact, laws may be educed from them of incalculable value. Whether his lordship meant as much as this I cannot say. Thoughtful men

not unfrequently express thoughts in words which have a far wider significance than they wot of at the time of utterance. Social Science is probably "one of the many instances in which the intentions of the mind have preceded inquiry, and gone in advance, leaving nothing for systematic investigation to do but to confirm by formal operations that which has already been felt and known."[1] Be this as it may, Lord Derby's sagacious words set me thinking of things socially, and gave me just a glimmer of the extensive field that from that day forward has from time to time opened before me as the domain of Social Science—a region with ever-increasing and practically interminable bounds.

With this introduction, the first Social problem that arrested my attention was supplied by an observation of the Registrar-General. It is his province to deal with a few, and those very simple, facts, but to deal with them in masses, to deal with "men in communities," as the Bishop of Worcester so well expresses it. Men are collected together in groups of thousands and hundreds of thousands, under a few simple headings—births, deaths, and marriages. In regard to one of these groups, that of marriages, he noticed a very striking coincidence—viz., that the number of weddings in any given quarter of the year varies inversely as the price of corn. When corn is cheap marriages are many; when corn is dear they are comparatively few. This, so far as I can remember, was my first study in Social Science. In it, as will afterwards appear, may be seen the working of a social law.

Chambers, in one of his useful volumes of "Information for the People," supplied me with a second social study. The writer remarks that the shops in Regent Street are almost, without exception, entered on a level with the pavement; and he hazards the computation that a single step, to be surmounted before entering one of the large establishments in that street, would make in the profits a difference to the proprietors of a hundred a year.

A third social lesson was presented to me at the home of one of Rob Roy's first Shoeblack Brigades. Amongst the many sagacious arrangements of the establishment this one in particular was made note of by my newly acquired social faculty. The earnings of each boy day by day are divided into three equal portions—one part is taken by the establishment as a contribution to the general expenses; a second is put into the savings' bank to form a fund, which, when the boy is ready to go out into the world, is something to begin with; and the third is allowed him for his daily food. It was this third portion

[1] Duke of Argyll's "Unity of Nature," *Contemporary Review*, 1860.

which suggested to me the following inquiry. Suppose the boy earns half a crown, he can claim tenpence for himself; but boys will be boys, and temptations of a certain kind are very strong to fallen man, and specially, perhaps, to boys; so I put this very probable case to the Manager. If the boy earns three shillings and gives you only half a crown, how can you detect the dishonesty? He said we soon find it out by the simple plan of changing the boys about. We have a number of fixed stations in different parts of London. On an average a given station, under similar circumstances of weather, &c., which we know by experience will affect our returns, brings in the same amount every day; so by changing the boys we soon detect impositions. Taking into consideration the many little circumstances that might prevent any individual passer-by from having his boots "shined" at one particular place, that the average number stopping, say, at the Royal Exchange day by day should be the same, is a remarkable fact and suggests the action of law. To explain it by saying that it is an illustration of the doctrine of averages, by which also a number of other striking results are determined, is to state the fact only in another form. I suggest, as being possibly a better explanation, that the phenomenon is due to the action of a number of social laws, and amongst them of the one to which I have already twice alluded. But before leaving the Shoeblack Brigade I call to mind another yet more simple illustration of its action. Another device has lately been adopted which has evidently the same object. Besides the check upon the boys, or, speaking more strictly, the test of their honesty supplied by changing their stations, a direct means of helping them to be honest has been introduced. This is by making the shoe-block serve also as the money-box. The penny dropped into the nick is at once put out of harm's way.

My tailor was my fourth instructor. It had been a very wet season, and with my sympathies awakened in behalf of the agricultural interest, the proverb occurred to me, "it is an ill wind which blows nobody any good"—tailors, at any rate, will profit by wet weather. So without further consideration I said to him, "this weather, which is so bad for the farmers, must at least be good for you, it is so ruinous to clothes." His reply immediately was "you make a great mistake, tailors are quite as much sufferers as farmers by wet weather; when it rains people do not care what they wear, if only they are *not* wearing new clothes."

Such illustrations as these might be multiplied indefinitely: when one's thoughts are once put upon the social tracks, illustrations come to hand every day and many times a day. The penny post; the railway system, in its many different departments; all missionary, philanthropic and commercial projects;

difficulties, financial and others, that threaten sometimes the very existence of time-honoured institutions, such, for instance, as the squabble at Guy's Hospital; controversies in Church and State; customs; fashions in general society, or in different professions, &c. &c., are all social phenomena. In fact, wherever and under whatever circumstances, voluntary or involuntary, people are brought to act "in communities," whether it be accidentally, as in the four instances that I have named or of set purpose, as in some of these just named, be the numbers as few as two, or as many as make up a whole nation, social phenomena may be observed, and they are the resultants of the action of social laws.

Taking simply the four examples given—not because they are the most striking, nor, perhaps, the best that could have been selected, but simply because they were the first that came to hand (any other such would have served equally well), the first thing to be learned from them is this, that they are the acts of "men in communities." This may be received as an axiom in social science. It has to do with societies, with associations. With individuals it has, strictly speaking, no direct concern; though individuals, as in the second example, may make use of it if they please. A man is married without ever consciously thinking of the price of corn. A lady buys a piece of ribbon for her bonnet without at all noticing the number of steps into the shop she enters. Rob Roy's choice of a money-box to help his shoeblacks to be honest, has in view not one boy in particular, but the whole troupe. I order a new coat, guided, as I think, wholly by my own free will. I order it when I please, and where I please. All this is true, but it is no less true that the acts of these "men in communities" are determined by circumstances, often times wholly external to themselves, and practically independent to their will.

This seeming antagonism between social law and individual free will has probably done more than anything else to hinder godly, sober-minded people from even thinking about Social Science. When they hear of an average of so many murders in a country every year, and are told that this is in accordance with social law, they are horrified, as if it had been said that a certain individual could not help committing murder. Similarly when they read that during the last ten months the number of accidents in the streets of London has fallen short of the average, and that in the next two months the number will certainly be made up, and that this is to be explained by Social Science, they regard it as almost tantamount to a denial of God's providence. But this is not so. It is as Holy Scripture says: not a sparrow falls to the ground without the permission of our Heavenly Father; and also every individual will have to give an account

to a righteous Judge of his own acts; and yet there are, as may be seen in these four examples, and as will be seen still more plainly in other instances that I shall give, laws which produce the several results. The truth as to Social Science and free will seems to be this—man individually is a free agent; man collectively is the creature of circumstances. I do not, of course, mean to say that the individual is wholly uninfluenced by the circumstances that surround him, but the influence in any one case is so small that his will is practically free. It is time now that I should state plainly the social law to which I have more than once made allusion. Two words will suffice. TENDENCIES TELL. In all social phenomena, however many may be the laws involved, this one is sure to be in operation. It may, therefore, fitly be distinguished by this first place, and be called the first law of Social Science. It is very much the same as the law in physics, that every cause produces an effect.

It will not wholly escape observation that the second example which I have given is not only an illustration of the action of this law, but is a proof of the advantage of acting according to its teaching.

The immense practical importance of this law to us as Churchmen, as well as some striking illustrations of its working in such efforts as the establishment of coffee-houses, &c., I leave for a subsequent paper. Also, pursuing the same historical method of my own progress, I shall be able to mention other laws which are no less remarkable than this one for their utility and for their extreme simplicity and beauty.

As to this one—Tendencies tell—I venture to say, that the careful observance of it on the one hand, or the neglect of it on the other, is the primary cause of all the successes and of all the failures in human undertakings that ever have occurred or ever will.

WILLIAM OGLE.

## Reviews.

*Authorized or Revised?* Sermons on some of the Texts in which the Revised Version differs from the Authorized. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Dean of Llandaff and Master of the Temple. Pp. 330. Macmillan & Co. 1882.

A NEW volume of sermons by Dr. Vaughan is always welcome. Of earnest, devout, and thoughtful Christians not a few, probably, scarcely ever read a sermon. There is no doubt whatever that a large proportion of published sermons fail to find readers, and prove financially unsuccessful. They contain no teaching thoughts, it is said, and the language is conventional; a whole discourse is not worth a page of Blunt

or Cecil. Yet really good sermons, of more than one type, are largely read with interest and profit. The eloquent Baptist preacher of Manchester, Dr. Maclaren, writes for a much greater circle than that of his own congregation. Canon Clayton's "Parochial Sermons," rich in wholesome teachings, have been widely read. Many others might be named. Dean Vaughan's sermons, like all his writings, reveal thought and labour; their literary finish, indeed, is as remarkable as their earnestness and force; and his style, no doubt, has peculiar charms for "cultured" readers. Nevertheless, as a sermon-writer, he never forgets the solemn responsibilities of his work. Hence, his sermons never read like essays; the tone is spiritual; and many passages, though the eloquence is simple and quiet, are in the best sense of the word impressive. Their circulation shows that they are eminently readable; and it is probable that the present volume will be as widely welcomed, as earnestly, gratefully studied, as its predecessors.

About the Revised Version, when considered as claiming to oust or supersede the Authorized Version, we are not able to go quite as far as the honoured author of the sermons before us. The question of the Greek text, as we judge, is extremely serious, and it is not ripe for settlement. Again, on not a few important renderings—to say nothing of changes which are not important—if the question be asked, Authorized or Revised? our own answer, we must confess, will unhesitatingly be, Authorized. On many of the points which he has touched we have in THE CHURCHMAN expressed our opinion; and we are glad to find ourselves, as a rule, in complete agreement with so accurate and judicious a scholar.

In his first sermon, "Personality of the Gospel," the Dean defends the New Version, 1 Tim. iii. 16—"great is the mystery of godliness; *He who* was manifested in the flesh . . . . " The alteration was made, he says, "on evidence which convinces all but a few who will keep at all costs a favourite argument." For ourselves, we may confess we were loth to assent to the alteration; but the evidence against the Authorized Version, patiently and without prejudice considered, seems overwhelming. At allevents, it has satisfied such conservative scholars of the highest rank as Bishop C. Wordsworth and Dr. Scrivener. There is no difficulty, grammatical or otherwise, in the rendering "*mystery . . . . He who.*" The Dean's remarks on the Personality of our religion may well be quoted. He says:—

> There be many that say, The Gospel is a *thing*—a good thing, a pious thing, a moral and even a rational thing—a thing which would make us all better men, if we walked in its precepts. There be many that say *more* than this—The Gospel is a revelation, a revelation of truth and doctrine—telling us of God manifest in the flesh, with many great inferences and momentous consequences—embodied in Creeds, formularies, and Catechisms—let us earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered.
>
> But the Revised Version of the New Testament says *this* to us—and if it were its only change, it would have been worth ten years of labour—The mystery of godliness, the revealed secret which has in it "reverence," the right feeling and attitude of the soul towards God, its Author and Object of being, is a Person—Incarnate, justified, attested, heralded, believed, glorified—a Person whom to know is life, whom to serve is freedom. He is not a doctrine, nor a book, nor a Creed, nor a Church—He is a Person. Do you hear Him speak? Do you speak to Him? . . . .

Dr. Vaughan's discourse on St. John v. 35-40, is excellent. That the Authorized Version "a burning and a shining light" is grammatically incorrect no scholar will deny; it is also exegetically incomplete. Whether the Revised Version, "Ye search the Scriptures . . . ." is, all things considered, better than the Authorized Version, "Search . . . ."

seems doubtful; but this discourse admirably unfolds the lessons of the indicative rendering.

The Dean's defence of the new renderings in what Traill called "the Lord's Prayer" (John xvii.), is by far the fullest and most persuasive which we have seen. The exposition of verse 2, for instance, "*that whatsoever* (all that thing which) *Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life*," is fresh, forcible, and suggestive. Nor is the rebuke administered to critics of a certain class, or rather of two classes, at all uncalled for. Anyhow, those who hold high views of Inspiration, cannot consistently sympathize with objections to this or that exact rendering which, when examined, are simply objections (1) that the rendering is unfamiliar, (2) that the language seems not so musical. The Greek text of verse 2, says the Dean, has unquestionably the singular neuter and the masculine plural combined in the manner represented by the Revised Version:—

Every one admits that there is a difficulty in reproducing this in English. Not more of harshness than there is in the Greek—but still a harshness. The fastidious ear, the facile tongue, the superficial mind, to which all must at any cost be made smooth and level, naturally cry out against the literal translation. They like better the Authorized Version, which sacrifices one-half the saying, to make the rhythm pleasing and the general idea transparent. Even those who are capable of construing the original profess to be actually perplexed and puzzled by the new rendering. So impatient are men of a moment's pause in their cursory survey of Divine truth. I will dare to say that the intricacy is in the thought—is in the Divine Prayer and the Divine Inspiration. . . . . The two thoughts—the body and its members, the Church and the Christian, "the bride of the Lamb" and the "great multitude that no man can number,"—are in the Prayer of the Lord, are in the Greek original; is it not worth something, some sacrifice (if it must be) of smoothness and commonness, and pellucid transparency, to retain both in "the tongue wherein we were born?

On verse 11, Authorized Version, "keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou . . . ." Revised Version, "keep them in *Thy Name which* Thou hast given me," the Dean's remarks are full of interest. Together with this comment may be read his exposition of "in [not *at*] the name of Jesus," the second chapter of Philippians ii., the tenth verse. His remarks on the whole passage of that chapter, verses 5–10, teaching the humiliation and exaltation of Christ, are clear and cogent. The Authorized Version, "thought it not robbery . . . ." we have long felt, ignores the ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκ. . . —the emphatic *but*.[1] In other respects, indeed, the Revised Version is more precise and pointed.

In his sermon on St. John v. 44, (receive *glory* one of another) the Dean brings out the meaning of "honour" as distinguished from "glory." St. Paul says "Render honour to whom honour is due"; and St. Peter says "Honour all men." St. Paul never said, "Give glory to whom glory is due;" nor St. Peter "Give glory to all men."[2]

Honour is respect—the recognition of the claim of position, or of the claim of character, or of that humanity itself which was made in God's likeness, to our regard and consideration as such. We see the difference when we read of the impious flattery paid to a worthless king, who was instantly smitten by the angel because he gave not God the glory. . . . . The word of the Lord is true, that much of that which men give to, and expect from, one another, is, being

[1] "Being (originally) in the form of God, he did not count it . . . . . but emptied. . . . ." Whether "prize" is the best word may be doubted.

[2] The word δόξα is, for precise translators, a rather difficult word; and we should have been glad if the Dean had made some allusion to St. Luke xiv. 10—"Then shalt thou have *glory* in the presence of all that sit at meat with thee" (CHURCHMAN, p. 378).

examined, not honour, but glory. It is the ascription of an excellence of some sort, not derived but inherent, to the being which was created, the being which has sinned, the being which must die.

The construction in the original, we may remark, is worthy of note. "How can *you* (ὑμεῖς) believe, *seeing that* ye receive . . and seek not. . ." The transition from the participle to the tense gives force. The other portion of the verse ought to be translated, as Dean Vaughan points out, "the glory that cometh from *the only God* (τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ) ye seek not." There is but one Person who has light to emit, who has excellence to manifest.

In the sermon "Enough and to spare," the Dean defends the rendering of St. John vi. 12, "gather up *the broken pieces which remain over;*" "broken pieces" instead of "fragments,"—not a gratuitous innovation, but a real improvement, as we pointed out last year (CHURCHMAN, vol. iv. p. 375). The Dean's remarks, throughout, are excellent. "The 'broken pieces,'" he says, "are not crumbs or leavings at all—they are the portions dispensed by the creative hand of Christ, as He furnished from the invincible store the separate supplies for the individual guests." Thus,

> "*Gather up the broken pieces*" calls attention to the generosity of grace, and bids us take notice of the boundless stores upon which we may draw without stint or limit in all the exigencies and emergencies of the inward and outward being. See, it says to us, how the Lord, having five thousand hungry men before Him, with five barley loaves and two small fishes as His only visible starting-point, was not perplexed and not straitened in furnishing forth His tables, but had twelve hampers full left over, when all had partaken—not of waste fragments, and not of coarse, unhewn material, but of definite portions, nicely and neatly broken, ready for the use of tens and hundreds more if they had been there to want, to ask, and to receive. "Gather up the superfluous portions," that you may learn to estimate aright the omnipotent hand, and to appreciate the superhuman grace and love which moves it.

On several other passages in these deeply interesting sermons we should gladly have made a brief comment; but our space is exhausted. The book is a valuable one; and we trust, with the Master's blessing, it may do great good service.

As to type and paper the volume is charming.

---

*The Friendship of God; and other Meditations upon Holy Scripture.* By the late Rev. HENRY WRIGHT, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Hon. Sec. of the C. M. S., and Minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead. Pp. 350. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.

"HAVING been requested by the family of my late beloved friend, Henry Wright, to edit a memorial volume of his manuscript sermons, I sought and obtained permission to make a selection of two or three from the many touching notices which appeared at the time of his death."

We have quoted the opening sentence of the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth's editorial preface in the volume before us. The first of the biographical notices thus referred to was written by the Rev. Walter Abbott, Vicar of Paddington; it embodies much of a valuable paper in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* of September, 1880. The third extract is from a letter written by the Editor himself, Mr. Bickersteth, giving personal reminiscences of his intercourse with Mr. Wright during the years 1872–80, at Hampstead; and to this charming letter is appended an *In Memoriam*, by the same polished pen, which opens thus:—

And has the Master call'd thee to His rest,
O man, greatly beloved and rested on,
As husband, father, pastor, kinsman, friend,
A leader of the heralds of the cross,
In the ripe fulness of thy strength ?

At the time when he was so suddenly taken away we desired to have a biographical notice of Henry Wright in THE CHURCHMAN, a magazine in which, as he told us, he took great interest.[1] But from one or other circumstance no arrangement was successful; and it has been to us a disappointment and regret that a worthy *In Memoriam* has not appeared in THE CHURCHMAN. We very gladly, therefore, take the opportunity which the present volume affords us; and of the "singularly felicitous biographical" notice written by Mr. Abbot[2] we transfer to our own columns the leading passages.

---

Henry Wright was the second son of the late Francis Wright, of Osmaston, Ashbourne, a man who will long be remembered in the Midland Counties for his Christian character and Christian munificence.

He was born January 14, 1833. Very early did he realize that he was the child of God and the servant of Jesus Christ, and it was the great wish of his boyhood to live the life and do the work of a Missionary of the Cross in a foreign land. A fever contracted during a visit to the Holy Land, and which for some time left its mark upon him, prevented the fulfilment of this wish; his mission was to be in England. After graduating in 1856, at Balliol College, Oxford, he was ordained in December, 1857, by the late Bishop Lonsdale, of Lichfield, to the chaplaincy of the Butterley Iron Works, of which his father was the chief proprietor. In the same year he married the fourth daughter of the Hon. A. L. Melville, Branston Hall, Lincoln.

After his marriage and ordination, he settled down at the Grange, Swanwick, and threw himself with all his natural sympathy and ardour into the great work which had to be accomplished, not only among the rough open-hearted foundry-men of Butterley, but also among the population of nearly 2,000 colliers, "framework knitters," "stockingers" (as they are called), of the adjoining hamlet of Swanwick.

Swanwick in itself, and as it then was, would hardly be deemed an "attractive sphere" or "a desirable position." It was a place to which no man would have dreamt of going, except from an earnest desire to win souls to God. That, however, was Henry Wright's one covetousness, according to the beautiful thought of Quesnel—"the covetousness of gaining souls to Christ." . . . .

Mr. Wright was not to spend the whole of his ministerial life in Swanwick. In 1867, he quitted the people to whom he first had gone,

---

[1] One fact we venture to mention in regard to THE CHURCHMAN. Mr. Wright wrote to us expressing his entire agreement with the observations in the preface to our first volume as to the lines on which a periodical representing the Evangelical School of the Church should be conducted. Mr. Bickersteth truly remarks (p. xxiii.) "there was a wonderful large-heartedness about him."

[2] Mr. Wright passed away on Friday, August 13. Mr. Abbott's sermon was preached at Coniston Parish Church, Sunday, August 15. When the sermon —an admirable one—was published (at the request of the bereaved) Mr. Abbott prefixed "the short outline of a life which, illuminated by the Spirit of God, has left a very bright track behind."

and by whom he was so greatly beloved, in order to succeed to the vacant rectory of St. Nicholas, Nottingham. In that parish of 4,400 persons, he laboured for five years with much blessing, exercising a solid influence, not only over his own flock, but over the whole town of Nottingham. . . . .

It is instructive to notice the grounds of this remarkable influence. Mr. Wright was possessed of few popular gifts; he was not an eloquent preacher, unless, indeed, eloquence be, as it has been termed, the "power of persuasion." He was a careful but not a fluent or a ready speaker; he had, indeed, his own peculiar gifts, a calm judgment, capacity for work, and considerable powers of organization, but they were not popular gifts.

His influence was the result of (*a*) definite and scriptural opinions. He believed firmly and preached fearlessly the great truths contained in the articles of the Church of England. Attached by strong conviction to what are called Evangelical principles, he was nevertheless too candid and large minded to be a partisan. Clear and distinctive in his views, he lived as every man should live, above the party to which he belonged. He called no man master—one was his master—even Christ. There was, however, no question about his principles, and in the proclamation of those principles under an abiding sense of the presence of the Spirit of God he commended himself "to every man's *conscience*."

(*b*) Mr. Wright's chief influence was the influence of character. Men who understood little and cared less for dogmatic teaching discerned no gulf between his principles and his practice. . . . .

It was in 1872 that he was appointed to the position than which there is, perhaps, *none* more honourable, and none more arduous in the English Church, that of Hon. Clerical Secretary to the Church Missionary Society. . . . .

Mr. Wright seemed marked out for the post about to be vacant; and there were many to testify to his personal qualifications as a man of rare spiritual character and devoted attachment to the evangelical principles of the Society. Ultimately Mr. Venn wrote and sounded him. Two letters came from him in reply; and both Mr. Venn and Lord Chichester instantly said that the man who could write those letters was the man for the Church Missionary Society. This interesting circumstance was mentioned by the venerable President himself at the committee meeting August 17.

Mr. Wright accordingly came to Salisbury Square. His work here, during the past eight years, was of the most varied and multifarious character. . . . .

It was after twelve months of toil and unusual anxiety that Mr. Wright, accompanied by Mrs. Wright and his eleven children, went for his summer holiday to the English Lakes, making Coniston his resting-place. There was, however, but little rest from the work to which he had devoted his life. Each morning until the day of his death he continued his correspondence with the missionaries of the Society. The Sunday succeeding his arrival at Coniston he walked to Brathay and back, a distance of sixteen miles, in order to preach for the Church Missionary Society. The next Sunday he preached also at Keswick for the same great work. This was his last Sunday upon earth. Early on the morning of Friday, August 13, whilst bathing from a boat in Coniston Lake, either from a seizure of cramp, or from the sudden shock to a system already overwrought, he was in a few minutes deprived of all physical power. He sank—he fell asleep in the deep waters of Coniston. He who believes in God will not be misled by appearances at the last, or falsely conclude such is the *end*—the untimely end—of one who lived for Christ and His Church. The life of the servant of God knows no

death. "Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die" (John xi. 26).

It is enough to know that his hour had come—his work was done. The Master called for him; the waters heard and released him; his spirit was uncaged; God's messengers bore him hence.

> In the grey of morning,
> They bore his soul away
> Beyond the prison bars,
> Beyond the fading stars,
> To the brightness of the day,

to the rest which remaineth for the people of God; to the immediate presence of Him Whose he was, and Whom he served.

---

Of the sermons contained in the memorial volume of such a man we need say but little. We have read them with interest and satisfaction, and most heartily recommend them. The first sermon, "The Friendship of God" (Job xxii. 21), gives the title to the volume; like the rest, it is clear and faithful, the meditation of a holy, happy, heavenly mind. One other discourse we may mention, "Go Forward," preached to the boys of Marlborough School. Would to God the boys of our great schools oftener listened to such words!

---

*The Revised Version of the first three Gospels considered in its bearings upon the Record of our Lord's words and of incidents on His Life.* By F. C. Cook, M.A. Pp. 250. Murray.

WE have read this book with interest. Its criticisms are of the highest value, as might be expected in such a work by such a theologian.

In his "preliminary considerations" Canon Cook refers to Dr. Scrivener's position, in regard to what Mr. McClellan termed the Egyptian bondage. Dr. Scrivener has hitherto been recognized, both in England and on the Continent, as the leading representative of English critical scholarship; and he attaches due weight to the oldest MSS., assigning the first place to B; but he invariably maintains the claims of the earliest Fathers and versions, and allows very considerable weight to the mass of cursives when they support a majority of uncials, especially when, as is frequently the case, those which generally agree with B or ℵ present a different reading. Canon Cook remarks on the fact, which is now admitted, that Dr. Scrivener maintains the chief, if not all the positions which he has long and consistently defended. He did not acquiesce in the decisions of his colleagues in the Committee of Revisers. He certainly cannot give to B the authority which Dr. Hort, in his "Introduction," has claimed for it. On these points, however, we shall soon be well informed. A new edition of Dr. Scrivener's "Introduction," we are glad to hear, is about to be published.

In defining his own position, Canon Cook says:—

> . . . . this I maintain, and hold to be an indisputable position, that when the earliest Fathers, up to the end of the third century, cite passages and texts which, in their judgment, and in the estimation of their contemporaries, whether orthodox or not, have important bearings upon the teaching or the integrity of Holy Scripture, their authority outweighs, in some cases infinitely outweighs, the adverse testimony of the MSS.—none earlier than the middle of the fourth century—on which modern critics rely for their most serious innovations.
>
> I will here give but one instance. It is of the utmost importance, both as

regards the teaching of Scripture and the evidence for its central fact, and also as regards the principles of bibilical criticism. I refer to the close of St. Mark's Gospel.[1] For its genuineness we have the express and most decisive testimony of Irenæus (see p. 38), the highest authority on such a question, not to speak of Justin Martyr[2] and other early Fathers, the testimony, in other words, of Christendom in its earliest representatives, supported by every ancient Version, even those in which this Gospel is most incompletely preserved, and, with three exceptions, by the absolute totality of MSS., uncial and cursive. Against it the margin tells us that the passage is omitted by the two oldest MSS., a statement which ought to have been modified by the fact that ONE only (ℵ) obliterates all traces of its existence, while the other, B, that which the Revisers hold to be by far the more trustworthy, leaves a blank, contrary to its invariable use—a circumstance which proves beyond all question the existence of such a close in the original document.

The eminent author's observations on the value of ℵ and B are extremely valuable; the chapter, interesting all through, has several new points of importance. It is too often overlooked that these manuscripts are admitted to have been written at a time when the Arian heresy preponderated, and when the great critical scholar of the Church was deeply affected by that heresy.

We thoroughly agree with Canon Cook's remark upon the punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 in the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, and the marginal note of R. V. The note of Dr. Gifford, in the *Speaker's Commentary* is indeed "admirable." "I should have scarcely thought it credible," says the Canon, "in face of the unanswered and unanswerable arguments there urged, that English divines would venture to have given their sanction to one of the most pernicious and indefensible innovations of rationalistic criticism."

Canon Cook quotes the CHURCHMAN, together with the *Guardian*, and the *Church Quarterly*, as testifying to the Revisers' freedom from doctrinal prepossession, and he then quotes an assertion from the Unitarian reviser, Dr. Vance Smith, ("Revised Texts and Margins," p. 45) which certainly calls for some notice at the hands of both Churchmen and Nonconformists. We agree with the distinguished critic as regards one unsatisfactory statement in Canon Kennedy's "Ely Lectures," recently reviewed in the CHURCHMAN. The Church of England maintains that the "decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople" may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ.

---

*Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement.* By the Rev. T. MOZLEY, M.A. Two vols. Longmans, Green & Co.

OF these volumes we had intended to give a rather lengthy review, particularly with reference to Oxford; but, owing to circumstances which, upon consideration, we cannot regret, our notice must be brief.

The volumes contain many amusing anecdotes. We quote the following as to the contrast between S. and H. Wilberforce (vol. i., p. 124):—

Many years after that period, when Henry had gone over to Rome, the two brothers, Samuel and Henry, gave a singular illustration of their respective

---

[1] For a fuller account of the evidence, and of Dr. Hort's defence of the mutilation, see further on, p. 120 seq. [This note, of course, is Canon Cook's. But it may here be remarked that the Canon's argument as to the mutilation is in our judgment unanswerable.—Ed. CHURCHMAN.]

[2] Westcott and Hort put a (?) before Justin Martyr, and Dr. Hort attempts to show that his testimony is doubtful. It could not well be clearer.

shares in the wisdom of the world. They made a trip to Paris. Immediately after they had left their hotel to return home, there came an invitation to the Tuileries. It was telegraphed down the line, and brought them back to Paris, when they spent an evening at the Tuileries, and had a long talk with the Emperor. The Archbishop of Amiens was there, and engaged them to a reception at his palace, offering them beds. It was a very grand affair; a splendid suite of rooms, brilliantly lighted, and all the good people of Amiens. The bedchambers and the beds were magnificent. Putting things together, and possibly remembering *Timeo Danaos*, the Anglican Bishop came to the conclusion that his bed had probably not been slept in for some time or aired either. So he stretched himself down upon the coverlid in full canonicals, had a good night, and was all the better for it. Henry could not think it possible a Roman archbishop would do him a mischief, and fearlessly, or at least hopefully, entered between the sheets. He caught a very bad cold, and was ill for some time after.

Mr. Mozley writes further (p. 126):—

Henry Wilberforce occasionally went to public meetings for which he had received the usual circular invitation, and was frequently late. He was sure that, had he been in time, he would have been asked to take part in the proceedings, and as he was never without something to say, he was sorry to find himself in a crowd of listeners, perhaps disappointed listeners. He noticed, however, that his brother Samuel, though quite as liable to be behind time as himself, nevertheless was always on the platform, and always a speaker. How could this be? Samuel explained it straight. He was perfectly sure that he had something to say, that the people would be glad to hear it, and that it would be good for them. He was also quite certain of having some acquaintance on the platform. So immediately on entering the room he scanned the platform, caught somebody's eye, kept his own eye steadily fixed upon his acquaintance, and began a slow movement in advance, never remitted an instant till he found himself on the platform. The people, finding their toes in danger, looked round, and seeing somebody looking hard and pressing onwards, always made way for him. By-and-by there would be a voice from the platform, "Please allow Mr. Wilberforce to come this way," or "Please make way for Mr. Wilberforce." Such a movement of course requires great confidence, not to say self-appreciation, but anybody who is honestly and seriously resolved to do good must sometimes put a little force on circumstances.

Mr. Mozley's style, from a purely literary critic, deserves unstinted praise; and his work, as a whole, is eminently readable. Nearly all readers, probably, of the type worldly and cultured, will enjoy the book as bright and clever. But thoughtful and unprejudiced readers who desire to understand the springs and the bearings of the Oxford movement, will obtain but little aid from Mr. Mozley's pages; and those who set the highest value on spiritual-mindedness (we expressly use this term), will find in Mr. Mozley's witty, *quasi* H. Walpole narratives, much that they dislike.

The work is open to four objections. First, the reminiscences are not always reliable; from forgetfulness or personal feeling, in matters of fact, the author has sometimes seriously blundered. Second, the book, with its spicy stories and personal remarks, is an innovation on the recognized proprieties of biography and autobiography. Third, his account of the state of religion in the country fifty years ago is not only, historically speaking, inaccurate and incomplete, but it is warped by prejudice. Fourth, his criticism of the Church is carping and unjust, while of his references to Romanism many merit sharp rebuke at the hands of her dutiful and loyal sons.

That for making these objections, "Evangelical" narrowness, or party spirit, ought not to be blamed, we might easily show by quotations from the *Quarterly Review*, the *John Bull*, the *Guardian*, as well as from

letters in the *Times*,[1] *Spectator*, and the *Guardian*. But we will make only brief quotations.

(1.) To say nothing of unimportant inaccuracies, we may quote from the *Guardian* two or three sentences as to gossipy stories :—

> Many of [Mr. Mozley's] anecdotes are obviously only the reflections of the current talk of the day. . . . . They are gossip and nothing more. And we are the more bound to bear this in mind, since Mr. Mozley himself truly describes a good deal of his writing, when he says, "Perhaps I shall even be found to come under the old description of those that remember the evil more easily than the good." It is not a pleasant charge to lie under. But he takes it lightly. "Be it so," is all he has to say.

(2). The *Quarterly* remarks that the book is full of stories which may be well repeated to intimate friends in the discreet confidence of conversation, but which should not be made public property during the lifetime of the persons concerned. The *Guardian* says :—

> There are many things which a wise or considerate or kindly man will abstain from saying even if he knows them to be true. Cardinal Newman, to whom Mr. Mozley sent the titles of his chapters before they were published, reminded him "that even where the persons named in my headings were no longer here, there were survivors and friends whose feelings had to be respected." It was a reminder to which Mr. Mozley has paid little heed. He is perfectly reckless in this respect, telling his stories and pronouncing his sentences without the smallest regard to the reputations he may injure or the feelings he may lacerate, and often—as we have seen—without taking much trouble to find out whether his stories are true or false.

(3). The *Quarterly*, having quoted Mr. Mozley's impressions of the system inculcated by Evangelical preachers, forcibly remarks :—

> Considering that Newman, as we have seen, was for years, and almost up to this very time, closely allied with the Evangelicals, it is difficult to believe that this can be anything like an adequate account of them.

(4). The *Quarterly* speaks of the "skilful special pleading" in Mr. Mozley's concluding pages. The *Guardian*, speaking of Mr. Mozley as an editor and newspaper writer, says :—

> But the work lasted only two years, from 1841 to 1843. The crisis was approaching, and Mr. Mozley himself, like the rest of his companions as well as his great leader, had to choose between England and Rome. As far as we can see, he chose neither. He sketches out a most *bizarre* theology, which seems to consist in showing that there is a good deal to be said for the Roman system—though he cannot accept it—and heaping a good deal of ridicule upon the English Church—though he does not see his way to leaving it. But this frame of mind was evidently incompatible with the editorship of the "British Critic." He threw it up, and the publication itself came to an end, to be replaced later on by the "Christian Remembrancer." But it is not a little surprising to find him, apparently without a moment's interval, engaging in another undertaking[2] which most persons would think not very congenial to an anxious and unsettled inquirer. This is his own account of it :—
>
> "At the same time there came to me, through my brother James and another

---

[1] A story about the late Sir James Stephen has been flatly contradicted by the distinguished son of that distinguished man, on the authority of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Blachford (then Sir F. Rogers). "The story about your father and myself," wrote Lord Blachford to the present judge, "is absolutely imaginary and impossible." The biographer of Dean Hook has refuted an attack upon the Dean ; Miss Whately has written concerning the Archbishop.

[2] As such a periodical as the *Quarterly* has stated it (to say nothing of lesser lights), there can be no harm in mentioning—to many of our readers certainly no secret—that Mr. Mozley became a contributor to the *Times*.

"member of our Oriel circle, the offer of employment in a quarter then supposed "to be friendly, not only to Newman, but to the movement of which he was "now held to be the real leader. After a good deal of conversation in the "Temple Gardens, in which I declared myself very strongly, for specified "reasons, against the Corn Laws and Protection generally, I agreed. This act "was necessarily a departure, as far as co-operation was concerned, and from "that time there could not be confidential correspondence on the heart of "affairs. But I had frequent letters from Newman, and occasional reminders "that what I did must be for heaven as well as for earth, and would have to "be so judged."

Those who fancy they can detect Mr. Mozley's share in the work which he thus describes, will be apt to think that Newman's reminders were much needed and much neglected. There may be some excuse for scoffing at a Church which you are preparing to leave: there can be none for habitually ridiculing, depreciating, and misrepresenting one in which you elect to stay.

Mr. Mozley, it may here be stated, was one of Newman's earliest pupils, and married his sister.

On the fourth objection, stated above, we might easily enlarge. A very friendly Reviewer in *Blackwood* remarks that Mr. Mozley is "somewhat hard upon the Evangelicals" of fifty years ago; and he adds that "whatever impressive preaching there was at that time in the Church was almost exclusively confined to the Evangelical School." Mr. Mozley's great brother-in-law, says *Blackwood*, was "a man of a gentler spirit and of wider sympathies";[1] and, as a matter of fact, until he drew near the Rubicon, Mr. Newman, a contributor to the *Record*, was most friendly to Evangelicals. Mr. Mozley tells his readers that he is no theologian. The information is needless. A clergyman of his standing and ability who can assert that "the Evangelical theory" is—"*You were to be quite sure . . . . that you had received a special revelation that Jesus Christ died for you in particular*," may be a very clever leading-article writer, but—charitably allowing that he makes such a statement in good faith—we cannot acquit him of crass, inexcusable ignorance. Again, his picture of the Evangelical clergy of fifty years ago, as neglecting their parishes and travelling about to this or that meeting, is simply absurd. In 1821 Henry Venn, at St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, spared no pains in regard to pastoral work; the larger portion of his working hours was spent in courts and alleys; and when he went to Drypool, he established a system of district visiting. But, indeed, the question is not worth arguing.

## Short Notices.

*Henry and Margaret Jane Shepheard.* Memorials of a Father and Mother. By their Son, Clement Carus-Wilson Shepheard-Walwyn, M.A. Pp. 340. Elliot Stock. 1882.

A notice of this excellent biography has by an inadvertence been delayed. We very gladly recommend a book so full of interesting devotional matter.

[1] Mr. Mozley's *animus* may be seen from a single sentence (vol. ii., p. 312): "For many years of my life," he writes, "my chief religious conclusions had been of a negative character, one continual revolt against the hollowness, flimsiness, and stupidity of 'Evangelical' teaching."

*Select Readings in the Greek Text of St. Matthew lately published by the Rev. Drs. Westcott and Hort;* revised by the Rev. S. C. MALAN, D.D., Vicar of Broadwindsor. With a Postscript on the Pamphlet, "The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament; by two Members of the New Testament Company." London: Hatchards.

We regret that we are unable to give a worthy notice of this learned pamphlet.

Archdeacon HESSEY has published his "Charge to the Clergy, Churchwardens and Sidesmen," May 23, 1882, with the title *Strength in Union* (T. Scott, Warwick Court, Holborn.) It contains an interesting exposition, in small space, of several Bills. Of the revised version, Dr. Hessey remarks:—

I will say that I am glad the attempt has been made—that the Revisers deserve our gratitude for having made it—that I can see very well already that the argument in many parts of the Epistles comes out more clearly from their handling—that all of us, especially the younger amongst us, will do well to study it, first, for our own improvement, and secondly, because the laity are studying it eagerly. A question has been raised whether it may be lawfully used in churches in lieu of the Authorized Version. This is to say, in other words, was the version so-called ever authorized at all? My friend, the late learned Dr. A. J. Stephens, held that it was not. He could find no record of authorization, and argued that none had taken place. The Lord Chancellor admits that there is no existing record of the fact, but, as the collection of records in which it would be looked for has been destroyed by fire, he thinks that it may have existed and was destroyed amongst them; for, he urges, it is exceedingly unlikely that at the beginning of the seventeenth century any one would have ventured to call it authorized without authority. And its eventual though gradual supplanting of other versions, as a volume, and the change of the Epistles and Gospels of the Prayer Book into its language at the last review, seem to point to the conclusion that it is the version from which the Lessons are to be read. I confess that this is my own view, and I think that no clergyman would be justified in resorting to the Revised Version for the Lessons.

We are glad to see that the question of Evening Communions is coming more and more to the front. The Rev. J. WILKINSON, M.A., Vicar of Brinscombe, Gloucestershire, has published (Church Book Society) a paper read at a Clerical gathering, with additions and notes, *Evening Communion.* From this interesting pamphlet we quote a few lines. Mr. Wilkinson says:—

I have seen less of irreverence, less of formalism, less of carelessness of manner, on the part of those attending the Communion in the evening than of those attending at midday. I have had but little experience of early Morning Communion, as I confess I do not like it. I do not think it so thoroughly in accord with our Lord's institution as is the Evening Communion. But I do not say that I think it is wrong to have it then, if people find it convenient, and so wish. To my mind the time is of little consequence; it may be at any time that suits best. But I fear that early Morning Communion helps to uphold that materialistic theory which encourages or necessitates Fasting Communion, and for that reason I object to Early Communion. But undoubtedly Evening Communion is right, and I protest most strongly against the wickedness of saying such things against it as one has read and heard. . . . . I feel persuaded that if some of our brethren who oppose it were to attend an Evening Communion in some church where it is practised, they would be won over, as I have heard of some being, by the quiet, solemn reverence pervading it, to see that it is a blessed means of grace.

In the *Church Worker,* Mr. Stock continues his excellent "Lesson Studies on the Parables." In the *Church Missionary Gleaner* appear some attractive Notes from E. Africa, by the Rev. W. S. PRICE. *Word and Work* (Shaw & Co.) contains, in the interesting pencil sketches of

practical effort, "Pearl Fisher on the North Sea," eminently encouraging to those who take an interest in one branch of the work done by the Thames Church Mission. In this graphic paper we read :—

Messrs. Hewett & Co., the largest fishing firm of the day, the company who have been successful in securing Parliamentary authority to build a new fish market at Shadwell, are the owners of the "Short Blue" fleet in two divisions, known as the Home and Lower fleets. Together with the crews of the seven fish-carrying steamers, over 2,000 men are employed in connection with this firm, and full facilities have by them been granted for the labour amongst their men of missionaries sent by the Thames Church Mission. To this field of services my visit was paid, and of its experiences I shall long retain a vivid memory.

In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* the Rev. ROBERT BRUCE, D.D. writes on the relation of the Ministry at home to the Ministry abroad. To the *Church Sunday School Magazine* Bishop CHEETHAM has contributed the first chapter of "The Mission to Sierra Leone." In the *Shield of Faith* (Wade & Co., 11, Ludgate Arcade, E.C.) Mr. W. CHAMBERLIN writes Part I. of "Atheism and its Evasions." *Little Folks* is bright and informing as usual. In the *Quiver* Prebendary Moore writes on Holiness. In an interesting paper on Sunday Schools for Men, we read :—

It is not possible to "tabulate" the results of such a movement as this ; it is just as little possible to doubt that it is a movement in the right direction. Its purpose is simple and direct, and the machinery employed is wisely adapted to the end in view, and it is effective. It aims to make working men better men, more intelligent, self-helpful, sober, and thrifty, and to quicken in them the consciousness that the life of the lowliest, as of the highest, is too sacred a thing to be wasted or despised. This work is a work for God, if it does no more than lead men from the darkness of ignorance into the light of knowledge. It is, however, God's work in a still higher sense ; for by means of it many a man once bound by vicious habits has been set free and made to rejoice in the manfullest freedom of all—the freedom of service for God and humanity. We are not without hope that the establishment of Adult Sunday schools throughout the land may help to solve the problem which so perplexes earnest Christians everywhere, as to how the alienation of the masses from religion may be overcome. But of this we may be very sure, that if working men can be persuaded to attend early morning Sunday Schools they will be not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, and not a few of them, by God's grace, will enter in.

In the *Leisure Hour*, as to Miss Whately's work at Cairo, we read :—

In a letter from Miss M. L. Whately, written from Alexandria, she said that she would have remained in Cairo, but left in order to satisfy the anxious wishes of others. She believed that their Moslem servants would have remained faithful, and that their feeling was well expressed by a water-carrier, who said, "Have I eaten your salt for ten years, and have I served you all so long, and am I going to turn against you who fear God?" This was said on hearing Miss Whately remark that she trusted in God, and was not afraid, and was sure her servants and neighbours would not turn against them. At the same time it seems well that she left, as the mob of a large city can never be controlled in time of disturbance. The panic was so great that many of the Europeans fled in haste, taking with them nothing, and some leaving their houses with the lights burning. There was alarm lest the lines should be cut, and therefore they hurried to the train.

We have received *Report of the Sixth Meeting of the Yorkshire Evangelical Union* (York: E. H. Pickering). Of this Lay and Clerical Union Canon JACKSON is the Chairman, Dr. SHANN the Vice-Chairman, the Rev. H. G. HOPKINS, Clifton Vicarage, York, the Hon. Secretary. At the last meeting, June 20th and 21st, great disappointment was felt in the absence, through illness, of the esteemed and honoured Chairman, Canon Jackson; but Dr. Shann ably presided, and the gathering was a very successful one. Canon Saumarez Smith and Mr. H. Barker read papers on "The Diaconate"; an address was given by the Rev. H.

Falloon on the Salvation Army. Dr. Bardsley, Vicar of Bradford, read a paper on Ritualism. Canon Falloon's paper—"Is God the Holy Ghost sufficiently Honoured in our Work and Life," we gladly notice, has been printed separately. From Dr. Bardsley's paper we quote a single passage:—

The late Dean of Chichester—Dean Hook—in his work on the Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, writes thus:—"Protestants of all shades of opinion were united on this one point, that the Mass should be turned into a Communion. The Mass was regarded as a sacrifice of our Lord for the quick and the dead. This the Reformers, one and all denied. They maintained that it was a Communion, through which the faithful were united to God; and that the sacrifice was the offering of themselves, their souls and bodies, to God's service, in common with the hosts in heaven." The late Archdeacon Wilberforce acknowledges, whilst he laments the fact, that the changes made in the Prayer Book in 1552, divested the Communion Service "of its sacrificial character." In the Homily on the Lord's Supper, we read, "For this is to stick fast to Christ, to Christ's promise made in His institution, to make Christ thine own, and to apply his merits unto thyself. Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no Mass, no means established by man's inventions." Can language be more clear or positive? Again says the Homily, "we must then take heed lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice, lest of a communion it be made a private eating."

We had no time last month to give more than a line of notice to the *Church Quarterly* (Spottiswoode & Co). The interesting article on Principal Shairp's writings contains much with which we agree; and "Modern Pagan Poetry," mainly a review of A. G. Swinburne's writings, is able and timely. The article on Evolution, as *John Bull* complains, is weak and unsatisfactory. From the article on Preaching we might make a lengthy extract: several points are well handled. We cannot agree, however, that when a man is single-handed and overworked he may well preach "*the same sermon* morning and afternoon." How many of the morning congregation, we wonder, would attend in the afternoon, if they thought it likely they would hear the same sermon!

A revised and cheap edition of *Our Lord's Life on Earth*, by the late Dr. Hanna, is issued by the Religious Tract Society. The venerable author of "The Life of Dr. Chalmers," died in London last May; the publication of this new edition was the last literary work which occupied his attention.

A pamphlet which will repay reading is *Prophecy, a sure Light in these Perilous Times* (J. F. Shaw & Co.), by the Rev. A. R. Fausset, M.A. Mr. Fausset is known as a learned and deeply reverent writer.

A pamphlet by Canon Clayton, *The Self-asserted Inspiration of the Scriptures* (Seeley), short, but full, deserves to be widely read.

The Rev. E. F. Campbell, Rector of Balleyeglish, has published, as a simple answer to the "Atheistic literature, freely distributed at Fairs and Markets," a twelve-page pamphlet, *Is there a God?* (Dublin: Hodges, Belfast: W. E. Mayne).

*The Home Church* is a paper on Family Prayer, read at the Irish Church Conference, April, 1882, by Henry T. Dix, Esq. (London: E. Stock; Dublin: G. Herbert).

*Sleeping Christianity* is an answer to "Behind the Scenes with the Salvation Army" (Civil Service Publishing Co., 8, Salisbury Court, Fleet Street, E.C.) The author, we observe, quotes Mr. Kitto's article in The Churchman.

We have been requested by Canon Simmons to correct his mistake in the article by him in our June number on *Alms and Oblations*. Page 216, last paragraph, instead of as there stated, the names of the bishops ought to have been, Cosin, Warner, Henchman, Morley and Sanderson. Page 212, fifth para. 2nd line, for "five," read "seven."

# INDEX TO VOL. VI.