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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1883.

ART. I.—THE RESPECTIVE TENDENCIES OF LITURGICAL DEFICIENCY AND RITUALISTIC EXCESS.

BEFORE entering upon a consideration of this subject, it is well to define the limits of our inquiry, and the terms employed in the statement of it.

We have here nothing to do with the modes of Divine worship outside the boundaries of our own communion, the Church of England; or beyond the requirements of our "Book of Common Prayer." Whether ancient or modern, Oriental or Occidental, Liturgies are the best, the most Scriptural, the most advantageous, we do not inquire. Whether the formal Ritual of the Church, or the informal worship of Nonconformists, possesses these characteristics to the greatest extent, does not come within the scope of our subject.

The ministers of the Church of England have been entrusted with the conduct of Divine service according to a prescribed form fenced with divers Rubrics of direction in its use, and they have accepted that Trust under most solemn circumstances, bound by most solemn promises. We are not to add thereto, for we are pledged to use "no other." Are we allowed to diminish therefrom?

This question brings us to the terms of our thesis. By Ritualistic excess we mean the adoption and use of forms of worship, whether in matter or manner, which are not prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. Taken from the Use of Sarum, the Roman Missals, Greek forms, or Genevan customs, it matters not; they all come under the term Ritualistic excess.

By Liturgical deficiency we understand the failing to comply with the formal appointments of our Prayer Book as to the

times, the frequency, the character of our services; as to the mode in which we conduct them, whether in accordance with, or deviation from, the Rubrics; and as to the accessories and arrangements for their performance. As everything beyond the Prayer Book constitutes Ritualistic excess, so everything that falls short of its requirements constitutes Liturgical deficiency.

Both these are violations of our Prayer Book and its requirement so far as the letter is concerned; but there may be a very important practical difference in the results. We have therefore to inquire into the "respective tendencies" of each, and see if they can be equally justified by those results, or if either of them is quite unjustifiable under the circumstances. If the tendency (or outcome) of either is contrary to the spirit as well as the letter of the Prayer Book; if it introduce discord and contrariety into what should be in harmony and concord; if it should tend to a destruction of the plan on which the Book is based—should affirm what the Book has denied, or deny what it has affirmed—then that one is unjustifiable; and common honesty towards the Church, the congregation, and the Book, demands that such shall be given up, and the services be expanded or contracted to the required limitations.

Having thus defined the terms of our thesis, we are prepared to enter upon its consideration.

It will be generally admitted, no doubt, that there are few, if any, of the clergy who strictly conform to all the Rubrics and requirements of the Prayer Book. One large portion are especially charged with Liturgical deficiency, and with great semblance of justice; some of them, possibly, are amenable to the charge of Ritualistic excess, using the term in its proper, not technical, significance. Another large section are equally charged with Ritualistic excess, and might, in some points, we think, be found guilty of Liturgical deficiency.

In these divergencies of opinion and practice, the best way of dealing with the subject is to try if an overruling principle can be found to guide us in both. We are not individual Christians, nor isolated congregations, occupied only with personal interests, or combined only for sectional purposes, but much more. We are Christians and congregations in a great community—an Apostolic branch of the Catholic Church of Christ. As regards common needs and their supply, common blessings and gratitude for them, common privileges and their use, we all are on the same platform; and in the realization of this unity, our Liturgy has been compiled, and is entitled the Book of *Common* Prayer. The need of one is the need of all—the need of all is the need of each; and when all come together

to express their need in prayer, and to receive a blessing from God, it must be that the form of worship is the most perfect expression that can be found of the principle that binds all together.

It may be a question whether forms are the best mode of expressing this sense of community. The Church has decided in their favour; the Nonconformists have, for the most part, decided against them. But the decision once made by the Church, it follows, surely, that *the highest and most perfect form that could be devised by those engaged in its compilation would be put forth as the Book of Common Prayer.* It is no mere fortuitous concurrence of devotional atoms, no mere aggregate of personal predilections. It is the offspring of the thoughtful, prayerful, efforts of men, whose character was as holy as their ecclesiastical position was lofty—whose spiritual acquirements in the knowledge of God's Word and man's need were as great as their knowledge of the Liturgical heritage of the Church from the Apostolic age to their own. They knew the meaning of "Liturgical excess"—had seen and experienced its tendencies. Preserving all that was good, and true, and suitable, they cut away the excesses and accretions of later corruptions, and put forth, for the use of the whole Church of England, what they deemed to be a perfect Ritual, beyond which, or contrary to which, nothing should be enjoined, practised, or allowed, except by that competent authority which put it forth.

This, surely, is the principle of the Prayer Book, which has been accepted by each succeeding generation of Churchmen. No competent authority has altered it in any material point; and it is very doubtful whether we should get one nearly so good if it should be cast into the furnace of conflicting prejudices, feelings, and opinions in our time. This Book, at all events, every clergyman holding benefice or license to minister in the Church of England has accepted; he accepted the Book with a solemn promise to use it in his ministrations, and "no other." I do not see how these words "no other" can be honestly evaded, or explained so as to cover much in the way of Ritual that is in use in our day in some churches of our communion. On the other hand, this is a first principle: whatever is really included between the backs of our Book of Common Prayer cannot be, and ought not to be, called Ritualistic excess. It had been better if this had been earlier recognised, and much harsh language, uncharitable judgment, and misguided zeal, had been held back until the limits enjoined by the Church had been actually transgressed. The opposition would have been more powerful for good had it been suppressed until there was something real to oppose.

Let us now turn to the other aspect of the question. The exclusive boundary of our Ritual, it has been maintained, is a hard and fast line, allowing no transgression. Is it necessary, as a requirement of the Church, that every one of her ministering clergy—every single congregation—shall come up to that boundary internally? Is it according unto right, and in conformity with her wish, that all her sons and all her assemblies, who do not come up to the high standard which she has set up, shall be deemed unfaithful to her, to their ordination vows, or to the spiritual interests of her various flocks? At first sight, we should be inclined to say that it is —that the clergy have no more right to be Liturgically deficient than to be Ritualistically excessive. This is the position taken up by many, expressed by some occupying high position in the Church, and put forth as a reason for non-repression of unlawful forms of worship, borrowed from pre-Reformation times, or taken from the Ritual of unreformed Churches. One evil does not justify another; and, if both Liturgical deficiency and Ritualistic excess be equally unjustifiable, the only legitimate conclusion is—let both be stopped; let the Procrustean bed be the exact standard of measurement, and let the Ritual that is too long be lopped, and the Ritual that is too short be pulled out to its proper length.

Now it would be easy to establish the fact that there may be—that there is—a vital difference between these two which will largely justify the one, and as decidedly condemn the other. Illustrations of this need not be adduced; let us not be led away from principles. We may pursue a much more direct course in establishing the position which has been taken up.

We have affirmed it as the only *rational*, and a really *necessary*, principle in the formation of our Book of Common Prayer, that it should be the most perfect and complete Ritual possible to the piety, the wisdom, the learning, and the condition of its compilers.[1] Our Ritual is often spoken of as a compromise, as if that were something very dreadful. Many compromises are very harmless, not a few very advantageous. The charge is, however, usually made with the signification that truth has been sacrificed, and the Church's protest against false doctrine and erroneous practice been weakened, in order to include as large a number as possible of those who still adhered to the unreformed Church. To this it is almost enough to reply that the expressions used respecting those doctrines

[1] Possibly most clergymen, and many laymen too, think that if they had only had a hand in it, it would have been more perfect; but that part of the subject need not be discussed.

and practices in our Articles, which find their place in, and form part of, our Book of Common Prayer, emphatically overpower any forms of compromise which an unjust and unreal interpretation may seem to discover. A comprehension extending even to the utmost limits of what is true is very different from even the smallest compromise with what is false. Our Prayer Book may illustrate the former, it does not exemplify the latter.

Our next proposition is, that the Book of Common Prayer, though put forth on the principle of its completeness and perfection as a standard of Ritual worship, does not enjoin or expect that all the congregations of our Church shall come up to that standard or fill out that measure; but, on the contrary, while she allows of no transgression beyond the limits which are assigned, does sanction deviations from a rigid uniformity, and *makes provision* for such Liturgical deficiencies as the circumstances of respective congregations may justify. The importance of this position will be seen at once. Though a failure to establish it by evidence may not necessarily prove an unfaithfulness in certain cases of Liturgical deficiency—for a spirit may give life even where a letter kills—yet if we can establish it by the testimony of the Book itself, the charge of unfaithfulness will be removed from many, and only rest with added weight upon those who make it, and endeavour, by raising a cloud of dust around their brethren, to hide their own violations of both the spirit and the letter of the Prayer Book.

We proceed, then, to establish our positions, thus affirmed, by evidence from the Book itself. It may be sufficient to place the facts in dry light; the clearness of the light, it may be hoped, will excuse the dryness of the mode in which it is presented. The Preface to the Prayer Book, which is too seldom read and too little known by Church people, is an expansion of the principles which have been laid down. These are its first words:—

> It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it. For, as on the one side common experience showeth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring), sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued; and those many times more and greater than the evils that were intended to be remedied by such change: so on the other side, the particular forms of Divine worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to

those that are in place of Authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient.

Again we read:—"Of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ) or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain." The Preface closes with these words:—"We have good hope that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

In the next section, "Concerning the Service of the Church," after an assertion of the necessity for some Rules, and that those framed are few, plain, and easy to be understood, we have another declaration of the principles on which the compilers acted as follows:—

Here you have an Order for Prayer, and for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious than that which of late was used. It is more profitable because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read but the very pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same.

The various Uses of the kingdom are put aside, and "now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use." Further, provision is made for doubts and diversities. These must be submitted to the decision of the Bishop, "who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same, so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book." Surely this restriction laid upon the highest official Authorities of the Church is a clear assertion of what we have called the perfection of the Book of Common Prayer; and, as we believe, facts show that there is no body of the Clergy more loyal to their Bishops than those who are so freely and sometimes contemptuously charged with Liturgical deficiency.

While there is thus a principle of perfection asserted, we affirm that there is also a permission granted for such variations in the performance of Divine service as are adapted to particular circumstances which preclude the attainment of that perfection; such as are not transgressions but simply shortcomings.

There is no doubt, for instance, that daily prayer, morning and evening, is the intention and order of the Church; but

variation is allowed by the permission to say it privately or openly, or to omit it for some urgent cause, leaving the "urgency" at the discretion of the Curate. But the cause need not even be "urgent," like sickness; it is sufficient if it be *reasonable*. And that there might be frequent reasonable causes is shown by the order for a bell to be rung when prayer is to be said, and only then that the people may not assemble in vain.

Another permitted variation is the permission either to *say* or *sing*, certain portions of the service, while in some other portions the permission is not granted. The General Confession is to be *said*, so is the Lord's Prayer wherever it occurs; but the Psalms, the Canticles, the Creeds, the Litany, may be said or sung.

Again, a distinction is made and a variation permitted in the Rubric after the third Collect, "In Quires and Places where they sing here followeth the Anthem," clearly intimating that there may be churches where they do not sing.

If we turn to the "Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion," we trace the same permission of variety. The perfect idea of the Church respecting the frequency of its administration may possibly be indicated by a Rubric at the end of the Order, "In Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches and Colleges, where there are many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Priest every Sunday at the least." Yet even this is not absolute, for the Rubric concludes, "*except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.*" Granted that it is desirable to have weekly Communion in every Church, no command for it can be found in the Prayer Book. The Rubrics all tend the other way, fixing the minimum at "three times in the year, of which Easter shall be one." A Rubric directs that the minister shall always give warning for the celebration or administration "upon the Sunday or some Holyday immediately preceding," which excludes the idea of a weekly Communion being necessary for conformity. The Table is to have a fair white linen cloth upon it "at the Communion-time," and may stand either "in the Body of the Church or in the Chancel." Intending communicants are to give in their names to the Curate at least the day before: it can hardly be intended or expected that they shall do this weekly. In the Rubric before the Prayer for the Church Militant, the words "when there is a Communion" preclude the idea of its administration on all occasions of Morning Service. Again, the Rubric allows a variety in the position of communicants at the time of actual administration, merely ordering that they shall be "conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament." Once more, when there is no Communion (according to the Rubric after the final blessing), one

or more of the appended Collects is to be said; "and the same may be said also, as often as occasion shall serve, after the Collects either of Morning or Evening Prayer, Communion or Litany, by the discretion of the Minister."

Sufficient evidence has been adduced, we think, to establish our two propositions, and that without going outside the Book of Common Prayer to introduce other arguments of more or less validity. The system of the Prayer Book is a complete system; its Rubric is a perfect rule. To go beyond it, to re-introduce the old and discarded, or to introduce a novelty, is transgression and disobedience. But inasmuch as from the nature and necessity of things it is improbable, perhaps impossible, that every congregation of the Church shall be able to reach this perfect standard, permission has been given for certain variations or omissions or deficiencies, so that the worst that can be said of them is that they are shortcomings, not transgressions. Thus the Church has ordered her worship on the principle of her XXXIVth Article:—"It is not necessary that the Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word."

Let us now examine the "*tendencies*" of Liturgical deficiency and Ritualistic excess. For Ritual excess there is absolutely neither plea nor warrant within the backs of our Book of Common Prayer; and history shows clearly that the tendency of excess in ritual has been ever in the direction of still further excesses, and that beyond a certain point the multiplication of forms is a painful increase of formality, and a still more painful diminution of spiritual piety and power. The memory of some of my readers can go back to the early history of the "Oxford" movement. We can trace the progress of the Ritualistic movement, step by step, from what was at first a noble protest against a too general slovenliness and indifference to the accessories of Divine service, onwards to what is now an avowed determination to restore the abandoned doctrines and discarded rites of pre-Reformation times. Upon the principles of our Prayer Book, I do not hesitate to affirm that this is dishonourable to those who teach forbidden doctrines and practise a forbidden Ritual; and dishonest to the Church of England, to her Bishops, to her Liturgy, and to her people. They have a perfect right to their opinion, but not a right to teach and practise it in a Church that has condemned it, and a Realm whose Courts of Law have declared against them.

So, on the other side, there is a dangerous tendency, arising from the weakness of human nature, to extend permitted variations to an entirely unpermitted length. This needs, in-

deed, to be carefully watched by all the Clergy, lest neglect and slovenliness in the performance or accessories of Divine service offend the people and drive them into the opposite danger. I do not say that those against whom this charge is most freely made are as guilty as is represented, for we must never forget that the great Evangelical revival was as noble a protest, not only against an undoctrinal morality but also against an indifferent Ritual, as the former; and that the broader and higher Evangelicalism of to-day is a very much nearer approximation to the true system of the Church, than the Church has seen for many decades of years. I must, however, say that in my opinion the Evangelical portion of the Church lost a great opportunity when at the first rise of Liturgical revival they refused to recognise their Liturgical deficiencies, and strenuously opposed the restoration of practices which were fairly within the perfect standard of the Church's worship. Had they acknowledged their deficiency, or at least charitably allowed such divergencies, and reserved their antagonism till it was fully justified by open violations of the Church's order, much heated argument, much uncharitable feeling, much disturbance of the Church's peace might have been avoided, and present dangers largely mitigated.

That the Church is in danger, imminent danger, is clear to everyone who will open his eyes and ears. Full of faction, divided by party spirit, with no certainty of doctrine, no uniformity of Ritual, she stands an object of exultation to the infidel, of scoff to the profane, of mockery to the indifferent. Daily becoming more and more a congeries of mere congregations, severally gathered by the peculiar idiosyncrasies of her individual teachers, and held together by merely personal ties, she is rapidly losing her national appreciation and influence; and another period as prolific of Ritualistic excess as the last, will see her disestablished from her national position, and perhaps her patrimony dispersed—a Christian Church, but not the Church of England.

The great want of the Church now for deliverance from these pressing dangers is the cordial co-operation of the three great and ever-existing schools of religious thought, High, Broad, and Evangelical, acting upon Church lines in Church matters as one body, and determined (without giving up such divergencies as are within the limits of our Prayer Book) to stand fast by the Church, to protest against everything beyond those limits, to elevate the standard of worship to her requirements, and to carry her spiritual influence amongst every class of men, into every walk of life, and every corner of the Realm. We should then have a Church, the Church of England, like the old Jerusalem, "a city that is at unity in itself;" and we

should be able to add, "whither the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the Name of the Lord."

E. Boteler Chalmer.

Art. II.—THOUGHTS ON SOCIAL SCIENCE.

ANOTHER Social Science Congress has been held. A few remarks upon the proceedings, so far as they bear upon the main question mooted in my former article (Sept., 1882), will be helpful at this juncture.

On the whole, an advance has been made at this Congress towards the goal at which I am aiming—namely, to induce thoughtful people to think of Social Science as a real science, and in particular to give serious consideration to it as a religious question of great practical importance. The advance, however, has not been very considerable. As to the claim of Social Science to be regarded as a true science, there may be found, even now, more to justify it in the remarks of opponents than of advocates. The quiet banter of the *Times* is much more to the purpose than an after-dinner remark accepted by the President as a sufficient answer to "the question asked by certain newspapers, What is Social Science?"

The following circumstances were the occasion and gave rise to the observations to which allusion is made. It is customary at the various Congresses to provide a series of excursions as a relief to the weariness that otherwise might ensue in listening day after day to the reading and discussion of papers, however interesting and important they may be. To many, indeed, these excursions form the principal part of the attraction of Congresses. Accordingly, at Nottingham, the members of the Social Science Association were invited to visit and inspect the "Radford Training Institution," a social experiment well worthy of careful study. The founder, being Chairman of the Nottingham Board of Guardians, has induced the ratepayers to take some workhouse children, who were orphans, and to bring them up in such a way as to lift them out of their unhappy atmosphere of pauperism.

It would be premature to speak of the endeavour in other terms at present than as an interesting social experiment. The happy faces of the children gave promise of success. They were dressed just like other children, uniformity being

purposely avoided; they were allowed to associate with the children of artisans in the neighbourhood, both in play and at the Board Schools; a few minutes, both in going and returning, were allowed for this special purpose. In these and in other such thoughtful ways they were given a fresh start in life; but it will take some years to test an experiment of this magnitude, and even then, not until Social Science is recognised as a science can the success or failure be truly estimated.

After the usual fashion of English hospitality, the inspection was concluded with a luncheon, and after luncheon came the customary toasts. The Mayor proposed "The Visitors," and took occasion to remark that "to himself Social Science was the application of the results of the experiments of science to the promotion of the greatest happiness to the greatest number." The President, as the most distinguished visitor, responded, and thought it impossible "to give a better definition of what was meant by Social Science." The public, however, is happily not so easily satisfied, and until a sounder definition than this is forthcoming the student of Social Science will do better to listen to the observations of friendly critics who express their dissatisfaction, and point out how much is wanting before the Social Science Association can lay claim to this much-coveted title "scientific." "Fas est et ab hoste doceri."

Thus, the *Times*, whilst it pays the Association the compliment year by year of making its work the subject of one or more leading articles, says of it this year:—

> The bill of fare is as varied as usual, and probably as attractive to the votaries of that which still miscalls itself "Social Science" after five-and-twenty years of ridicule and remonstrance. There is not much in a name, of course; but there are good names and bad names, and Social Science is not a good name [why not?]. Nevertheless, prescription counts for much; and as Social Science has now enjoyed the respectable prescription of a quarter of a century, we suppose it must be allowed to pass without further protest. The worst of it is that no one can say what is, and what is not, included in the term "Social Science." . . . Still, the Association is a centre for the communication and interchange of ideas on current topics of political and social interest. As such it undoubtedly has its uses. It is a common meeting-point for men of all parties, who are anxious to take stock of the progress which society has made, and to survey the paths in which it is likely to move. Cynics have described it as an organization for the encouragement of gossip on things in general; and certainly it would seem as though it had taken, not, indeed, all knowledge, but all human nature for its province. . . . If all this is really Social Science, then every copy of a daily paper must be regarded as a treatise on Social Science. We are all of us interested in topics of the kind that will be discussed; most of us have definite opinions concerning them. But opinion is not science; and if the truth must be told, the

science has not yet come to the birth which can comprehend all these multifarious subjects within its purview.

To the same effect have been the comments in previous years :—

"Whether such a thing as Social Science really exists we shall not venture to pronounce, but if it be a reality . . ."[1]

"We must indeed forget, if we can, the name of the Association . . . if we are to give science its more reasonable meaning, as being the process by which the relations between phenomena and the laws that govern them are determined, the members of the Social Science Association can hardly be called scientific investigators."[2]

"If there be scientific principles which only require development and enunciation in order to solve the great social problems that are every day pressing more urgently for solution, let those principles by all means be made known. We fear that this society stands self-convicted of professing the cultivation of a branch of human knowledge which as yet has little existence except in the pretentious name."[3]

The local papers in like manner were equally candid. The simple fact, for instance, was not, could not be ignored that the Congress had drawn together a somewhat motley company; that with few exceptions men of mark were conspicuous by their absence. "A few lawyers, a few doctors, a few artists, a few clergymen, a few theorists with fads, and a plentiful array of ladies," is the description given of the audiences. These and other such remarks (which might be multiplied indefinitely from other leading journals, *Standard, Daily Telegraph, Daily News, Saturday Review, Spectator*, &c.) are fair and, to those who can read between the lines, are most helpful criticisms. It is true that no one, at least no member of the Social Science Association, has yet said, "what is and what is not included in the term Social Science." It is true that every copy of a daily paper is full of Social Science. It is true that Social Science must, like all other sciences, set forth the process by which the relations between phenomena and the laws that govern them are determined. It is true that "Social Science has as yet little existence except in the pretentious name;" that "the science has not yet come to the birth which can comprehend all human nature." The wonder is that, after waiting so many years, the patience of the public has not been exhausted. This can be accounted for on the assumption that there is in the public mind a conviction that after all there is a science which can satisfy all these conditions. This supposition also will account for the good will which accompanies, in most instances, these otherwise caustic remarks. Praise is freely bestowed wherever there is a favourable opportunity for doing so.

[1] *Times*, Oct. 4, 1863. [2] *Times*, Oct. 6, 1865. [3] *Times*, Oct. 4, 1865.

In the same leading article from which, as being the most recent utterance of the Press, so large a quotation was made, the "sober, business-like address of the President" is given in abstract; and in regard to his remarks on education, it is admitted that from the earliest days of its existence the Association has been "a leader and guide, and is certainly entitled to a considerable share in the credit of the result already obtained." In short, the public Press, the fourth estate, whilst it acknowledges fully the usefulness of the Association, demurs to its claim to be considered scientific. But though the Nottingham meeting contributed so little directly to the establishment of this claim, the past Congress will be memorable in virtue of having done so indirectly; and that, by grappling much more definitely than usual with the religious aspect of the question.

The preacher at the opening service, which happily, with rare exceptions,[1] has been considered a necessary part of the

[1] It is both interesting and instructive to note the way in which these opening services of the Social Science Congress have been dealt with, and in particular to mark the value that has been attached by the authorities to the sermons. In the official programme the service is seldom if ever mentioned as if it were a necessary part of the proceedings. Sometimes it remains doubtful, even to the last week, whether a service will be held at all. It was so in 1862, when the Congress met in London: only at the last moment was the service in Westminster Abbey announced. On several occasions there has been no service. For example, when the Congress was held in Dublin in 1861 and 1881, and Belfast 1867, and in fact whenever it has been in Ireland, this public recognition of God has been dispensed with. This also was before the Irish Church was disestablished.

The sermons preached have been dealt with still more negligently. For the first few years they were always printed in the "Transactions;" but after this, until quite recently, they have been as invariably omitted. The omission commenced in 1862, when the sermon was given in abstract only, and was shunted into a note. It was a remarkable discourse, judged only as a contribution to Social Science. Dr. Hook was the preacher, and his subject was the building of Solomon's temple. His theory was that, just as Solomon invited Hiram, a Gentile, to help him in the building of the Jewish temple, so the Church is willing to accept the services and accept the aid of Social Science as its servant. It was a left-handed compliment, but one with which the Association can find no fault, if it consents to treat religion as a subject beyond its province. In the following year not even is the text mentioned, though the preacher was the Rev. C.W. Arnot, D.D., a divine who by his writings was entitled to speak with authority on Social Science. After this, until quite recently, there has been the same unfortunate omission to print the sermon —unfortunate, not only because of the faulty principle thereby involved, but because of the loss to Social Science of some very valuable addresses.

In my former paper I acknowledged the debt that I myself owe to the sermon preached by the Bishop of Worcester (1868) at Birmingham. It is the most valuable contribution that I have ever met with on the subject; but besides this one, the sermon of the Archbishop of York (1864), and that of Canon Rickson (1866), and some others, were well worthy of

proceedings, commenced his discourse with this bold statement: "There is, we may be sure, but one ruling thought in our minds at this moment, the relation of Social Science to religion. This Congress is a witness that such a relation is believed to exist." Though not prepared to accept without qualification Dr. Wilson's exposition of what that relation is, the whole sermon is well worth reading and study. There are sentiments in almost every paragraph of great depth and beauty, and the discourse as a whole cannot fail to strengthen the growing conviction that exists in the minds of thoughtful men, both that there is such a science as Social Science, and that its religious aspect is one that cannot be ignored without doing grievous injury both to science and to religion.[1] The truth is, if I mistake not, that Social Science should be spoken of not like other sciences, as a science having certain relations to religion, but as being itself one of the many ways in which the truth of religion becomes manifest to those who have eyes to see and hearts to understand. I venture also to suggest in regard to the scientific value of the work done by the Association during the last twenty-five years, that it probably stands somewhat in the same relation to true Social Science as alchemy did to chemistry. The alchemists did not, indeed, find the valuable stone which was by a touch to turn everything to gold; but in their search for it they brought to light the nature of the various substances upon which their experiments were made, and in this way were the pioneers to discoveries which have proved to be of infinitely greater value than would have been had they found the thing itself that they desired. It may be so with some even of these "theorists with fads." They are dealing with "communities of men;" and if their schemes do not seemingly come to much, if they seem to bring to their promoters nothing but disappointment, and sometimes ridicule, time may show that these very failures were steps toward the attainment of

> "More things in heaven and earth
> Than were dreamt of in their philosophy."

preservation as valuable essays on Social Science. Even the abstract of Dr. Hook's sermon is to the student of Social Science worth many pages of the other addresses which were printed *in extenso* in the same volume. In 1877 and 1878 the sermons are once more printed, but in 1879 the sermon is only just mentioned, though again it was a valuable one. In 1880 the sermon was printed; in 1881 there was no service, the meeting being in Dublin. The report of 1882 is not yet published; but the value of the sermon can scarcely be questioned, and there is little doubt that it will be preserved.

[1] "For the present it excludes theology and the sciences properly so called; though if the career of the Association be continued with equal energy, we doubt if these exceptions can be maintained . . . it is doubtful if religion can altogether be separated from questions of education." —*Times*, Oct. 14, 1865.

It is thus, at least, that the believer in Social Science can find solace in the retrospect of failures over which he is obliged somewhat mournfully to write, "Quorum pars magna fui."

These remarks upon the Social Science Congress last year prepare the way for some further observations on the law of tendencies, which was given as the first law of Social Science in the former article. The illustrations which were then adduced would not, could not, unless supported by others, give anything like an adequate idea of the all-pervading operation of this simple law. I proceed, therefore, to submit two other illustrations. The first pair chosen, as before, from private everyday life; the second pair from life the most public that can be selected; and these latter for the special purpose of showing the universality of the action of this law.

Gin-palaces and coffee-palaces are the first pair. The bane and an antidote. The one showing success obtained by taking advantage of the law of tendencies, the other no less strikingly proving its existence by the failures ensuing upon its neglect. Yet not by failures only; still further proof is evidenced by subsequent successes. In each case the various tendencies will be specially notified by the numerals 1, 2, 3. . . . . .

Observe then of the gin-palace that it is commonly situated in a densely crowded (1) neighbourhood; surrounding poverty and dirt is a consequence; but it is also a favouring tendency (2). The building is at the corner (3) of the street, where also stands the strange woman (Prov. vii. 12), and for the same reason. If four ways meet, there may be seen sometimes a gin-shop at each corner. A baker's shop may possibly be able to hold possession of a fifth, and prove that in that particular locality the bread-tendency stands to gin in the ratio of one to four. Again, the gin-palace looks bright and warm inside (4), and its privacy (5) is carefully preserved. The poor wife must herself enter the door before she can tell for certain whether her husband is in the trap. The door also is ajar (6), and there is no step (7). Every possible inducement to enter is made use of; every possible hindrance is removed. In one word, those who open gin-palaces instinctively perceive that "tendencies tell." They avail themselves of the law and succeed.

Contrast with this the past history of coffee-house promoters. How slow to note these same favouring tendencies! how prone to treat the contraries as unimportant "littles"! how easy to be beguiled by the apologetic "it is only . . . ."!

My first coffee-house experience, many years ago, was in Pimlico, and these were some of the mistakes made. A nice comfortable room was fitted up, but it was upstairs (1), in an out-of-the-way (2) street, in a well-to-do, that is *not* (3) coffee-wanting neighbourhood. Any one of these tendencies to

failure would have been alone sufficient to ensure it; failure not, as was then thought, for want of more money, but in consequence of the operation of this social law.

The second experiment of the kind that came under my notice was in the enterprizing town of B——, where first there was a failure and then a great success. There was failure where, though in a populous neighbourhood, the coffee-house was in a small back (1) street, which was also a blind (2) street, leading nowhere. When even in the street itself the room was (3) not easy to find; when found you had to go upstairs (4) to it; and, finally, when it was also a night-school (5), a blunder of which I shall give presently a yet more striking example. Just now I point out merely the fact that this was a blunder, and in violation of a social law yet to be specified. But besides these adverse tendencies, there were also others arising out of the means adopted to overcome them. First, there was that common error of thinking that more money (6) is the only thing wanted; then that equally common mistake of assuming (7) that the money is good for the purpose, irrespective of the source from which it is obtained; from a bazaar for example, which one might safely say stands at this time lowest amongst the agencies for raising the wind that Social Science would approve.[1] I reserve to another occasion a full exposition of this policy and some of its consequences; at present it is enough to state that "more money" was tried, and failed.[2] The last straw, however, that broke this patient

[1] "Bazaars and the Grace of Liberality," by the Rev. V.M. White, LL.D. 1882 (Walbrook, 180 Brompton Road). A very valuable treatise.

[2] The cry for "Money! money! money!" without any particular intimation of carefulness, or even a thought as to the source from which it comes; without a question being raised as to the possibility of improvement in the mode of expenditure—the issue of "a fresh appeal," without any token of reconsideration indicative of effort made to understand better the object in view, or the suitability of the existing agency for the accomplishment of that object, is exactly parallel with that of a gunner—if such an one could be found—who has but one idea, how to make his gun more effective. "Powder! more powder!" is all that he thinks or can be induced to believe is wanted. The end of a gun so served, and of the gunner, would not long be doubtful. There would be a few reports, and then the last. The gun would burst, and the gunner . . . ! But philanthropic schemes are made of tougher material than gun-metal, and managing committees have a vitality that is practically indestructible; so appeal after appeal is made, report after report is issued, each longer and louder than the last. But in case of deficiency, rarely, indeed, in the minds of the most sagacious does there arise the suspicion, rarer still the confession, that the first necessity is not more money (at any rate, not more money from the charitable public, possibly even less!), but a better understanding of the business in hand, and better modes of expenditure.

An unlooked-for justification of these remarks appears in a leading article of the *Times*, Jan. 20, 1883. Commenting upon the alarming de-

camel's back was not the appeal for money; nor the scarcely less questionable device of increasing the custom of the coffee-house by the (8) purchase of free tickets, to be given away indiscriminately; but it was the demand made upon the committee of managers to attend personally (9) in rotation. Each member was to attend once a week, some of them oftener, to supply the places (10) of those who should unavoidably be unable to take their turn. This was (happily) asking too much; so at last, notwithstanding all these efforts, or as Social Science would say, in consequence of the tendency of many of them to failure, the house was closed.

Any temporary success under such circumstances is in itself, to a certain extent, a failure, because obtained at such, more than necessary, expenditure of money, time, and patience. Worst of all, and that because the promoters do not know of such a science as Social Science, the valuable experience thus dearly purchased is generally thrown away. The consequence is, that when failure comes, it is complete. People are thoroughly tired out, and they excuse themselves by saying that, though the object is confessedly a good one, it is "impracticable." In the light of Social Science, difficulties are what the Iron Duke said they were, "things to be overcome."

Happily for the town of B——, some persons (the same, or others) made a second trial, and, this time, with complete success. The best possible situation was selected. A high rent was considered rather an advantage, because it meant a busy (1) thoroughfare. The shop taken had, in fact, previously been kept by one of the best jewellers in the town. A man of great experience (2) was chosen to be manager, and he was (3) trusted. For instance, the directors thought they must charge more than one penny for a cup of coffee. He told them, "Charge twopence, and you will fail; charge a penny (4), also let your goods be first-class (5), and I will guarantee a good profit on the outlay. Do not fear in this, your best house, to spend a little on decoration (6). This will act as an advertisement, and in this way be a help to other houses in the town,

---

ficiency in the income of some of the general hospitals in London—four of them having been obliged to sell out, during the past year, investments to an amount approaching to £30,000, and again, seventeen of them realizing a total of £35,922 less in 1881 than in 1877—it concludes with these significant remarks:—"Their growing impecuniosity will not be without its uses if it set the public upon observing their defects, and oblige their managers to combine for reciprocal sustenance and improvement." In the same issue is a very able letter from the secretary of the Social Science Association. In my next article this important question of medical charity will be fully dealt with, for it was in this field more than in any of those hitherto mentioned, that I learnt so many Social Science lessons.

where decoration would be extravagant. But take care, in all the houses alike, that they are bright and cheerful, sweet and clean; that they have plenty (7) of waiters, civil (8) and obliging; and that the food is good of its kind. Fresh coffee every morning; no warming up of last night's leaving, no stale bread, buns, etc., and you will succeed." And so it came to pass. In obedience to this law of tendencies, success—success beyond expectation—was speedily obtained; a dividend of ten per cent., with a handsome overplus carried over to the redemption of the capital invested.

This particular instance was one of the earlier successes. Similar successes are now, thank God! to be met with in many other towns, and even in some villages.

As already hinted, I have yet another example of coffee-house experience to narrate. It is again a failure, and on that account, as before, the more instructive; but it is mentioned for the purpose, more particularly, of bringing to light the working of a social law, second only in importance to the law of tendencies. It is

THE LAW OF SINGLENESS, OR SIMPLICITY,

a term which the following history will explain. This coffee-house was started under circumstances exceptionally favourable. The situation was good, at the corner of a street; the entrance to it was easy and private; the room bright and warm; the manager excellent—in fact, the very man who had succeeded so well at B——; the administration was liberal, good coffee, fresh buns, etc., every day; house open early, five a.m., and closed late, eleven p.m.; low prices, etc. But the scheme was weighted with one adverse tendency, and this one by itself was sufficient to account for the failure, and especially for failure in that particular locality.

It was a Roman Catholic quarter, to a great extent, and this particular coffee-house was also a mission-room. Of course the Roman Catholics would not only keep away themselves, but would do all in their power to keep others away. Solomon's admonition, "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird," was unheeded; the words also of One greater than Solomon were not regarded, or, still more likely, were thought to favour the combination. But "If thine eye be single" were His words, and the comparison of this passage with others where the same word is used, will, if need be, justify the remark that when our Lord said "single," He did not mean "double." And so, though uncommon personal energy, great kindliness of heart and unstinted liberality of purse, kept things going for a time, these and other such adventitious aids

could not command success against the overpowering adverse tendency of want of singleness.

I may mention, in further illustration of this same law, that the room is now used simply as a mission-room, and it prospers. A coffee-house has been opened within a stone's-throw, and is now carried on by a company, not by a clergyman; yet it is to be feared that the false start made at first will greatly imperil its success.

On this law of "singleness," perhaps more than on any other, depends the issue (success or failure) of many undertakings—success if the law is observed, failure if it is neglected. It is a law that may be observed in operation every day in ordinary business. The post-office for letters, the railway system for passengers and goods, the telegraph for messages, are good illustrations—three subdivisions of one general department in a national provision for conveyance. In each and in all the business is kept "single," and hence the success. Similarly, in religious undertakings, the most successful are those in which singleness of aim, a rigid adherence to the special business undertaken, whatever it may be, characterizes all the proceedings. It is enough to mention the Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, the London City Mission, and, amongst the more recent efforts, the Blue Ribbon Army, the evangelistic prowess of Messrs. Moody and Sankey. I leave it to my readers to contrast with these other similar efforts where the course pursued is not so single.

I know no better test, in forming an opinion of the trustworthiness of any new proposal, than to ask this simple question, "Is it marked on the face of it by the characteristic of singleness?" It is much more common for people to ask, "Who is the promoter?" or "Who are on the managing committee?" or "Who are subscribers?" and to be guided accordingly; but except in the case of the secretary, who is generally the prime mover, this mode of testing an undertaking is very often misleading; and even in regard to a secretary, the test of singleness, as applied to the undertaking, is both much more searching, and it also carries with it this great incidental advantage, that it keeps the question free from personalities, which are so apt to intrude themselves.

This question as to singleness, besides being a good test, is also a most trustworthy guide in any undertaking already in hand. There is nothing more helpful to secure both thoroughness in execution and soundness in the modes of operation, than this same principle of singleness. This is but common-sense, but it is that kind of common-sense which is not common. It is much more usual for people to have at least two objects in view in any work they undertake. Sometimes both objects

are named, sometimes not—a practice which is called jesuitical,[1] and rightly so; but, even when both are named, the professed business is not always kept in the foremost place. There is what may well be called a social squint, instead of singleness. The result is always doubly disadvantageous. The business in hand suffers, as in the case of the coffee-house just mentioned; and the other "cause," even though it be a very good one, which the promoter thinks to help on incidentally, is injured. The mission-room succeeds now far better than it did when it was also a coffee-house.

Much of so-called Church-work in the present day, and not a little "Christian work," would be better every way if there were more "singleness" in the procedure. It needs more than ordinary confidence in your "Church," and more than ordinary faith in your Christianity—in other words, more than ordinary trust in God's wisdom and in God's ways of working, to believe, and to act upon the belief, that if anyone tries to do what he has to do well, that is thoroughly, and without any ulterior object in view, both the Church itself and Christianity, and everything else that is good—yea, that highest good of all, namely, God's glory—will not suffer, but will be furthered in the best possible way.

Thus the teachings of Social Science are, as might have safely been anticipated that they would be, in perfect harmony with Holy Scripture. The first law—"tendencies tell"—is but another form of the inspired declaration, "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." And the second law—the law of "singleness"—is but an application socially, *i.e.* to communities of men, of our Lord's declaration, "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light;" and again, of that pregnant command, given to the Thessalonians, "Study" ("be ambitious," N.V. *margin*) "to be quiet, and to do your own business." The world (the Christian world inclusive) says, "Be ambitious to 'make a noise, even though your own business be left undone.'" The analogy also that exists between these laws of Social Science and those of nature, should not be overlooked. "Tendencies tell" is the analogue of the physical law that every force produces an effect; and the law of "singleness" in Social Science is the exact counterpart of that which obtains in nature, whereby every created object, animate and

[1] I may possibly use this word again, and perhaps more than once. I beg, therefore, that both here and elsewhere may be noted the essential difference between saying that a certain course of action is *jesuitical*, which may be a most justifiable and proper remark, and saying that the person, even the originator of the scheme, is a Jesuit, which, even if true, had far better be left unsaid.

inanimate, has in itself an individuality of function so determinate, that even each ultimate atom has the essential character of being a manufactured article.[1]

But it will be noticed, and perhaps objected, that thus far the workings of these laws have been traced only in comparatively small undertakings. The objection, so far as it has any force, will be abundantly answered by the second pair of illustrations. In anticipation of these, however, it may be observed that though the communities of men selected have been insignificant as compared with "all human nature," it was exactly the same in the case of Newton's observations on a falling apple, which led to the discovery of the law of gravity. If Newton had not shown that the law which regulated the fall of that apple is the same that regulates the movements of the planets, that it reaches to the utmost bounds of creation, he had done little. Similarly in regard to any social law which has been, or which shall be hereafter given, so far as from the nature of things it is possible to apply it, so far let the law he applied. Unless it holds good, the law is not law. Unless the laws propounded can stand this test, the so-called science is not worthy of the name. The second pair of illustrations is intended to supply this necessary test. Attention will be restricted first to the law of tendencies. I appeal to society at large and to the changes that have taken place in it during the last thirty years or less, selecting, for example, some in the Established Church and in the nation, and some corresponding changes that have taken place in the customs of ordinary every-day life. It may not be possible wholly to separate these the one from the other, but it will be convenient to make the attempt, and I shall begin with the nation.

I select a tendency which has of late been brought into special prominence by the persistence of one of the constituencies to force upon the House of Commons an avowed atheist. It is not necessary to name either the individual or the town which has thus signalized itself. The bare mention of the fact is all that is required. The believer in Social Science regards this as evidence of the operation of a tendency, and looks around for other evidence of a similar kind. He accepts the event not as an isolated fact, but like an eruption in smallpox or scarlet fever, or some other palpable evidence of constitutional change; a mere symptom in itself, but significant of something pervading the whole system. This com-

[1] Address by the late Professor Maxwell, at the meeting of the British Association (1873). The close of that discourse was a noble and manly avowal of his belief in the Divine power and wisdom by which the worlds were made.

parison of a community with the human body, derived originally from Scripture, is fully borne out by the teaching of Social Science, and is oftentimes, as in this instance, helpful to the student in the interpretation of social phenomena. Accordingly he inquires, what other proofs have there been in the national life, during the last thirty years, of a tendency to do without God? He observes that in former days, in times of pestilence, war, famine, or excessive drought of rain, or of any other circumstances affecting for ill the whole nation, a day of prayer and humiliation used to be set apart by command of the Queen; days also of thanksgiving for special national mercies were not unfrequent. For some of these the deliverance was so signal that the anniversary of the joyous day was ordered to be observed year by year. Religious services were held, and customs were adopted by the people for the express purpose of keeping the event ever more in remembrance. The fifth of November is a case in point; but within the last few years the service has been expunged from the Book of Common Prayer, by authority of Parliament; and even if the day fall on Sunday, it is the exception in the pulpit to take any notice of it. It seems likely that were it not for boys' love of fun and fireworks, the "Gunpowder Plot" would soon be forgotten. But further, it would tax the memory severely of most of my readers to recall a day appointed either for national thanksgiving or for national humiliation. An abortive attempt is made from time to time, when for very shame it is impossible to be longer silent. Sometimes the proposal originates with a few godly people,[1] of their own will and pleasure; sometimes at the invitation of one person, whose character and position entitles him to speak, *e.g.* the venerable and recently departed Dean Close;[2] still more rarely, a Bishop issues an order to his

[1] In 1881 an effort of this kind was made. A circular was very extensively issued throughout the country, announcing the intention of certain persons 'to observe Saturday, July 23rd, or where this is not possible, Sunday, July 24th, with regard to the following subjects:—i. Thanksgiving to God for mercies to the nation; ii. Humiliation for our national sins.'

[2] The suggestion of Dean Close was much more to the purpose. He wrote to the *Record*, suggesting that petitions should be sent to the Government for presentation to the Queen, asking Her Most Gracious Majesty to appoint a day. This was in 1878 (?), at the close of the last session of Lord Beaconsfield's Administration. A form of petition was wisely given. In Derby at least it was extensively signed; "With both hands!" was the simple and hearty response given by some who were asked. I have but little doubt that if the same trouble—a trouble not worth mentioning—had been taken in other towns and villages as was in Derby, the expressions of public opinion would have been so strong that it would have been impossible to ignore it. The apathy was not with the people but with the authorities. Another instance, and the only

clergy. The last episode of the kind was mentioned in the newspapers (I know not on what authority) as the act of the Prime Minister. But these are none of them national acts. They may be taken as a confession of what the nation ought to do, but nothing more. In case of war, it is not the Prime Minister, nor the people, nor the Commander-in-Chief, but the Queen who issues the proclamation; neither can anyone except the Queen, through her Ministers in Council assembled, appoint a national day either for humiliation or for thanksgiving.

A former Bishop of Lincoln (Kaye), understood well the distinction between his own duty in this respect and that of the Queen. When urged to appoint a day, he refused, saying that he had no power to do it, and therefore no right to act as if he had that power. More than this, when the Government at last fixed the day, he would not issue orders to the clergy in Lincoln to observe it, until the Mayor had first taken the initiative. This having been done, the Bishop was not slow to perform his own part. He preached in the Cathedral a sermon that is yet remembered, and in it he administered a severe rebuke to the authorities for the unseemly delay that had taken place. "O si sic omnes!" The Education Act (1870) is another instance of the operation of this same tendency to exclude God from the Statute Book. Liberty is thereby given to the people, if they will, to shut out God's Word from the National Schools. That the people have not yet availed themselves of this power in no way alters the character of the Act itself.

The increasing difficulty of maintaining ancient religious statutes, such as those that enforce the national observance of the Lord's day; still more, certain specific acts of modern legislation, which are "within measurable distance" of allowing man's authority to override other of God's commandments (*e.g.*, the seventh and eighth), are proofs to the believer in Social Science of the operation of this same atheistic tendency upon the nation. If further proof be required, it is enough to mention the notorious fact that the expression "Vox populi vox Dei" has become proverbial, and that it is accepted by "advanced" politicians as a recognised principle of action against which there is to be no appeal.

W. OGLE.

---

other that I can call to mind worth mentioning, was a resolution moved by Canon Wilkinson (Bishop-elect of Truro), in the Lower House of Convocation—immediately after the assassination of Lord F. Cavendish and his secretary in Ireland, praying the Upper House to concur in asking for a day of humiliation and prayer. The motion was seconded, and carried *nem. con.*—*Times*, May 11, 1882. What further steps, if any, were taken has not transpired. Petitions in support of the proposal were sent from Derby.

ART. III.—LADY BLOOMFIELD'S REMINISCENCES.

Reminiscences of Court and Diplomatic Life. By GEORGIANA, Baroness BLOOMFIELD. Two vols. Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co. 1883.

THE message from the Treasury Bench in the House of Commons, to representative men in the Upper House, requesting to be told—"in one word," as Bishop Wilberforce used to say—"What are the duties of an Archdeacon?" brought at last, as everybody knows, the epigrammatic answer, "The duties of an Archdeacon are strictly archidiaconal." Of those who have a fair stock of useful knowledge, few, probably, can answer offhand the question, "What are the duties of a Maid of Honour?" Lady Bloomfield tells us, in her "Reminiscences of Court Life," that the duties of Maids of Honour are very easy. Except at meals, or when the Queen sends for them, they may sit quietly in their rooms. Their chief duty, indeed, consists in placing a bouquet beside Her Majesty when she sits down to dinner, and even this only happens every other day. The "badge" is the Queen's picture, surrounded with brilliants on a red bow. Lady Bloomfield, who was a Maid of Honour at twenty, and an ambassadress at twenty-three, was the youngest child of the second Lord Ravensworth. It is said that one day her father (then Sir Thomas Liddell) was walking in Portland Place, when he met a nurse carrying a baby in her arms; and, being struck by the beauty of the infant, he asked whose it was. The nurse, much astonished, answered, "Your own, Sir Thomas!" When Miss Liddell was fifteen, she was confirmed in the Chapel Royal. She was only examined once before it, by a Fulham clergyman; "the preparation and instruction in those days," she remarks, "being very different from what they are now, and consisting literally in the knowledge of the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Church Catechism." From her earlier years, however, her mother had impressed her with a sense of God's presence, and tried to instil religious motives into her mind. Her eldest sister, the Marchioness of Normanby, was one of the ladies-in-waiting; and a good story is told of a little scene at Court in the year 1840. "One day," says our author, "the Queen expressed a desire to hear me sing; so, in fear and trembling, I sang one of Grisi's famous airs, but omitted a shake at the end. The Queen's quick ear immediately detected the omission, and smiling, Her Majesty said, 'Does not your sister shake, Lady Normanby?' My sister immediately answered, 'Oh yes, ma'am; she is shaking all over.' The Queen, much amused, laughed heartily at the joke." That was the year of the famous "Bedchamber Plot,"

when, as Mr. McCarthy writes, "Sir Robert Peel could not govern with Lady Normanby, and Lord Melbourne could not govern without her." The following year, however, Sir Robert came into office, and the Duchess of Sutherland and Lady Normanby resigned. Lord and Lady Ravensworth were pleased and flattered by the Queen's desire that another of their daughters should be selected to wait upon Her Majesty, although, as she was the only daughter remaining at home, they did not like the idea of her leaving them for three months in the year. The young lady herself, however, was decidedly in favour of accepting the post.

In January, 1842, the King of Prussia arrived at Windsor Castle for the Prince of Wales's christening.[1] The Duke of Wellington, looking well, stood behind the Queen during the christening, bearing the great sword of state. The banquet was quite magnificent; the table reached from one end of St. George's Hall to the other, covered with gold plate and thousands of wax candles. Rundell's famous piece of work, "an immense gold vessel, more like a bath than anything else, containing thirty dozen of wine, was filled with mulled claret," and it surprised the Prussians greatly. The King of Prussia much enjoyed his visit. At the Duke of Sussex's, he "made a very pretty speech;" at the Archbishop of Canterbury's he gave the toast, "The Queen and the Church, for they can *never* be separated." His Majesty seemed to have got weary of the rigid etiquette of the English Court; for, as the Lord Chamberlain and attendants were backing and bowing in taking him to the carriage, he said, "De grâce ne faites donc pas cette cérémonie pour moi; allez-vous en, allez-vous en!"

In February, 1842, the Queen paid a visit to Brighton. Lady Bloomfield writes:—

> We left Windsor a little after eight, and arrived here at twenty minutes before three. The roads were very heavy, but the Queen always travels with relays of her own horses, so we came a capital pace. We stopped at Reigate, and there I had a good opportunity of seeing the two children. The Princess Royal is very pretty, and the Prince of Wales is such a very fine baby. Crowds of people assembled, and we had to go a foot's pace from the entrance of the town; the windows and balconies were all filled with people waving and cheering, and a great many gentlemen came and met us a long way off, and joined the escort; the road for four miles was lined with carriages.

[1] On the Sunday in the Castle, Bishop Blomfield, we read, "preached a beautiful sermon from John iii. 8. He impressed upon us the importance of the Sacrament of Baptism as the appointed means whereby we are admitted members of the Church of Christ on earth, which, we hope, will make us members of it hereafter in heaven." This sentence is far from clear.

The Queen had not been at Brighton since her marriage; and it may have amused Her Majesty to show the Prince so curious a palace. Lord Jocelyn, who had lately returned from China, said the Pavilion was a perfect specimen of a Chinese house. But the garden was "odious;" there was neither pleasure nor privacy to be had there. "The whole place was a strange specimen of royal eccentricity," adds Lady Bloomfield, "and a most uncomfortable, dull residence, so I never wondered at the Queen's getting rid of it." Mention is made of the well-known clergyman, Robert Anderson. "I went to hear Mr. R. Anderson, who preaches extempore, and gave us an excellent and uncommon sermon; he has great command of language, and remarkable facility." The Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, we may add, was a son-in-law of John Shore, first Lord Teignmouth.

On May 29th of the same year our author was in waiting at Buckingham Palace, and had attended Divine service on Sunday at the Chapel Royal, with the Queen and Prince Albert. The following day—

I was not a little disappointed when, about six o'clock, we saw the Queen drive off in an open carriage with Prince Albert. I remarked that it was very hard to keep us in the whole afternoon when we were not wanted, and I went off grumbling to take a walk in the Palace gardens. I was much horrified to learn on my return that the Queen had been shot at by a lad of the name of Francis. That evening the Queen was talking to Sir Robert Peel, who was then Prime Minister, and who was much affected at the risk Her Majesty had run, when the Queen turned to me and said, "I dare say, Georgy, you were surprised at not driving with me this afternoon; but the fact was that, as we returned from church yesterday, a man presented a pistol at the carriage-window, which flashed in the pan; we were so taken by surprise that he had time to escape; so I knew what was hanging over me, and was determined to expose no life but my own."

Some amusing anecdotes are related concerning the little Princess Royal. Whilst they were driving, one day, the Queen called her, as she often did, "Missy." The Princess took no notice the first time, but the next she looked up very indignantly, and said to her mother, "I'm not Missy; I'm the Princess Royal." When three years old, she spoke French fluently, and she was reading, one day, when Lady Lyttelton went up to her; she motioned her away with her hand, and said, "N'approchez pas moi, moi ne veut pas vous."[1]

In October, 1844, the Queen paid a visit to the City, and the

[1] On another occasion, when driving in the Great Park, she took a fancy to some heather at the side of the road, and asked Lady Dunmore to get her some. Lady Dunmore observed she could not do that, as we were driving too fast; so the Princess answered, "No, *you* can't; but *those girls* might get out and get me some"—meaning Miss Paget and Miss Liddell.

procession was magnificent. Our author went in a state carriage with Lady Gardiner (the bedchamber woman-in-waiting), the Duke of Norfolk (Earl Marshal), and Lord Anglesea (Gold-stick). The Lord Mayor, who met the Queen at Temple Bar, had put on a huge pair of jack-boots over his shoes and stockings to keep the mud off. Unfortunately, the boots were too tight; and in spite of tremendous tuggings, one would not come off. The Queen's carriage was drawing nearer and nearer, and the poor Lord Mayor was obliged to put the big boot on again. At breakfast, at Windsor Castle, two days later, Sir Robert Peel was most amusing. He told the ladies how, at a Guildhall dinner, he heard Alderman Flower remark to Mr. Canning, "My Lord Ellenborough (the Lord Chief Justice) was a man of uncommon sagacity." Mr. Canning bowed assent, and said he believed he was; but asked what gave rise to that observation at that moment. Upon which the alderman answered: "Why, sir, had he been here he would have told me by a single glance of his eye which is the best of these five haunches of venison." About this time Lady Bloomfield wrote: "It always strikes me as so odd when I come back into waiting; everything else changes, but the life here never does, and is always exactly the same from day to day, and from year to year." In conversation with Lady Sale, the Maid of Honour learned many details of the tragic tale of Cabul. The prisoners were often twenty-four hours without food; they usually slept in the open air on the snow, each having one sheepskin. In 1845 the author resigned her appointment at Court, in consequence of her mother's state of health. Shortly afterwards she was engaged to the Hon. John (afterwards second Lord) Bloomfield, who was Ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg. She received a letter of congratulation from the Queen, which is worth quoting, as it pleasingly shows Her Majesty's kindness and sympathy:—

Osborne, July 29, 1845.

My dearest Georgiana,—I received this morning your kind letter announcing your marriage with Mr. Bloomfield, which has surprised us most agreeably. I do not think you guilty of any inconsistency, and we only hope you will be *as* happy through a long life as *we are*; I *cannot* wish you *more* than this. I highly approve your choice, having a high opinion of Mr. Bloomfield, and I shall be much pleased to have, as the wife of my representative at St. Peterburg, a person who has been about me, whom I am so partial to, and who, I am sure, will perform the duties of her position extremely well. I pity you much for the painful separation from Mr. Bloomfield to which you will be subjected. Once more repeating our sincere wishes for your happiness, and with our kind regards to your parents, who we hope are better,

Believe me,

Always yours affectionately,

Victoria R.

Lady Bloomfield's residence at St. Petersburg, which extended from 1845 to 1850,[1] was interrupted by several absences; the climate was very trying to her health, and she rejoiced greatly to hear at length that the Queen had been pleased to request Lord Palmerston to give them another post. Some of her reminiscences of society in the metropolis, and of the Emperor Nicholas, are vivid and full of interest. The Russian ladies at that time never appeared to occupy themselves; their chief interest was the theatre. In all the splendidly furnished rooms our author was struck by the apparent want of occupation, books, &c. English nurses, it seems, were greatly preferred. Princess B—— gave her nurse £70 a year, besides quantities of presents; and one day, when an English lady was calling on the Princess, the nurse sent in to say she wished to have the carriage-and-four to take the child an airing! This request was immediately acceded to, and she was met walking down the great staircase attended by a footman! On one occasion, wrote Lady Bloomfield—

> We were rather amused to hear that a party had been invited to dine with the Grand Duke Michael, to eat some English mutton, which is considered a great delicacy at St. Petersburg. This turned out to be a poor sheep my father sent me, which broke its leg on the voyage from England, and had to be killed immediately; but which we could not use because the meat was bad, so it was sold by our cook to the Grand Duke's, as a great favour, but of course when the meat came to the table it was not eatable.

The Russian Court at that time was not much given to hospitality, as regards the diplomatic body; but the Empress, whose health was very delicate, showed much kindness to the English Ambassador's wife. When she was first summoned to Tzarskoe Selo, Lord and Lady Bloomfield left St. Petersburg in their chariot, with four horses abreast, at twelve o'clock, reaching the Palace at two. On arriving, they were shown to their apartments, which were handsome as to size, but wretchedly furnished, with just a bare table, a few chairs, and a very stiff, uncomfortable sofa placed against the wall. Though they had been offered beds, the offer was evidently a mere formal courtesy, as there was only one small bed in the ante-room. By asking, they "succeeded in getting washhand-stands." After dinner there was an interval; then a play. As soon as supper was over they took leave, getting home again at three o'clock in the morning. The servants were all serfs; and

[1] In the year 1850, Dr. Gutzlaff, the famous Chinese missionary, dined with Lord and Lady Bloomfield; and his conversation, we read, "was extremely interesting and amusing. He had lived twenty-three years in China, and looked exactly like a Chinese."

some of them paid as much as 200 roubles a year poll-tax to their owners. Lady Bloomfield wrote :—

The Moujiks lived altogether apart from the foreign servants ; in our house they had a small *entre sol*, which they kept excessively hot, never admitting a breath of fresh air during the winter, but they went out into the open air when there were many degrees of cold. The Moujiks' rooms were never furnished, and I believe they slept on the floor wrapped up in their sheepskins. Their food consisted of cabbage, frozen fish, dried mushrooms, or rather toad-stools, called gribuï, stale eggs, and very bad oil. They mix these ingredients together in a pot and boil them, and this mess they greatly preferred to good food. When Lord Stuart de Rothesay was Ambassador, he wished to feed his Moujiks like his other servants, but they declined eating the food the cook prepared for them. They wore a red shirt, loose cotton trousers, boots outside their trousers, a jacket and an apron ; and they never undressed except once a week when they went to their bath, which was described to me as a large sort of flat oven, which is heated as much as possible, and then water is thrown over it, which causes a great steam.

The English Ambassador's footman, Foky, it seems, was a very good man, "better than most Russian servants;" he always grew ostensibly thinner during the Lent and Advent fasts. He was in the habit of reading the Bible in Slavonic.

Several items of information as to religious matters are well worth quoting. For instance, on one Easter Day, when the Czar came out of the chapel at the Winter Palace, saying, "*Christus vos Krest*" ("Christ is risen"), which is the Russian salutation on that festival, he greeted the sentinel, who responded, "That is a lie." It turned out that he was a Jew. We have heard this story, but with the sentinel's contradiction in a more courteous form. Again, Lady Bloomfield writes :—

As late as the reign of the Emperor Alexander, an ukase was printed forbidding a blessing to be carried in a hat. It seems that formerly when a Pope (priest) was sent for to administer extreme unction, if anything hindered his going to the dying man, he whispered a blessing in the messenger's hat, which was covered in his presence, and uncovered before the sick man ; and this was supposed to convey a special blessing equivalent to the sacrament of extreme unction.

Count Nesselrode[1] . . . looked rather Jewish . . . He was christened on board an English frigate in the Tagus, and always considered himself a member of the Church of England. In Russia no official can receive his salary till he can prove that he has received the Holy Communion in whatever Church he belongs to. Consequently, once a year, generally

[1] Shrewd statesman and diplomatist as he was, Count Nesselrode's forecast was not always correct. Dining at the English Ambassador's, January, 1848, he remarked that no political event seemed of any importance in those days—"Quand tout va comme un papier de musique !" Within a few weeks Europe was in a blaze, and Louis Philippe was a fugitive.

on Holy Thursday, Count Nesselrode, when Chancellor of the Empire and Minister for Foreign Affairs, used to attend the English Chapel on the English Quay, and receive the Holy Communion according to the forms of the Church of England, which, however, he never attended on other occasions, or, I believe, any other place of worship, though he had, of course, to be officially present at all the great ceremonies of the Greek Church.

The Czar was keen and severe; police espionage was everywhere strict; yet bribery, and deceit, and robbery, tainted every department. When General Count Beckendorff was Minister of Police, on returning home one night from his club, he found his pocket-book, which was full of rouble-notes, missing. He accordingly gave the police notice of the fact, stating the sum he had lost. A few days after the sum was returned to him without the pocket-book, which was reported lost; but in the meantime it had been found, notes and all, in his fur pelisse, having slipped down between the lining and the cloth. The police, to show their zeal and activity, had collected the money all themselves, and presented it to their superior officer.

Several anecdotes are told about the Emperor's strictness in military matters. Thus, once at a review, when Lord Bloomfield was present :—

> The officer in command made an egregious mistake by leading his men up a hill in the face of a strong force of artillery, which was blazing away like fury. The Emperor's quick eye speedily detected the error, and, in a perfect fury, he drew his sword, and rode at the wretched officer in command; and my husband said he hardly knew what would happen, but thought the Emperor was going to cut off the culprit's epaulettes. After, however, giving him a severe reprimand, the Emperor turned round to the suite, and said, "Gentlemen, after the humiliating spectacle we have just witnessed, I think the review had better conclude; so adieu!" and he turned his horse's head and galloped off the field.

By removing from St. Petersburg, Lord Bloomfield escaped the trials which Sir Hamilton Seymour had to endure. Yet Berlin, after a time (during the Crimean War), was not a pleasant place for the English, as the Queen was a bitter partisan for Russia. In the spring of 1854 parties were running so very high that "the town was divided into two camps, and those who were well with Russia, which included the Queen and the whole of the 'Kreuz-Zeitung' party, almost cut us and our French colleagues," while the Princess of Prussia (now Empress of Germany) found her residence in Berlin "very trying." Lady Bloomfield at this period gave a State ball, and the Queen said in public that "she was not sure she should go," to which the King replied, "You must" (Du musz). "Lord Bloomfield and I went down to the hall-

door to receive their Majesties; and the Queen took my husband's arm; but the only remark she made was, 'Votre escalier est bien roide, Milord.'"

In justice to Frederic William IV. (the King Cliquot of *Punch*), one remark of our author should be quoted: "The King," wrote Lady Bloomfield, "was beginning to show symptoms of the fatal malady"—a softening of the brain—"which developed rapidly the following year; his walk was uncertain, which gave rise to the report that he was drunk, instead of which he was a remarkably sober and moral man in all his habits."

There are many other interesting passages in the volumes before us, from which, had we space, we should gladly quote. The great charm of the work is its simplicity. These "Reminiscences," are entirely free from the faults of Greville's "Memoirs," and—we must add—of the third volume of the "Life of Bishop Wilberforce."

Art. IV.—JOHN BUNYAN.[1]

THE author of the immortal allegory, "The Pilgrim's Progress," lived in an age of great excitement. The human mind was agitated by the great events that were happening, and, indeed, was stirred to its very depths. John Bunyan was born in rough times, days of revolution and reconstruction; years of tumult, and yet of advance, when some of the most striking events of history took place, and some of the most noted men England has produced gave a page to her annals.

The period of Bunyan's life comprises such events as the Star Chamber and the High Commission; Edgehill, and Naseby, and Marston Moor; and such names as Laud and Strafford, Charles I., Cromwell, and Charles II. The Parliamentary ability of that time was of the highest order; and among the most distinguished members of the House of Commons were Falkland and Hyde, Digby and Harry Vane, and Oliver St. John. But the two foremost men were Pym and Hampden, and by universal consent of friends and enemies, the first place belonged to Hampden. It was a day not only of eminent politicians, but also of great divines. And now it was that such

[1] "The Works of John Bunyan," edited by George Offor, Esq. (Blackie & Son, Edinburgh). "English Men of Letters," edited by John Morley; "Bunyan," by James Anthony Froude (Macmillan).

theologians wrote and preached as Charnock and Owen, Howe and Henry and Baxter. These were great Puritans; but the Church of England by no means lacked men of fine mental power and impressive eloquence. To quote the words of the brilliant historian, "Cudworth and Henry More were still living at Cambridge, South was at Oxford, Prideaux in the close at Norwich, and Whitby in the close of Salisbury. Sherlock preached at the Temple, Tillotson at Lincoln's Inn, Burnet at the Rolls, Stillingfleet at St. Paul's Cathedral, Beveridge at St. Peter's, Cornhill. These were men who could set forth the majesty and beauty of Christianity with such justness of thought and such energy of language, that the indolent Charles aroused himself to listen, and the fastidious Buckingham forgot to sneer."

Nor was the day without its poets; some of them not rising above the character of graceful versifiers; but two, and one of these pre-eminent—"a bright particular star"—shining in the literary firmament. In the former rank we may place Waller and Cowley, and the author of the witty "Hudibras;" in the other, Dryden, a poet of the Classical School, satirist and dramatist, who proved his lyric skill in two fine and celebrated odes, and greatest of all John Milton, with eyes shut to the natural beauties of the world, but with that inner sight by which he was enabled to see "the light which never was on sea or shore," and from whose pen flowed as an inspiration the immortal "Paradise Lost."

The age that gave birth to such men also gave birth to John Bunyan, the glorious dreamer, who was a poet in right of the possession of the imaginative faculty, and who, in his moods of exalted and devotional rapture, seems to have heard, to borrow the majestic language of Milton, "a sevenfold chorus of hallelujahs and harping symphonies." Nor, indeed, should we omit the name of another poet, though following Milton at a great interval, that of the sweet and saintly George Herbert, whose muse drew its inspiration from the Church he loved so well, and of which he was so loyal a son. Bunyan himself, though he may not have had the accomplishment of verse in any eminent degree, yet wrote some pointed and graceful verses, and was gifted with a sympathy with the external world and all beautiful things, which in equal degree was possessed by few. Some lines of Shakespeare's give us a description of the poet's office which was realized by Bunyan:—

> "And as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothings
> A local habitation and a name."

John Bunyan was born in the village of Elstow in the year 1628, thirty years after the death of Spenser, twelve years after the death of Shakespeare, when Milton was in his twentieth year, and three years before the birth of Dryden. He was of obscure parentage, "of a low and inconsiderable generation," his father being a tailor, and some have conjectured, from a passage in "Grace Abounding," that he was of gipsy blood. "His youth," he tells us, "was passed in excess of riot;" he spent his time "in cursing, swearing, lying, and blaspheming the holy name of God." "Yea," he says, "so settled and rooted was I in these things, that they became as a second nature to me; the which, as I have also with soberness considered since, did so offend the Lord, that even in my childhood He did scare and affrighten me, with fearful dreams, and did terrify me with fearful visions. For often after I had spent this and the other day in sin, I have in my bed been greatly afflicted while asleep with the apprehensions of devils and wicked spirits, who still, as I then thought, laboured to draw me away with them, of which I never could be rid." Those who wish to understand the spiritual struggle through which he passed, and would comprehend how real to him were sin and sorrow, self-abasement and utter self-condemnation, should read his autobiography, entitled "Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners;" a book written in prison some years before the "Pilgrim's Progress," and charged with the highest imagination and the most burning passion. He lives the feelings which he describes. He feels the sensations which he depicts.

> I was (he says), as if the strength of my body had been taken away by the power thereof, and often when I was walking was ready to sink with the burden of it. Even crushed to the ground therewith. I saw it, I felt it, I was broken to pieces by it. I could for days together feel my body to shake and totter by reason of this my terror, and was especially at some times as my breastbone would split asunder. I feared also that this was the mark God did set on Cain, even continual fear and trembling under the heavy load of his guilt. Thus did I wind, and twine, and shrink under the burden that was upon me, which burden did also so oppress me that I could neither stand nor go, nor be either at rest or quiet.

He had horrible internal conflicts with wicked suggestions, and terrible battles with the devil, who was as much a personal presence to him as he was to St. Paul or Martin Luther. The struggle was often fierce and long-continued with this spiritual foe. "In prayer I have been greatly troubled at this time. Sometimes I have thought I have felt him behind me pull my clothes; he would be also continually at me in time of

prayer to have done: Break off, make haste, you have prayed enough, and stay no longer." Macaulay would resolve all his expressions of self-condemnation into a morbid state of mind, and says that "it is doing him gross injustice to understand them other than in a theological sense." Froude takes the same view, and lays down his self-accusations to a curiously sensitive conscience, which revenged itself upon him in singular torture. But though he was a man of the strongest feelings, and moved by deep religious excitement, we cannot think that his own account of his violent and passionate boyhood was nothing more than the fancy of an illiterate man, whose affections were warm, whose nerves were excitable, and whose imagination was ungovernable. No doubt his personal experiences were largely coloured by an enthusiastic nature, and the tempestuous workings of a poetic fancy; yet who that remembers the stories of other great sinners who became saints does not see in the humbling self-upbraidings of Milton the work of that Spirit Who convinces of sin, and lays the proudest low in the very dust. "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee," says one; "wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief," says another. And what are we to think of the "Confessions" of St. Augustine, and of the battles he fought with his ghostly enemy the devil? And was not Bunyan being thus prepared for giving to the world that immortal allegory which was not only the delight of our childhood, but is our pleasure in manhood and old age? The tinker of Elstow was led, himself, through this valley of the shadow of death, that he might describe with the intense reality that he has done the Progress of his Pilgrim, from a land overhung with darkness, and peopled with devils, and resounding with mourning, lamentation, and woe, through the sheepfolds and orchards of the Delectable Mountains, and thence to the bright and beautiful land of Beulah, where the flowers never wither, and the sun shines night and day for ever.

In his seventeenth year we find Bunyan in the army—"an army where wickedness abounded." Whether he served on the side of the King or on the side of the Parliament is doubtful. He does not tell us himself. It is probable that he served with the Royalists. He was at the siege of Leicester in 1645, where he was the subject of a remarkable providence. He was drawn to be one of the besiegers; but when he was just ready to enter on this perilous service, one of the company desired to go in his room; "to which," says Bunyan, "when I had consented, he took my place; and coming to the siege, as he

stood sentinel, he was shot in the heart with a musket-bullet, and died." "Here," he says himself, "were judgments and great mercy, but neither of them did awaken my soul to righteousness; wherefore I sinned still, and grew more and more rebellious against God, and careless of my own salvation." The troop to which he belonged was soon disbanded, and he returned to his tinker's work at Elstow, much as he had left it.

While he was still under twenty years of age, Bunyan married. The only marriage portion he received with his wife was two admirable books—"The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven," and "The Practice of Piety;" but he had a treasure in the woman herself, who had been brought up religiously, and who now gave him a happy and well-ordered house. And so he had to acknowledge that a good wife is from the Lord, and her price is far above rubries. The wife's conversation and example, and the perusal of the books she brought as her dower, wrought upon his conscience, and he began to curb his sinful propensities, and to work out an external reformation. He fell in

> Very eagerly with the religion of the times—to wit, to go to church twice a day, and that, too, with the foremost, and there should very devoutly say and sing as others did, yet retaining my wicked life; but withal I was so overcome with the spirit of superstition, that I adored, and that with great devotion, even all things, both the high places, priest, clerk, vestments, services, and what else belonging to the church, counting all things holy that were therein contained, and especially the priest and clerk most happy, and without doubt greatly blessed."

It was a strange experience, this bondage to superstition, yet is it not uncommon. It is the only religion which numbers of men have. It is a form of godliness which is keeping many from the Saviour, and throwing up a barrier between the soul and God.

Looking back on the time when he was content to be priest-ridden and to fix his hope of heaven on his membership with the Church, Bunyan lays bare the fatal danger and deception of formalism. He says: "For all this while I was not sensible of the danger and evil of sin; I was kept from considering that sin would damn me whatsoever religion I followed, unless I was found in Christ; nay, I never thought of Him, nor whether there were such an one or no."

While under the thraldom of superstition, he continued to indulge in his besetting sins; he was a Sabbath-breaker and a profane swearer, and took much delight in all that was evil. A sermon which he heard on the holiness of the Lord's Day smote him to the heart, and for a time almost drove him to

despair. But he shook off these convictions, and, "kicking against the pricks," played the madman at such a fearful rate, that even wicked people were amazed at his audacity. On one occasion, while he was "garnishing his discourse" with oaths at the beginning and the end, an abandoned woman who stood by severely reproved him, and told his companions to quit his conversation, or he would make them as bad as himself. This unexpected reproof cut him to the quick, and, standing by the shop-window, he hung his head in silence and in shame. "While I stood there," he says, "I wished with all my heart that I might be a little child again, that my father might learn me to speak without this wicked way of swearing." From that moment he left off this sinful habit, and one by one he relinquished the other sins which so easily beset him, though he was as yet a stranger to the love of Christ, and had a heart alienated still from the life of God. He was under the lash of the law. He had only reached Mount Sinai, "that burned with fire, and the blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words;" and he was distracted by terrors and alarms. "Poor wretch as I was," he says, "I was all this while ignorant of Jesus Christ, and going about to establish my own righteousness; and had perished therein had not God in mercy showed me more of my own state by nature."

At this time a new and beautiful light flashed upon his spirit, from the conversation of some godly women who were sitting at a door in the sun, and talking joyfully of the things of God. Bunyan, leaving his occupation, drew near, and eagerly drank in all that they said. "Methought they spake as if joy did make them speak. They spake with much pleasantness of Scripture language, and with such appearance of grace in all they said, that they were to me as if I had found a new world; as if they were a people that dwelt alone, and were not to be reckoned among the neighbours."

These holy women, sitting in the sunshine, and talking of heaven and heavenly things, lived in Bunyan's imagination until the incident became for ever glorified in the narrative of "the three shining Ones," who met Christian at the Cross and gave him his robe and his roll. It was a happy providence that brought him into the company of these pious women, for after a time he was persuaded to open his mind to them, and lay bare his spiritual experience. They met him with the sweetest sympathy and most tender counsel; and no sooner had they learned his troubles and difficulties, than they told their pastor, Mr. Gifford, the "Evangelist" of his dream, a man of a remarkable piety and of a joyous temperament. Mr. Gifford took Bunyan under his careful charge, and invited him

to his house, where he could hear the little godly company speak of the things of God, and the unsearchable riches of Christ, and the hopes of the world to come.

"This," says Bunyan, "was as seasonable to my soul as the former and latter rain in their season." Not that all was peace and sunshine, "green pastures and still waters," as yet. He was often in doubt and in darkness. Temptations, fearful in their power and terrible in their subtilty, assaulted his soul. Apollyon met him face to face in the valley of the shadow of death, and their swords struck fire and made the darkness visible. It was some time before the light broke through the gloom. But at length it came, like the shining of the sun after rain, and he saw in its brightness the path which led from the City of Destruction to "the Delectable Mountains;" and the shining light "shone more and more to the perfect day." But even then his course was not unseldom chequered by conflicts and fears. He became a professed member of the Baptist Church, and was baptized in the Ouse. This was in the year 1653, when he was about twenty-five years of age. And now there fell into his hands the book of a kindred spirit, brave old Martin Luther's "Commentary on the Galatians," in which he found his own condition as clearly mirrored in the Reformer's experience, as if the book had been written out of his own heart. "I must," he said, "declare before all men, that I do prefer this book of Master Luther upon the Galatians, before all the books, excepting the Holy Bible, that I ever have seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience."

Bunyan was at this time in a position greatly superior to that in which he was born. "God," says a contemporary biographer, "had increased his stores so that he lived in great credit among his neighbours. On May 13th, 1653, Bedfordshire sent an address to Cromwell, approving the dismissal of the Long Parliament, recognising Oliver himself as the Lord's instrument, and recommending the county magistrates as fit persons to serve in the assembly which was to take its place, and among thirty-six names attached to the document, appears those of Gifford and Bunyan." This is proof that he was a prosperous householder, and was a person of consideration.

When Mr. Gifford's earthly testimony to Christ came to a close, Bunyan engaged in earnest exhortations to sinners, as a man in chains, "and carried that fire," he says, "in mine own conscience, that I persuaded them to be aware of." This would give a terrible earnestness to his preaching, and make him plead with all the reality of one who knew the horrors of the doom from which he urged his hearers to flee, and all the blessedness of the heaven which he would fain persuade them to enter. So preaching, with fire in his eye and pathos in his

voice, and the flame of Pentecost on his lips, no wonder that he made an impression on his audience, and that he "commended the truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God." He soon felt himself constrained by the inward call of the Spirit, and by the urgent entreaty of men who understood his rich mental gifts, and felt the power of his words, to undertake the regular ministry of the Gospel. His preaching was with demonstration of the Spirit and with power. His fame spread through the Midland Counties, and all thronged to hear him. The doctrines which he preached, and which he took from the Word of God, stirred the hearts of men to their depths, and none could resist the intense earnestness, the burning passion, of his addresses. Election, conversion, regeneration, judgment, eternity, heaven and hell—these were all real things to him, as real as anything that he saw, or heard, or handled. Nay, more real; these were the substance, all earthly things were to him but as shadows. He had felt the terrors of the Lord; he had known the stings of conscience and the horrors of the great darkness which is wrought by sin; he had rejoiced in the peace of faith, the joy of hope, the light, the liberty, the life, that are found in Christ; and therefore he was fitted to testify the things that he had seen and heard, to plead with man for God, and with God for man. We have the same truths for our use in the ministry of to-day; we can give no credence to Froude when he says, "The bloom is gone from the flower." We cannot consent to his dictum, that "the most solemn of all realities have been degraded into the passwords of technical theology." God forbid! The only hope of the world lies in the faithful and earnest delivery of a message which is the same in all ages, and which, if it be preached as a reality, in sincerity, and in dependence on the Holy Spirit, is still "the wisdom of God" and "the power of God unto salvation."

After preaching and suffering for fifteen years, he was appointed to the pastoral office, or eldership, and his great object was the same that it had ever been, to bring sinners in penitence and faith to the foot of His Cross who "came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." And success attended his words; thousands hung upon his lips; numerous converts were added to the Church; the proud were humbled; drunkards became sober; the licentious chaste; blasphemers sang the praises of God, and the spiritual desert bid fair to rejoice and to blossom as the rose.

Bunyan was during all this time engaged in controversy—controversy with members of the Church of England, controversy with the Ranters, controversy with the Quakers, all of whom he attacked by mouth and pen.

His reputation for zeal brought with it hostility, and roused the baser passions of enemies to truth. He was slandered and reviled. No name was thought too bad for him. He was said to be a Jesuit, and a highwayman. He was accused of witchcraft; he was charged with using incantations and charms. The vilest calumnies were uttered against him; he was accused of unchastity, of having two wives, and of many other vices and crimes, which were all the most utter falsehoods.

But now came a more serious trial. Oliver Cromwell passed away. His son was unable to grasp the helm of public affairs, which he soon let fall from a feeble hand. Charles II. was brought back to the throne. The Act of Uniformity was revived. The Church of England was reinstated in her old place. The King, who before his restoration had declared his determination to publish an amnesty for all political offences, and to proclaim a liberty to tender consciences, when once seated securely on the throne passed the most oppressive and tyrannical acts, compelled uniformity in belief and in the mode of conducting public worship.

Under the 35th of Elizabeth, it was enacted that Nonconformists refusing to attend worship in the parish churches were to be imprisoned till they made their submission. Three months were allowed them to consider; if at the end of that time they were still obstinate, they were to be banished the realm; and if they subsequently returned to England without permission from the Crown, they were liable to execution as felons. This Act had fallen with the Long Parliament; but at the Restoration it was held to have revived, and to be still in force. The effect was that religious liberty was at an end. Dissenters' chapels were closed. Informers were everywhere on the track of the Nonconformists, and men were obliged to attend their parish churches under certain penalties. Many were the hardships and cruelties that befell those whose consciences would not submit to the dictation of an unrighteous Act. Bunyan was stern and resolute enough to refuse submission. He would not be silenced. He held services everywhere—in barns, milk-houses, stables, or in any convenient place where they were not likely to be disturbed. At length an information was laid against him, and he was caught in the very act of worshipping God with some of his people whom he had arranged to meet once more, that they might hear from his lips a parting address, as he intended to leave Bedford till more quiet times. Though he had no fear of martyrdom, he had no desire to court it unnecessarily. On November 12th, 1660, as the winter was setting in, having been invited to preach at Samsell, a village in Bedfordshire, he prepared a sermon on the words, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" Francis Win-

gate, a justice of the peace on the adjoining district, having been informed of the intended meeting, issued his warrant to bring Bunyan before him. His friends heard of it, and becoming alarmed for his safety, advised him to forego the opportunity. It was a trying moment for him. He had a wife whom he loved; for having been left a widower a year or two before, he had married a second time, and had four children, one of them blind, depending upon his exertions for their daily bread, and also many opportunities, if he found himself still at liberty, to preach the Gospel of the grace of God. But his mind was made up. He would not flinch from what he considered to be a duty, and would witness a good confession in the face of bonds or imprisonments, or even of death itself. "No," he said to the friends who wished him to consult his safety; "no, by no means; I will not stir, neither will I have the meeting dismissed. Come, be of good cheer; let us not be daunted. Our cause is good; we need not be ashamed of it. To preach God's Word is so good a work, that we shall be well rewarded if we suffer for that." So at the time and place which had been appointed, with his Bible in his hand, he was in the room at Samsell, and was about to read the text, when the constable and his attendants came in and exhibited their warrant. Being commanded in the King's name, he made no resistance, but went with the officers, accompanied by some of his friends, to the magistrate's residence. As the justice was from home, the constable, to save the expense and trouble of charging a watch to secure his prisoner, allowed him to go home, one of his friends undertaking to be answerable for his appearance the next day. On the following morning they went to the constable, and thence to the justice.

When Bunyan and the constable came before Justice Wingate, he, supposing that the prisoner had been guilty of treasonable practices, inquired how many arms had been found at the meeting. When he learned that those who attended the meeting were unarmed, and had only assembled to hear the preaching of the Word, Wingate was disposed to treat the matter as of little consequence. He asked Bunyan why he did not follow his calling and go to Church? Bunyan said that "all his intention was to instruct and counsel people to forsake their sins, and that he did, without confusion, both follow his calling and preach the Word." At this the justice ordered his committal to gaol, refusing bail unless he would promise to give up preaching. Bunyan refused to be bailed on such conditions. Nothing should stop him from preaching. He felt constrained, like the Apostles of old, to obey God rather than men. So the committal was made out, and Bunyan was being taken away, when he met two of his friends who were

known to Wingate, and they begged the constable to wait. They sought an interview with the magistrate, and told him who and what Bunyan was. The magistrate was disposed to be lenient; and it was agreed that if the prisoner would give some general promise of a vague kind he might be released and go where he pleased. Another magistrate, who was acquainted with Wingate, now joined him, and both declared their reluctance to send him to prison, and said that if he would promise not to call the people together any more he might go home. But Bunyan stood firm. He would not accept freedom on the terms of an evasion. He said he would not force the people to come together; but if they assembled to hear him, knowing that he would speak, he might be said to have called them together. There were many ways of calling a meeting, and if he were in a place where the people were met, he should certainly speak to them. So the magistrates were compelled to commit him to Bedford Gaol to wait for the sessions.

Thus Bunyan suffered for conscience' sake. The trial was a bitter one, and aggravated by the delicate state of his wife's health at the time. The agitation at her husband's arrest brought on a premature confinement, and she was lying in her house in a most critical state. He was a man of a tender heart, and the separation from his wife at such a time was peculiarly painful. After lying in prison for some seven weeks, the Sessions were held at Bedford, and Bunyan was indicted "for devilishly and perniciously abstaining from coming to church to hear Divine service, and as a common upholder of unlawful meetings and conventicles, to the great disturbance and distraction of the good subjects of this kingdom, contrary to the laws of our Sovereign Lord the King." Justice Keelin presided at the trial, and entered into a long argument with the prisoner, asking him why he did not go to church, and warning him of his danger if he spoke lightly of the Prayer Book. Bunyan argued that prayer was purely spiritual, the offering of the heart, and not the reading of a form. Keelin said—and the words have been a standing jest with the biographers of Bunyan from that time to this—"We know the Common Prayer Book hath been ever since the Apostles' time, and is lawful to be used in the Church." After a further examination, in which he remained steady to his convictions, he was sent back to prison for three months; if at the end of three months he still refused to conform, he was to be transported, and if he came back without license he would be hanged. Bunyan made answer, "I am at a point with you; if I were out of prison to-day, I would preach the Gospel again to-morrow by the help of God."

At the end of three months he became anxious to know what was to be his lot. He was resolved to persevere in the course he had adopted. The clerk of the peace, Mr. Cobb, was sent to persuade him into some kind of compliance. He was asked to give up preaching in public; if he would so far conform, the going to church would not be insisted on. He was told that he was at full liberty to "exhort his neighbours in private discourse," if only he would not collect the people together in large numbers, as this the magistrates would be bound to notice. Bunyan would not yield. He was a representative man; the cause of religious liberty was bound up with the course which he should pursue, and so he resolved at all hazards to stand firm. The magistrates, knowing his freedom from seditious intentions and regarding him more as a religious fanatic than a leader in rebellion, wished to deal as leniently with him as possible; and so instead of bringing him before them again, and finding themselves compelled to pronounce a sentence of banishment, left him in prison. His wife and children were allowed to visit him daily, and he had all the alleviations, temporal and spiritual, which such a conditon as his permitted. His gaoler, with the sanction of the sheriff, let him go where he pleased—once even so far as London. He used his liberty, as he had declared he would, in preaching the Gospel. But this disobedience to the law could only last for a time, and all indulgences being withdrawn, he was put into close confinement. He petitioned to be brought to trial again, but as he could only have had liberty on the condition of exile, the judges and magistrates thought it better to leave him in prison. At the coronation of Charles, April 23, 1661, an order was issued for the release of prisoners who were in gaol for any offence short of felony. Those who were waiting their trials were to be released at once, and those convicted and under sentence might sue out a pardon under the Great Seal at any time within a year from the proclamation. Bunyan determined to seek his liberty by a petition to the judges. His wife resolved to present it in person; and having obtained a hearing, the judges listened courteously to what she had to say. Sir Matthew Hale was much affected by her earnest pleading for one so dear to her, and whose life was of such value to his children. Hale remarked that she looked very young to have four children. "I am but mother-in-law to them," she said, "having not been married yet full two years. I was with child when my husband was first apprehended; but being young, I being dismayed at the news, fell in labour, and so continued for eight days. I was delivered, but my child died." Hale, whose heart was touched by the Divine love, treated her with marked kindness, but at the same time

told her that as the conviction had been recorded, it could not be set aside, and she returned to the prison with a heavy heart.

Bunyan's imprisonment lasted in all for more than twelve years, and might have ended at any time if he would have promised to conform to what he considered an unrighteous law. It did end after six years, when he was set free under the first Declaration of Indulgence; but as he at once began to preach, he was arrested again. Another six years passed, and he was again released, but was arrested once more as he was found preaching in a wood. This time he was detained but a few months, and in form more than in reality. In 1672, Richard Carver, one of the Society of Friends, who had been mate of the vessel in which King Charles escaped to France after his defeat at Worcester, and who had carried the King on his back through the surf, and landed him on French soil, claimed, as his reward the release of his co-religionists who crowded the gaols throughout the land. After some hesitation, Charles was shamed into compliance. A cumbrous deed was prepared, and under the provisions of that deed, which was so framed as to include sufferers of other persuasions, Bunyan obtained deliverance; and he was free for the rest of his life.

When his long confinement ended, Bunyan was forty-four years old. The order for his release was made out on May 8th, 1672, and he was licensed as pastor of the Baptist Chapel at Bedford on the 9th of that month. He established himself in a small house in the town, and began to make arrangements for his worldly business and to provide for the wants of his family, a matter of little difficulty, as their habits were so frugal. "Though by reason of losses which he sustained by imprisonment," says one of his biographers, "his treasure swelled not to excess, he always had sufficient to live decently and creditably." His writings and his sufferings made his name famous throughout England, and he lived the rest of his days usefully and honourably: preaching where he pleased, and never more molested in his work for God. His influence gradually extended, through his writings, to America, and as he neared the Everlasting Hills, Doubting Castle faded from view, and he dwelt in the land of Beulah, where his hope was ever bright, and his peace flowed like a river.

Bunyan uses some remarkable words when he writes of his being delivered up to the gaoler's hands, and placed in Bedford Gaol. "I was had home to prison," he says. "Home to prison!" And did he not make it a "home"? and did he not illustrate the truth of the words:

> "Stone walls do not a prison make,
> Nor iron bars a cage;
> Minds innocent and quiet take
> That for a hermitage?"

And in another and better sense than that in which Sir John Suckling uses the words, he might have added:

> "If I have freedom in my love,
> And in my soul am free,
> Angels alone, that soar above,
> Enjoy such liberty."

He had leisure in his prison to think and reflect, and to give his inventive faculties full play. He had not many books, nor was he a great reader at any time; but he had the Bible, which, as has been well observed, "if thoroughly known, is a literature in itself;" and he had "Foxe's Book of Martyrs," with its records of the men who, for the truth's sake, were "stoned, were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword," and who went from the stake to heaven in a chariot of fire. With such companions he soars beyond the walls of his dungeon and is in an ideal world; visions of heaven float before his eyes, songs of heaven ring in his ears; "the light that never was on sea or shore" is around him; gales from the Delectable Mountains blow freshly across his brow, and from the summit of the Hill Clear he beholds the splendours of the Celestial City, and sees the saints with crowns on their heads and palms in their hands, standing on the sea of glass mingled with fire. He is in a prison no longer. His soul has risen beyond the measure of his cell. And as great thoughts surge through his heart, and kindle in his eye, and flush his cheek, he in this moment of inspiration seizes the pen, and the page becomes instinct with "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn." The "Pilgrim's Progress" grows into life and beauty under his marvellous hand. Of the "Pilgrim's Progress" there is no need to speak in terms of eulogy; it has been praised by all ranks and conditions of men. "It has been copied and travestied; turned into an oratorio, done into verse, quoted in the novel and in the sermon, in the speech and in the play." "There has been a Roman Catholic version, with Giant Pope left out; a Socinian parody and a Tractarian travesty, where the author, dissatisfied with Bunyan's theology, alters, with a careful delicacy towards Rome, every expression which might be distasteful to a Roman Catholic reader. It is a remarkable proof of the power and beauty of the work, that it has extorted praise from men the most diverse in sentiment and genius. Southey, a hater of Calvinism, confesses: "If Calvinism had never worn a blacker appearance than in Bunyan's works, it would never have become a term of reproach." Coleridge knows of no book, the Bible excepted, which he thought taught so nearly the whole of saving truth as the "Pilgrim's Progress." He writes: "This wonderful

book is one of the few books which may be read over repeatedly with a new and different pleasure. I read it once as a theologian, once as a poet, once with devotional feelings. I could not have believed beforehand that Calvinism could be painted in such exquisitely delightful colours." Dr. Arnold held John Bunyan to have been incomparably the greatest divine England has produced, and loved the "Pilgrim's Progress" with all his heart. "I cannot trust myself," he used to say, "to read the account of Christian going up to the Celestial Gate, after his passage through the river of death." In one of his letters from Naples, he says: "Far be it from me, or from my friends, to live or sojourn in such a place, the very opposite, as it seems to me, of the Hill Difficulty, and of the House Beautiful, and of the land Beulah." Macaulay, in his "Essay on John Bunyan," has these words: "Bunyan is almost the only writer who ever gave to the abstract the interest of the concrete." And again: "There is no work in our literature on which we would so readily stake the fame of the old unpolluted English language, no book which shows so well how rich that language is in its own proper wealth, and how little it has been improved by all that it has borrowed."[1]

We must pass by with a word Bunyan's other works. "Grace Abounding," which is the pathetic story of his own spiritual conflicts; and the "Holy War," greatly inferior in interest to the "Pilgrim's Progress," but which Macaulay thinks, if there had been no "Pilgrim's Progress," would have been the first of religious allegories. Froude shortly sums up, what probably is the opinion of most readers, in these words: "The 'Holy War' would have entitled Bunyan to a place among the masters of English literature. It would never have made his name a household word in every English-speaking family on the globe."

A few words here may not be out of place on Bunyan's writings in relation to spiritual conflict. In reading Bunyan, one is especially struck with, if I may so express myself, the warlike character of his allegories. The "Holy War" is the story of spiritual conflict from the beginning to the end. Mansoul had

[1] An anecdote which the late Dean Stanley used to tell with great delight may not unfittingly be given here. A few days after he had unveiled the statue raised to Bunyan at Bedford, which he did with some of his own happy characteristic remarks, eulogizing the great allegory, he received a letter from a working-man in the North, with the request that he would lend him a copy of the "Pilgrim's Progress;" the Dean went to a bookseller, purchased a copy, and sent it as a present to his unknown correspondent. In a very short time he received another letter, this time of thanks: "I have read your 'Pilgrim's Progress,'" said the writer, "and it *have* set my soul on fire!"

been created pure and happy, and was a town altogether so commodious and so advantageous that there was not its equal under heaven. Shaddai built it for his own delight, and had raised in its midst a stately palace which He intended for Himself. By this palace, Bunyan tells us, he means the heart. Mansoul, the body, could never be broke down unless the townsmen allowed it. It had five gates, which could only be forced by consent of those within. These gates were Ear-gate, Eye-gate, Mouth-gate, Nose-gate, and Feet-gate. Diabolus, once a chief servant of Shaddai, but who having through ambition formed a conspiracy against him, and being defeated with his crew and banished from his territory, plotted against this town, and took it and defiled it. Shaddai comes to its rescue, drives out the devil, executes his officers, and destroys his works. But between the defeat of Mansoul and his victory over his subtle foe, there is many a struggle and peril; many enemies on the right hand and on the left to be vanquished; many a fortress to be taken, and many a stronghold to be cast down. Bunyan may have thought of his old fighting days in the Civil wars as he composed the story of Mansoul's defeat and deliverance; and this no doubt gave reality to his picture of the fight to the death, not only "against flesh and blood, but against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

So in the "Pilgrim's Progress," the Pilgrims have to clothe themselves in armour, and to fight every stage of the journey. The conflict assumes various shapes and forms, and is waged with different foes; but it is always a fight unto the death; there is "no discharge from the warfare;" and it is carried on with all the sternness of men who, to use Bunyan's characteristic words, "are not yet out of gun-shot of the devil." Enemies? Yes, the Pilgrims found them on every hand. Their name was "Legion." Mr. Worldly-Wiseman; Mr. Legality; the three sleepy gentleman, Simple, Sloth, and Presumption; the two travellers from the land of Vain-glory, Formalist and Hypocrisy; the two giants, Pope and Pagan; and Mr. Talkative, ready to talk of things heavenly or things earthly, things moral or things evangelical, things sacred or things profane, things past or things to come, things foreign or things at home, things essential or things circumstantial, "provided that all be done unto our profit." We have only a word for Vanity Fair, Bye-path Meadow, Doubting Castle, and Giant Despair, from each of which Christian finds new dangers and temptations, but from all of which he is mercifully delivered; and, recovering the pilgrim path again, at length reaches the Delectable Mountains in Emmanuel's own land.

There can be no doubt that in the scenes so graphically

described we have many of the incidents of Bunyan's own life, and the temptations which assailed him in the mortal struggle between his soul and sin. It is this fact that makes his pictures so substantial and true. There is nothing shadowy about them. Abstractions vanish, and reality takes their place. No wonder, then, that the places, the hills, the valleys, the towns, the people in the great allegory pass out of the land of shadows, and are as familiar on our lips as household words, and become to us as real as the men and women, or the localities which we have seen. Who does not know as well as if he had seen them, the "Wicket Gate," the "Slough of Despond," "Hill Difficulty," the "Valley of the Shadow of Death," "Vanity Fair," "Doubting Castle," the "Palace Beautiful," and "Bye-path Meadow"? Have we not all met Mr. Feeble-mind, and Mr. Talkative, Mr. Cruelty, Mr. Lovelust, Madam Bubble, Mr. Sloth, Mr. Presumption, and, I am thankful to add, Faithful, Hopeful, and the four gracious ladies who entertain Christian in the Palace Beautiful, and give him a room for his sleeping-chamber called "Peace"?

Bunyan's latter years were peaceful. His circumstances were easy. He was happy in his family. The blind child, that lay so near his heart, had died while he was in Bedford Gaol. His other children lived and prospered; and his wife, who had pleaded his cause with such pathos before the judges, was spared to be a blessing in his home. His health, it was said, had suffered from his confinement; but the only serious illness which we hear of was an attack of sweating sickness, which came upon him in 1687, and from which he never thoroughly recovered. He was then fifty-nine, and in the next year he died. His death was brought on by exposure, when he was engaged in an act of charity. A father had been offended with his son, and had threatened to disinherit him. The family, with whom he was acquainted, lived at Reading; and in order to effect a reconciliation, Bunyan made a journey on horseback to that town, and his errand was crowned with success, though it cost him his life. Returning by way of London, he was overtaken by excessive rains, and, in an exhausted state, he took refuge in the house of Mr. Strudwick, one of his attached friends.

Bedford was then two days' journey from London, and it is not known whether his wife and children had the happiness of ministering at his dying bed. In ten days he was no more. He died at the age of sixty. The exact date of his death is uncertain. All of his biographers agree, however, in placing it in the August of 1688; and if so, only two or three months before the landing of King William on our shores. His last words were these: "Take me, for I come to Thee." May not

the eye of faith follow him after he "shuffled off the mortal coil," and use the words which he wrote of his own immortal Pilgrim: "I saw in my dream that this man went in at the gate; and lo! as he entered he was transfigured, and he had raiment put on him that shone like gold. There were also that met him with harps and crowns, and gave unto him—the harps to praise withal, and the crowns in token of honour. Then I heard in my dream that all the bells in the city rung again for joy, and that it was said unto him, 'Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' I also heard the man himself sing with a loud voice, saying, 'Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.'"

Bunyan was buried in Mr. Strudwick's vault in the Dissenters' burying-ground at Bunhill Fields, and his tomb has been visited by thousands of pilgrims, who have found pleasure in honouring genius sanctified by the purest devotion. Take him all in all, he was one of the most remarkable men that England has produced; and with rare qualities of head and heart, and a passionate and intense nature, he had that thorough-going conviction of the truth of Christianity which lies at the foundation of all true and earnest work for God or man. It was this conviction that gave the Puritans, amongst whom were found some of England's noblest and best men, their power, and animated them with a fiery resolve to conquer self, and to cast out from the heart and life all that was opposed to the will of God. To some their stern fulfilment of moral duty may have appeared enthusiasm, to others asceticism; but it enabled them to live the noble lives they did, and with the whole soul to oppose "the whole body of sin." This intense faith in the unseen was the strength of the Protestant theology; it gave England her power at the Reformation, it made her great, and has been the origin of her mental, social, political, and religious freedom, the source of any and every blessing that has been the portion of our favoured land. A solemn voice has reached us from the death-bed of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, which has told us that "the Church and the world seem to be entering on totally new phases." It may be so. It is possible we may be standing on the verge of some momentous revolution in the State or in the Church; it is possible we may be about to pass through some strange and unknown manifestations of thought and life. It may be that these changes shall not come in our day. They may be nearer than we think. But our duty is in either case the same, to be loyal to God. We need have no fear for our Church, or country, or ourselves, if we only stand fast by the old truths, and hold with firm grasp that true reformed faith which is the source

of our liberties—social, political, religious—the faith which has come down to us from battles which our fathers fought, and from scaffolds where they fell.

CHARLES D. BELL.

ART. V.—THE UNITED DIOCESES OF DOWN, AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.

AT a time when trouble and perplexity are in the hearts of the true friends of Ireland, and when they are straining their eyes to discover some rift in the dark cloud which rests upon her fortunes, it is something to be able to indicate at least one spot of brightness and hope, and one possible solution of the difficult question as to the future of Ireland and her ancient Church.

The results of the late census have been in some respects disappointing. They show a general diminution of the number of members of the Church of Ireland, which, though it might have been predicted, is none the less disheartening. The diminution of course may be explained. In many parts of the country, landlords, whose incomes were diminished, and whose lives were not safe, shut up their houses, and withdrew with their establishments to places where they could live at less expense, and with less danger. In most of the districts thus affected, the withdrawal even of one family with its belongings would make a sensible impression on the small congregation attending the parish church, and a still more sensible impression on the sustentation funds of such parishes. Moreover, it was well known that the action of a considerable portion of the Primitive Wesleyan Methodists, or "Church Methodists," as they were called, would tend to show a decrease in the numbers of Irish Churchmen. Many of those Church Methodists, who in previous decades returned themselves as members of the Irish Church, on the occasion of the last census, untrue to the traditions of their Founder, returned themselves as members of the Wesleyan community. The decrease, amounting as it did to little more than 30,000, by no means exceeded the anticipation; still, it is 30,000 on the wrong side, and it is to be distinctly traced amongst those professional classes in which much of the strength of the Church of Ireland lay. It is small comfort to be able to account for this by the steady action of political patronage and promotion, and the growing influence of Romanism in

the Poor-law Boards and Dispensary Committees of the South and West; the result is as it is, and, being so, is disappointing.

This result, however, truly disappointing as it would have been had it been all along the line, is modified by the returns from some of the Northern Dioceses, and notably from that united Diocese of Down, and Connor, and Dromore, the name of which is at the head of this paper; nor is it without its own significance that a diocese which exhibits a substantial increase in its church population, is in material things the most prosperous as well as the most law-abiding in Ireland.

It may then be interesting to attempt a brief sketch of the past and present of these dioceses. It may also be useful to do so, having regard to what, without offence, may be called the prevailing ignorance amongst our English friends with regard to Irish affairs in general, and Irish Church affairs in particular.

Speaking geographically, the Dioceses of Down, Connor, and Dromore include the whole of the counties of Down and Antrim, with a small portion of the county of Armagh, and a very small portion of the county of Londonderry. The Diocese of Connor, which includes the greater part of the town of Belfast, is the largest of the three, and is nearly conterminous with the county of Antrim. This Diocese of Connor has far and away the largest church population of any single diocese within the limits of the Church of Ireland.

Speaking ecclesiastically, these dioceses, in the course of their long history, have been independent of one another, united, disunited, and partially re-united, previous to the present settlement, which was effected by the Church Temporalities Act of 1833. By that Act, the Diocese of Dromore, then a separate diocese, was, upon the death of its Bishop, to be joined to the See of Down and Connor.[1]

It is conjectured by Ware ("Works," vol. i., p. 195, ed. Harris), that, for centuries after the year A.D. 583, Down had no peculiar Bishop of its own, but was included in the Diocese of Connor. Dean Reeves, however, seems to think that, having regard to the number of names of Bishops of Down, as well as of Connor, recorded in the "Irish Annals," we may reasonably suppose that, for a considerable time at all events, the two dioceses were independent of one another, their union being effected at the Synod of Rathbreasil, A.D. 1118. We may therefore for convenience' sake, in our notice of the foundation and early records of these dioceses, follow the ordinary classification, and treat of them as Down, and Connor, and Dromore.

A few preliminary observations as to the nature of the

[1] A union which took place in the year 1842.

Episcopate in the early Irish Church may be of use at this stage of the proceedings. One peculiar feature of the early Irish Church is the number of its Bishops, and, we may add, the number of little Sees, which were subsequently grouped together so as to make a diocese of orthodox dimensions. Nennius sums up the labours of St. Patrick by ascribing to him the foundation of 365 churches, the consecration of 365 Bishops, and the ordination of 3,000 presbyters; and the tripartite life of St. Patrick makes the number of Bishops consecrated by him to be 370, and of priests to be 5,000. These Bishops seem to have been, for the most part, suffragans, and somewhat of the nature of Rural Deans; and they also seem to have been called forth by the sudden accession of great numbers to Christianity; for, as has been remarked by Dr. Lanigan, there is no instance of any other nation which received the Christian religion in as short a space as the Irish nation did. The number of petty principalities into which the county was divided, led to a corresponding number of these "Chorepiscopi," or "country Bishops," who differed from what have been called the "Cathedral Bishops" by receiving their consecration from *one*, and not from *three* Bishops. The institution of Rural Deans, which appears to have taken place at the Synod of Kells, A.D. 1152, gradually led to the suppression of these minor members of the Episcopal order.

That these Chorepiscopi, however, possessed higher privileges than those which pertained to the priestly function, is clear from the case of St. Columbkille, the Abbot of Iona, whose biographer and successor, Adamnanus, tells us how a certain stranger from Munster, a Bishop in disguise, was made known to the saint in the breaking of bread, and how due reverence was rendered to his superior by the saintly Abbot.

This multiplication of Bishops had its own inconveniences as well as its own advantages; it developed into an order of roving Bishops, who, having no special duties of their own, became *Episcopi vagantes*—wandering stars—intruding into other dioceses in strange countries, and there using the functions of their office to the often annoyance of their brethren. It was therefore in the nature of things that, having served the purpose which called them forth, they should in due time have to pass away; but some notice of their existence is necessary even in so brief a sketch as this, were it only for the fact that, before the Diocese of Down reached its present form and dimensions, it absorbed the sub-Dioceses of Dunlegthlas, Nendrum, Maghbile, Beanchui,[1] and —name still harder to be pronounced—Rathmurbhuilg.

[1] Or Bangor (White Choir).

The first of these names, *Dun*-leg-thlas, gives its title to the Diocese of Down; and the name Down-patrick, which belongs to the cathedral of the diocese, accords with the prevalent opinion that it was founded by St. Patrick. Indeed, the grave of the saint is shown in the churchyard; and three niches, still remaining in the gable over the east window of the cathedral, are said to have contained the statues of Sts. Patrick, Brigid, and Columba.

> "Hi tres, in *Dumo* tumulo, tumulantur in uno,
> Brigida, Patricius, atque Columba pius."

According to another tradition, Rossius, or Rus—the first convert to Christianity in Ulidia—is said to have been the first Bishop; and, according to others, one Loarn. Mention is also made of a St. Thassach; but, as we have seen above, there was no stint in the matter of Bishops in the early Irish Church, and it is enough to indicate St. Patrick as the Founder, and the latter part of the fifth century as the time.

Dun-leth-glas, or the *camp* or *fort* of Lethglas, was the capital of the surrounding territory, which went under the name of Ulidia.[1] The importance of the place led to its supremacy as the cathedral city, and the affix Leth-glas, which doubtless arose from local circumstances, dropping off, the word *Dun* remained, which became in Latin *Dunum*, and in English *Down*.

Before we proceed to later times it may be well to make a few observations on the Dioceses of Connor and Dromore.

Like Down, the present See of Connor comprised several churches, which on one or more occasions have been Episcopal seats, and have given their title to their Bishops; it is needless to particularize the hard names, and it will suffice to say that the See of Connor was founded during the latter half of the fifth century by Ængus MacNisse, who became its first Bishop and Abbot.

Connor, which is now a small village, is about five miles from Ballymena, a large market-town in the centre of the county of Antrim. It is also about half a mile from the village of Kells—where are the remains of a monastery—to which it is probable the ancient cathedral church was attached.

---

[1] About the beginning of the twelfth century, in many instances the old *cathedral* names of the Irish Sees were for a time superseded by *territorial* designations: thus the Bishop of Dundalethglas became the Bishop of Ulidia, the Bishop of Connor became Bishop of Dalaradia, the Bishop of Dromore became Bishop of Iveagh; and this nomenclature continued for some ages among the natives, until by degrees it died away, and all the dioceses of Ireland resumed their own cathedral names, with the exception of Meath and Ossory, which still retain their territorial names.—See Dean Reeves' *Eccl. Ant. of Dio. Down*, &c.

As far as can be ascertained—the monastery and cathedral became permanently separated about the end of the twelfth century, and another church, subsequently called the Church of Connor, was founded for cathedral or parochial purposes. The edifice then erected has long since disappeared, and previous to the Reformation nothing in the nature of a regular cathedral chapter seems to have existed; in fact, up to that time the only dignitary connected with the cathedral was the Archdeacon, and all capitular acts were performed by the Archdeacon and clergy assembled in Synod. The present chapter was constituted by charter of King James I. in the year 1609.[1]

The Church of Connor is now only parochial and is, what used to be called in directories, and the multitudinous books of those who travelled in Ireland, and gave their impressions of what they saw then to the public, "a small neat edifice in the Gothic style." The church at Lisburn, or Lisnegarvie,[2] is now called the Cathedral of Connor, and the dignitaries and prebendaries are installed there; but surely it would seem that the time has fully come when this great diocese should have in the busy centre of Belfast a cathedral worthy of its importance.

The See of Dromore was founded by St. Colman, who established a monastery there, and presided over it in the joint capacity of Bishop and Abbott. Similarly with Down and Connor, Dromore has grouped under its own name several smaller Sees, and two of the parish churches at present within its bounds, viz. Donaghmore and Magheralin, once laid claim to cathedral dignity as being Episcopal seats. The Cathedral of Dromore, a very unpretending edifice, was dedicated to St. Colman, and up to the time of the Reformation had for its chapter a Dean, Archdeacon and Canons; but in the year 1609, James I. not only changed the constitution of the chapter by transforming the Canons into dignitaries with one Prebendary; but he also changed the name of the cathedral, ordaining that from henceforth "erit et vocabitur Ecclesia Cathedralis Christi Redemptoris de Drumore."

At the period of what may fairly be called the Anglo-papal

[1] The first Dean being Milo Whale, the Archdeacon Nicholas Todd, the Precentor William Todd, the Treasurer Samuel Todd, the Chancellor Robert Maxwell. The prevalence of the name of Todd in the chapter may possibly be accounted for by the fact that Bishop Todd was then at the head of the three Sees of Down, Connor, and Dromore.

[2] The Church of Lisburn was made by charter of King Charles II. the cathedral for the Dioceses of Down and Connor. At that time the Cathedral of Down was in ruins; but as it has since been restored, the Diocese of Connor now enjoys the sole privilege, such as it is, of using this building for the purpose indicated above.

invasion, the Church of Ireland reaped certain advantages in the way of form and organization, whilst she undoubtedly lost much of her old independence and purity of doctrine and practice. St. Bernard draws a doleful picture of Down, Connor, and Dromore in the year 1124; he describes the faithful in those parts as being beasts rather than men, as Christians in name but Pagans in reality. And yet a close analysis of this holy man's complaint makes it sufficiently clear that the great fault of these Irish Churchmen was that they did not conform to the Romish discipline. Indeed, during the whole of the twelfth century it seems to have been the cue of the advocates of Papal ascendency in Ireland to depreciate the native institutions of the country and to exalt the discipline of Rome. But the union of the Sees of Down and Connor and Dromore, under the presidency of Malachi, in the year 1124, points to a consolidation of small Sees, which, whilst after the manner of human affairs it ran into an opposite extreme, must have tended to better government and greater unity of action. On the retirement of Malachi, the See of Connor seems to have again had a separate Bishop of its own; and so things continued till the year 1441, when, the See of Down becoming vacant, John, Bishop of Connor, entered on the administration of Down and Connor, and from henceforth the two dioceses were incorporated under one Bishop.

At the time of the Reformation, the Bishop of the United Sees was Eugene Magenis, whose episcopate extended from 1541 to 1560,[1] and therefore included those stirring periods of change and excitement, the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII., the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary, and the commencement of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. When he came to preside over the See, he found his Cathedral of Downpatrick in ruins, it having been pillaged and burned by Lord Leonard de Grey, who defaced the monuments of Sts. Patrick, Brigid and Columba. This occurred in the year 1538; and it is one amongst many proofs of the stormy and unsettled character of succeeding centuries, that the Cathedral of Down remained a ruin until the close of the eighteenth century, when, by the exertions of Arthur, Marquis of Downshire, and Dean Annesley, it was restored to something of its former grandeur.

The history of the Reformation in Ireland during the reign of Queen Elizabeth is very much of a blank; and on the whole it is better that it should be so. Reformation of religion, in the real sense of the word, was confined to Dublin and

[1] The Bishop who succeeded Eugene Magenis was John Merriman, an Englishman, Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth; his appointment does not seem to have been made until 1568.

some few of the larger towns. In the country parts much more was done in the way of burning than of building churches, and—it is sad to say it—the Bishops were far more intent on alienating the revenues still left to their Sees, than in reclaiming the flocks committed to their charge from barbarism and Popery.

The north of Ireland had its full share of misery and unrest; in fact, under the O'Neills it was in a chronic state of rebellion during a great part of Elizabeth's reign. As Spenser said: "It is ill preaching amongst swords;" and the sounds of the Gospel of peace were hardly heard amidst the din and clash of arms. Still, it is a striking instance of the overruling Providence of God that the district of Ireland, once the most wasted and disturbed, is now the most peaceful and prosperous and Protestant; and the fact that we have such an instance to point to, ought to give us some hope and cheer when we are inclined to despair of the future of this country.

On the accession of James I. the flight of the two great Irish chieftains, the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, whose conspiracies were detected and frustrated, threw into the hands of the Government an immense quantity of forfeited property. To this flight and forfeiture we trace the celebrated "Plantation of Ulster," a measure which, notwithstanding all the jobbery which followed it, and the division which it unfortunately introduced into the Protestant camp, has left its mark for good upon the face of the Province of Ulster, and more particularly on the counties of Armagh, Derry, Tyrone, Fermanagh, Down, and Antrim.

This plantation was carried out by the advice and under the superintendence of the Lord Deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester. The colonists were of three kinds: viz., undertakers, or immigrants from England; servitors, or persons who had been connected with the Government service; and Irish natives, who, after strict examination of character and antecedents, were allowed to come in. The lands were allotted in portions of 2,000, 1,500, and 1,000 acres. He who had the assignment of 2,000 acres was bound to plant forty-eight able and honest men on his estate, and the others were bound to plant in a like proportion. Each proprietor was to build a castle, house, or bawn, and all were to take the oaths of allegiance and fidelity to the Government. Nor were the interests of the Church forgotten in this plantation. It was provided that a church should be built, rebuilt, or restored in every parish, and that glebes of 60, 90, or 120 acres should be assigned to the clergymen. In the interest of education also a considerable portion of the confiscated land was assigned to Trinity College, Dublin, which also obtained the patronage of six

good livings. As the result of this wise measure multitudes of people flocked from England and Scotland; the London Corporation obtained vast tracts of land, and built the cities of Londonderry and Coleraine.

Two difficulties attended this plantation: one, almost inevitable, though happily not permanent; the other, which still to a certain extent remains and will remain for many years to come.

It could hardly be expected that the natives, who were driven from their lands and homesteads, should have looked with much favour on those who took their places. At first, indeed, they had nothing to do but grin and bear it, for they were weakened by crushing defeats, and the Government was too strong to be assailed with any hope of success; but they bided their time, and the massacre of 1641, which chiefly took place in the plantation of Ulster, was a testimony to the hatred of the native Irish to the immigrants, and was the cruel outpouring of wrath long pent up. The colonists, however, soon rallied when the first shock of terror was over, and their ranks have never since been broken.

Another difficulty, however, was not so easy to be dealt with. Many of the colonists came from Scotland, and brought over with them modes of religious thought and ideas of ecclesiastical discipline which were not in accordance with the doctrines and form of government of the Church of Ireland. It is not very easy to say what might have been effected with some of those people if large concessions had been made to their prejudices and predilections, but there is no doubt that, whether in Scotland or Ireland, they were a stubborn generation, and, for their part, were not much disposed to make concessions, large or small. Certainly Archbishop Ussher was very tender with them; and even Archbishop Bramhall was fain to introduce a softening clause into the letters of Orders of their conforming ministers. On the other hand, poor Bishop Echlin received scant courtesy from Mr. Robert Blair, who returned his Diocesan's concession in the matter of ordination by rebuking his patron, Lord Claneboy, for kneeling at the Lord's Supper. It is to be feared that the temper of the time, and the relations of triumph and defeat in which each party found itself as the wheel of fortune turned, were not conducive to close union and cordial feelings of friendship.

Time, however, is a powerful solvent of merely traditional animosities; and time has already done so much, that we can safely leave the matter in his hands.

An illustrious name—the name of Bishop Jeremy Taylor—is connected with another temporary union of the three Sees soon after the Restoration. The Dioceses of Down and

Connor, with Dromore, united in the time of Malachi, were again united under the presidency of the English Chrysostom, who, "for his virtue, wisdom, and industry," was entrusted with the government of the See of Dromore in addition to those of Down and Connor. Had it been the will of God to have prolonged the life of this excellent prelate, more might have been done in the way of consolidation, and much of the work of later days might have been anticipated; but it is something to say that the illustrious Jeremy Taylor presided over the diocese in its full form—the form which it now has, and which it is likely to retain.

On the history of the diocese during the eighteenth century we need not dwell; that history has not much to interest or attract. The Church held her own quietly, and after the manner of the age, exhibiting an unvarying aspect of conservatism and loyalty which was not always exhibited by the parties surrounding her.[1] But as the nineteenth century advanced, tokens of renewed life and vigour began to be manifested. In Belfast, then rapidly rising to the status of a first-class town, the labours of the late Archdeacon Hincks, and subsequently of the late Dr. Drew, told effectually, and church after church began to rise in a town where before there were many meeting-houses, and but one small parish church;[2] and it is a fact that shortly before the disestablishment of the Irish Church the merchants of Belfast endowed six new churches in different parts of the town, to which four more have been added since. Nor was this revival of energy and advance of numbers confined to the town of Belfast. In the town of Ballymena, in the centre of Antrim, there were hardly 80 members of the Irish Church eighty years ago; the population was almost entirely made up of Presbyterians. There are now, according to the late census, nearly 2,300 members of the Church, the whole population being considerably under 9,000.

[1] A strong feeling of sympathy with the French Republic led many of the Presbyterians into rebellion in the year 1798; but the murderous excesses of the Romish rebels in Wexford and other portions of the South effectually quieted the spirit of insubordination which found itself in such strange and uncongenial company.

[2] There are now in Belfast and its suburbs twenty-four churches, and yet even this number is quite insufficient for the wants of the Church population. In the district in which these churches are situated—which includes the portion of Belfast in the county of Down, and Ballysillan, Canmoney, and Whitehouse—there must be from 65,000 to 70,000 members of the Church of Ireland. Oh for some Belfast Guinness or Roe, who would build and endow a cathedral, which might be done for half the money which it took to restore the Cathedrals of Christchurch and St. Patrick in Dublin! or oh for the spirit of the Cork Protestants, who rebuilt their cathedral at a cost of over £100,000, and are now thinking of an endowment!

And these observations may lead us to consider the results of the last census with reference to this diocese. The whole result of the census, as we have already stated, is disappointing, though it might easily have been anticipated; but the revelation made as to the strength of the Church in the counties of Down and Antrim is most reassuring, and is full of hope as to what may yet take place when the Church, recovered from the shock of disestablishment, is allowed to pursue her work steadily and quietly, and to leaven the minds of the rising generation with feelings of attachment to her forms and doctrines.

The figures which follow are taken from a table of statistics, carefully compiled from the census returns, by a respected clergyman of the Diocese of Connor. They give the population of each parish in the three divisions of the diocese for the years 1861, 1871, and 1881, noting the increase and decrease in these respective periods. It would be altogether beyond the limits of this paper to enter into the subject of the parochial statistics, nor indeed is it necessary to do so. What we want is a general summary, and a comparison of the increase or decrease, with the increase or decrease of the Nonconformists and the Roman Catholics; and it may be remarked that, in this table, the Nonconformists, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and others, are all grouped under one head, though, of course, the great bulk of Protestant Dissenters from the Church in the North of Ireland consists of Presbyterians.

From these statistics it appears that, in the Diocese of Down, which includes a large part of the county of Down, the total of Church members in the year 1861 amounted to 24,732; in the year 1871 to 28,247; and in the year 1881 to 30,192. The returns for 1861 are not given in the case of Nonconformists and Roman Catholics; but those for the two following decades exhibit these results: for 1871, Nonconformists, 79,008; for 1881, 75,650. Roman Catholics for 1871, 30,327; for 1881, 27,727. And, making allowance for the fact that the increase in some parishes is affected by a decrease in others, the net result, as to the three denominations in the Diocese of Down, may be stated as follows: for the Church, a net increase of 1,945; for the Nonconformists, a net decrease of 3,358; and for the Roman Catholics, a net decrease of 2,600.

In the Diocese of Connor, where the population is much larger, including, as it does, the whole of the county of Antrim, the results are still more striking. In the year 1861, the total of the Church population in Connor was 76,817; in the year 1871 it increased to 92,027; and in the year 1881 to 102,377, thus showing a net increase of 10,350. In this diocese the Nonconformists amounted in 1871 to 213,727; and in 1881

to 223,040, showing a net increase of 9,313. And the Roman Catholics in 1871 to 107,569; and in 1881 to 107,706, showing a net increase of 137. Thus the Church population, which was the smallest of the three, has made the largest increase; and the increase of the Roman Catholics is so trifling as hardly to count for anything.[1]

We now come to the Diocese of Dromore, which is partly in the county of Down, and partly in the county Armagh, which, having few large towns, and so being more liable to the drain of emigration, has decreased all round; but which, even in its decrease, has its own lesson. In Dromore, the Church population in the year 1861 amounted to 51,918; in the year 1871 to 50,488; and in the year 1881 to 45,735, thus showing a net decrease of 4,753. At the same time, the Nonconformists amounting in 1871 to 62,168, in 1881 numbered only 56,676, showing a net decrease of 5,908; whilst the Roman Catholics, who in 1871 numbered 76,474, in 1881 sank to 67,539, showing a net decrease of 9,583. There has, as we have said, been a decrease all round; but the Church, in that reduction of members, has suffered least, and the loss of the Roman Catholics is nearly twice as much as hers.

Now, when we add up the populations of the three dioceses, the result is more striking still. In 1871, the total Church population of the United Diocese of Down, and Connor, and Dromore was 170,762; in the year 1881 it amounted to 178,304, showing a net increase of 7,542. In the same decades, the Nonconformist population of the three dioceses was 354,903, and 355,366, showing a net increase of only 463; whilst the Romanists, amounting in 1871 to 214,370, and in 1881 to 202,972, have in ten years lost 11,398 of their members.

From the foregoing figures it will appear that, whilst the Church is an important and growing factor in the component parts of this diocese, and whilst her numbers now nearly equal the numbers of Roman Catholics, and fairly promise at

[1] The increase of the Church population in the town of Belfast is marvellous. The estimate given does not include the population of Ballymacarret, which is a suburb on the east side of the river Lagan, and is in the Diocese of Down. This suburb, including the parishes of Ballymacarret, St. Jude's, Willowfield, and Knockbreda, has a population of 8,054 Church people, as against 3,102 in the year 1861. We are dealing more particularly with the great parish of Belfast proper, or Shankhill, in the Diocese of Connor. In the year 1861 the Church population of Belfast amounted to 29,436; in the year 1871 it was found that the Church members had increased to 44,386; and in the year 1881 to 54,681, showing an increase of 10,295 in the space of ten years. In the year 1871 the Nonconformists, consisting for the most part of Presbyterians, amounted to 68,927, and in 1881 to 82,168, showing an increase of 13,241; whilst the Roman Catholics, amounting in 1871 to 54,194, and in 1881 to 57,821, only gained a net increase of 3,627.

the next census to equal or even exceed them, the Non-conformist or mainly Presbyterian element is very much the strongest; indeed, in the counties of Down and Antrim, the Presbyterians amount to nearly two-thirds of the whole body of Presbyterians in Ireland. This fact, however, has not at the present time the significance which it had two hundred years ago; nor is it in any way connected with the difficulties and dangers of the south and west of the country, where the scattered Church members are hemmed in and pressed on every side with the masses of the Roman Church. It is not that the Northern Churchmen love their Church less, or that the members of the Presbyterian Church are less strongly attached to their own system. It is not even that the old political feeling, which was the heritage of Presbyterianism, and which was fostered by what it fed on, the idea of inequalities and disabilities, is dying out—for it still lingers amongst a large section of the community—but there is a common sentiment felt rather than understood between the two great bodies of Protestants in the face of a common danger; and this sentiment derives no small element of strength from the fact that Churchman and Presbyterians agree as to the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for a rule of faith, and as to the duty of framing their lives according to the precepts contained therein. The canny Northener, with his Scotch traditions, has a very shrewd idea as to his own interest, and an accurate estimate of the value of pounds, shillings, and pence; but withal he feels that he should do unto others as he would have others do to him, and, above all, he shows a reverence for the commandment which tells him, "Thou shalt do no murder."

There is, therefore, abundant room for approaches as between the two great parties, and for interchange of kindly feeling. The writer of this paper can bear testimony to general and kindly sympathy of the members of the Presbyterian community of Ballymena, when the noble parish church of that town was destroyed by fire some three years ago—sympathy which was in nowise confined to words—but which placed at his disposal for the use of his congregation, and that for the space of fifteen months, a large and handsome Presbyterian place of worship. That the interchange of kindly offices and Christian courtesy must in the long-run prove beneficial to the interests of the Church is hardly a question, since experience has shown that it has already done so; but still the real progress of the Church must be looked for in her own activity and in faithfulness to her principles.

Nor are such faithfulness and activity wanting; no doubt there is call for more self-denial with reference to the tem-

poralities and spiritual work of the Church in these dioceses, but the reports of the Diocesan Synods will show how bravely the shock of disestablishment was met, and how well and wisely the work of organization has been carried on; no one who has been privileged to take part in the proceedings of the Diocesan Council, and who has observed the patient constancy with which busy laymen have sacrificed their valuable time to the interests of the Church, can withhold his meed of praise, nor fail to admire the tact and wisdom of that excellent Bishop, whose praise is in all the dioceses, and whose business capacity and governing power have made him in effect the permanent chairman of the General Synod.[1]

We have no temptation and no desire to throw a roseate hue over the prospects of Ireland and Ireland's Church. In all sincerity the prospect is gloomy enough. We have simply stated certain facts which pertain to certain dioceses in the northern part of the island; and if we are to state further what lies at the root of those facts, they may be comprised in two words—emigration and immigration—emigration and immigration carried out on the principles of the nineteenth century; *i.e.* in a liberal spirit and with a due regard for the interests of all concerned.

Statesmen have a knotty problem to solve in the settlement and pacification of Ireland, but if they wish to deal with the question honestly and fairly, they should look closely into the circumstances of that portion of the country which is prosperous and peaceful,[2] and they should ask, How much of that peace and prosperity is due to the operation in the reign of King James I. known as the Plantation of Ulster?

J. W. MURRAY.

---

[1] In vol. iii. of the biography of a famous Prelate, edited by his son, the Irish Church and the Irish Bishops come in for a double portion of slanderous detraction. It was hardly to be expected that one who was not tender of the reputation of his own father should have been tender of the reputation of Irish Bishops and the Irish Church. The course of events since the disestablishment may well be set against the slanderous innuendoes of gossiping letters; and the Bishops—and notably the Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore—can well afford to pass such insinuations by with silent contempt.

[2] It is very instructive to contrast the criminal statistics of the northern province with those of the southern or western provinces—or we may even say of the Province of Leinster. The very small percentage of crime in Ulster, as compared with the other provinces, ought surely to carry its own lesson with it.

VI.—MR. BICKERSTETH'S "THOUGHTS FOR TO-DAY. NO. 1."

Evangelical Churchmanship and Evangelical Eclecticism. By the Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, and Rural Dean. Sampson Low. 1883.

WHATEVER else may be said about Mr. Bickersteth's pamphlet, just published, this at least will be admitted, among devout and thoughtful Church-folk, on every side: its tone is excellent, while its statements and its suggestions are worthy of most serious consideration. On such a subject no man probably has a better right to speak; and certainly no man could refer to facts and plead in argument with gentler lovingness and zeal.

I. Mr. Bickersteth refers to facts. Is Evangelical Churchmanship changing its front? "If by this," he writes, "it is meant to ask, Are Evangelical Churchmen willing to surrender one foothold of that great platform of Catholic and Protestant truth which we have received from our fathers? I for one am confident that thousands of the clergy of our Church and ten times ten thousands of the laity would answer, God forbid! But if it is meant, Are Evangelical Churchmen in non-essential matters of ritual—ritual which symbolized no false doctrine—willing to use for the furtherance of the Gospel the prevalent æsthetic tastes of the age? Facts answer, Yes."

"Let facts speak," says Mr. Bickersteth; and accordingly he quotes the well-known *Guide to the Churches of London and its Suburbs*, as to the surplice in the pulpit and surpliced choirs. The statistics are striking. The surplice in the pulpit is now used in some 700 churches; and surpliced choirs last year were found in 476 churches out of 907. "Twelve years ago," he proceeds, "according to the same *Guide*, the Holy Communion was administered weekly in 169 out of 651 churches; last year, in 488 out of 907. And during the same period the primitive and apostolic custom of celebrating the Lord's Supper in the evening has advanced from 97 to 285 churches." Again, numbers alone are not to be weighed. "The surplice in the pulpit, surpliced choirs, and weekly Communions are now to be found in a great number of congregations which are shepherded by our most trusted Evangelical leaders, men whose fidelity to Protestant truth is as staunch and undeniable as theirs who still adhere to the black gown, the choir of school-children, and the monthly Communion."

These facts in the churches of London and its environs, says Mr. Bickersteth, "are very significant. Probably the proportions would not widely vary in the provinces;" but "the

verdict in favour of musical services," he rightly remarks, "would be even more pronounced in the northern than in the metropolitan dioceses."

Now, do these facts, while signifying a growth of Church taste, and a desire for "bright and dignified services,"[1] signify in themselves any change of doctrine? The esteemed author says, No. He quotes "the weighty words of the late Archbishop of Canterbury." The Archbishop says:—

It is a mistake, as I believe, to ascribe, directly or indirectly, to the influence of the Oxford movement, the marked change which has, with the general approval of the clergy and laity, taken place during these very years in the arrangements and architecture of our churches, and in the conduct of divine worship. The change is to be observed beyond the limits of the Church of England. It is not less evident amongst the Presbyterians of Scotland; and even the most rigid of English Dissenters have thrown themselves into the æstheticism of the day.

Upon this point, Mr. Bickersteth also quotes an article in the *Record*.[2] That paper says:—

There is a tendency to oppose every change which comes, or appears to come, from the High Church party. Here we seem to notice a lack of discrimination. We principally refer to matters of detail connected with the fittings and furniture of churches, and the conduct of public worship. Now we have already commented on the large support which the popular taste of the hour has given to the outward development of the [Oxford] movement. Much wisdom has been shown by the leaders in this respect. Not only is it a great assistance to have fashion on your side; but in such matters it is almost hopeless to fight against it. And why should we?

Nevertheless, the policy of concession, in any congregation, may easily be carried too far. Every "innovation" should be tested: and in a day of ceremonialism it is well the testing should be strict. Is the change in accordance with Church rule? Does it directly or by obvious symbolism foster false teaching? Does it tend to support an unevangelical ecclesiasticism?

II. We have passed from statements to suggestions.

Mr. Bickersteth touches upon such subjects as decorations,

---

[1] "To try to check Ritualism by discouraging a bright and dignified service is the wisdom of a mother, who, to prevent her boy from being a sailor, never lets him go near the sea."—*Bishop of Rochester's Pastoral*, 1878, p. 52.

[2] We gladly quote Mr. Bickersteth's words, in regard to the improvement in the *Record*, a change which more than once has been noted in THE CHURCHMAN:—"Let me add the counsel lately given by the *Record*, a Church paper which has shown such a marvellous growth of vitality and power and breadth of thought during the last two years, and bids fair to become increasingly an organ of light and leading in the anxious days before us."

surpliced choirs, daily services, Holy Days, Retreats or clerical "quiet days," the amount and character of the music which it is wise to introduce into our services. Against a policy of concession where doctrine is concerned, he speaks with firmness. For instance, he says: "If ritual, commended by the fleeting fashion of our times, in anywise whatever symbolizes strange and Romanizing doctrine; if it tends to signify the local presence of our ascended Lord in the sacramental bread and wine; or if it would, in the eyes of the people, transform the ambassador of the everlasting Gospel into a sacrificing priest, we must give place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel may continue amongst us unpolluted, undegraded, unimpaired." Elsewhere, in a similar vein, he speaks strongly of faithfulness. "The great Evangelical principles," he says, "must be held inviolate." Nothing could well be clearer than his sketch of these principles; and his language concerning the tenacity of grasp should satisfy every inquirer that his "change of front" is in no wise doctrinal. Strongly Protestant he is as ever. Nevertheless, as to musical services, Church adornment, etc., he recommends—as is natural in a man of his poetic gifts—that "Evangelical" Churchfolk should "go with the times." Let us gladly, not grudgingly, he says, employ "the cultivated tastes of the present day in the worship and service of our God."

One ingredient in his counsel, we think, is a specially suitable "thought for to-day," and we therefore quote it:—

> Surely our wisdom in these days is to take our stand on the impregnable rock of pure Scriptural doctrine, and in any matters of ritual or practice, which do not countenance error, to leave the decision to our brethren, *without holding them more or less Evangelical* because their usage may not in all points coincide with our own. If we suspect or speak hesitatingly of others on account of such external matters, the mischief may be done before we are aware. Suspicion repels. Confidence wins. I fear we have lost many young men, both lay and clerical, and more young women still from our Evangelical ranks, because some of us have set ourselves against certain tastes of the age, although these tastes are free from doctrinal error, instead of using them to the utmost in our Master's service.[1]

[1] In his able address at the Islington Meeting, Mr. Goe said:—"I submit these remarks in the interests of Evangelical Churchmanship, which we all desire to see vigorous, united, and growing. In view of the errors and difficulties of the present time, I wish to see its basis as comprehensive as we can make it, consistently with the special functions which God in His providence has assigned to us. Let us strive to attract the undecided by showing them that we can enter into their difficulties, rather than to repel them by an unsympathetic exclusiveness. If we protest against harmless diversities in ceremonial with as much vehemence as we protest against false doctrine, we shall weaken our own cause, drive away many whose sympathies are on the side of Evangelical truth, and incur the merited reproach of being unable to distinguish between things that differ."

Concerning some of Mr. Bickersteth's suggestions, of course, different opinions will be held. The correspondence columns of the *Record* bear witness to this diversity, especially as regards ritual;[1] matters of Church order and discipline stand on a different footing. About the observance of rubrics, in cases where the Bishop has given directions, there can hardly be two opinions among loyal, law-abiding Churchmen. Obedience has happily been, and is, a note of the Evangelical School. Again, when congregations desire their minister to make a change, provided the thing itself be according to the general spirit of the Word of God, and be likely to foster devotion in the temper of the Prayer Book, surely it may be chosen as good. One guiding principle, however, must be borne in mind. In the majority of our rural parishes, circumstances differ widely from those of ordinary town churches. In regard, therefore, to Holy Days, to take one point, the question for an incumbent seems to be, Can a congregation be had? In parishes of which the population is at all considerable, no doubt, whether rural or urban, a service in the evening can hardly fail to be well attended, if only the value of prayerfulness and of common prayer, according to the traditions of the Evangelical School, be duly proclaimed in the pulpit and taught by a diligent pastor. Of the usefulness of "prayer-meetings," in the parish schoolroom, or in some Bible-class room contiguous to the church, or in private houses, we have a very high sense; but all such gatherings, as a rule, we believe, where there is a sound "Church" tone, will increase rather than diminish, week-day attendances in the sanctuary. Of services conducted in a meagre, parsimonious way, Mr. Bickersteth's criticisms are just. "The pure and incorruptible Gospel," he says, "will not sound the less sweetly because the house of God in every part of it, within or without, bears witness to the loving earnest care with which we regard all things connected with His service and worship."[2]

As to the tendency of Mr. Bickersteth's suggestions, regarded as a whole, and taken together with the corollaries which his pamphlet is sure to bring out, a second edition, no doubt,

---

[1] Mr. Bickersteth does not ignore the question of *cost*. He says:—"While admitting the urgency of the command, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature,' some have been so absorbed with providing for the expenses of an extravagant ritual . . . that their efforts in the missionary cause would make apostles blush."

[2] In his recent Diocesan Address, we observe, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol remarks, that "in many of our churches" the "plainest and most obvious requirements" of the Prayer Book are ignored, and "its rules slothfully disregarded." If any of the "churches," to whom his lordship's remarks apply, have *Evangelical* Incumbents, we can only express our great regret that so it should be.

will soon give us an opportunity to express an opinion. Here and there occurs a remark which will probably be perverted. For instance, on page 33[1] our honoured friend says, "the bread and wine we present are not consecrated:" the Prayer Book word, however, is not *present* but *place*. It is important to bear in mind, as we have more than once observed of late, the Rubric says of the alms, "*humbly present* and place," but of the elements, simply "place." About the word "*then*" [when there is a Communion the Priest shall then place], compared with the same word in the Baptism Rubric [the font "is then to be filled"], something might be said, with justice, in refusing to make a change; but, for ourselves, we do not forget the Liddell judgment.

Other points in this interesting pamphlet invite attention. But we desire to recommend the "Thoughts for To-day;" and we hope it will be widely read. The subject is one of immediate importance.

Reviews.

The Official Report of the Church Congress, 1882. Bemrose & Sons.

THE Church Congress at Derby has been admitted on all hands to have been a great success. In many ways, no doubt, it thoroughly deserves this meed of praise. The arrangements gave universal satisfaction; there was not a single breakdown or failure or hitch in the management. From the first the Bishop of the Diocese took the liveliest interest in it, watched over all the work of the committees, and at last presided in such a way as to win golden opinions from all who were present. There was an elevated tone of thought maintained throughout the majority of the meetings. Never, we believe, has the attendance been so well sustained all through the week, and the attention so continuous. The financial results also were satisfactory. Though the price of tickets was lower than on many occasions, and no expense was spared to secure the comfort

[1] Mr. Bickersteth here quotes from the Bishop of London's Primary Charge, 1871. His lordship said:—"May not a clergyman . . . when rebuked for the introduction of some unauthorized ceremony, feel some natural indignation when he observes his neighbour continually violating the Rubric which provides that 'when there is a Communion, the Priest shall *then* (*i.e.* after presenting the Alms, and before saying the prayer for the Church Militant) place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient'? This Rubric is perfectly plain and undoubtedly binding. If it had at one time fallen into desuetude, its vigour has been revived in a decision of the Final Court of Appeal. It is practically without difficulty under almost any conceivable circumstances. It has about it no taint of superstition."

of the guests, a balance of £170 was handed over to the Southwell Bishopric Fund; and to sum up all, the Report, often sadly behindhand, was in the possession of subscribers on December 1st. All this may be fairly called success. Such a gathering demonstrates the energy of the great Church of England, and we should suppose that at Derby an impression of this vitality and power must have been produced.

The subjects of paramount interest were discussed, as was fitting, in the Great Hall. These were: "Unity of Belief in Relation to Diversities of Thought," "Evangelistic Work at Home and Abroad," "The Church and Modern Thought," "Political Relations of the Church," "The Church and other Communions," "The Liturgy," "The Church in Relation to Domestic and Social Life," and "The Devotional Life." It was noteworthy that on these subjects Evangelical men, or men, if not so called, yet imbued with Evangelical thought, occupied prominent places. No one who was present can forget the ablest and most interesting of all the discussions on the relations of the Church to modern thought. The papers and addresses of Mr. Wilson of Clifton, Professor Stokes, the Bishop of Bedford, and Mr. Welldon, deserve to live, and will live. Cambridge had no occasion on that day to be ashamed of her two senior wranglers and her senior classic, who did their work so well. Mr. Welldon's brief speech was full of fine feeling, and moved the audience as the heart of one man.

These were the topics discussed at the Congress which touched those who had minds and hearts to appreciate them. Other questions of far inferior interest and moment were relegated to the Temperance Hall. In many of these discussions High Churchmen predominated, but on the most exciting occasion there were not more than two hundred present. On the subject of Church Courts, to which we refer, the selection of readers and speakers happened to be singularly one-sided. Canon Gregory, Canon Trevor, Mr. James Parker, Mr. Dodd, Dr. Wirgman, Dr. Belcher, and the Rev. T. O. Marshall,[1] seven doughty champions, followed one another in quick succession; and yet when Canon Lefroy rose to say a word on the other side, the audience refused to listen, but turned the place into a Babel of confusion, and actually shouted him down. It does not say much for the judicial calmness which is to be expected if Canon Gregory and his friends have their way; fortunately, it need not trouble us, for so long as the Church is established by law, any change of Courts must have the sanction of the House of Commons, who are not likely to sell themselves and their fellow-laymen to sacerdotal government.

On the Thursday morning the subject handled was "The Church and other Communions—is Re-union or Inter-communion possible with Rome or Dissent?" In the afternoon this was followed by the discussion on "The Liturgy—whether any, and if so, what, changes are desirable?" These are kindred subjects, and their relation to one another are plainly indicated. The papers and addresses at the first of these meetings were somewhat disappointing; the second of the meetings will live in the memory of all who were present. It was admitted in the morning that union and communion with Rome is out of the question, that the breach has widened considerably since the Reformation, and that by *her* action, *not by ours*. It was as plainly admitted that it would be indeed a blessing to our land if the breach between us and our Nonconformist brethren could be healed. In the afternoon there was presented to us, on the one

[1] This gentleman is designated organizing secretary of the E.C.U. His speech (pp. 182-3) should be read as a specimen of what he wants to bring upon us. He would like to have "another Laud" and "another Becket"!

hand, a proposal for the alternative use, with Episcopal sanction, of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.; and, on the other hand, it was mildly suggested by Mr. Butcher that there were Churchmen who would desire Liturgical changes in the opposite direction, in order to promote conciliation with certain of the Dissenting bodies. The two discussions were so far parallel. But no one reminded the meeting of the lesson of History on the subject. It cannot be for a moment doubted that the mind of England has, since the Reformation, moved decidedly away from Rome in the direction of Evangelical freedom. Never was the proportion of Romanists to the population so small as at the present time, while Dissent has stolen from the Church not less than one-third of the mass of the people. Is it likely, under these circumstances, that the English people will make a retrograde movement, and go back ever so little behind the lines of the Reformation? Is it not certain, on the contrary, that any move the Church may make must be in the direction of Protestant truth and liberty?

This discussion was the occasion of that which we may call the Wood-Hoare episode. After Mr. Beresford Hope, in a cynical tone, had enumerated the advances of the Ritual he loves, Mr. Wood suggested, as we have just mentioned, the introduction of Edward's First Prayer-Book[1] for alternate use. It is to be observed that his proposal was that, having in view the little regard already paid to the Act of Uniformity, the *Bishops* should allow this. He admits that Legislative sanction is not likely to be obtained for his scheme, and hopes that our Episcopal rulers will thus sanction lawlessness. The Bishop called on Mr. Hoare, out of his arranged position, to follow Mr. Wood; and no one who heard his speech, and marked the effect it produced, will ever forget it; an effect which was afterwards heightened by the contrast of the—what shall we say?—unhappy style of Canon Gregory. Mr. Wood's suggestion was, as their own organ admits, the manifesto of the party he leads, and had been submitted to his choice counsellors. But we hardly think the very Ritualists themselves would wish to adopt all that they would gain by the innovation. The Holy Table is called, almost in the same page, *the Altar* and *God's Board*, which plainly indicates the state of transition under which the book was produced; and they would have to pray that God will deliver us "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all her detestable enormities." One thing is quite certain, the Evangelical body in the Church of England will never tolerate such a step backwards, from light into darkness. Canon Hoare will leave behind him many happy memories. His gentleness, goodness, power of sympathy, and skill as a teacher, have endeared him to many; but he will be remembered, we venture to say, more especially as he stood forth in the Drill Hall at Derby, a good old soldier of the Cross, a veteran warrior for the truth of God, whose eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.

There is much in the Report of real interest—many a thought that will live and work in the minds of men; but on the manifold details of the multitudinous subjects discussed, or attempted to be discussed, it is impossible to enter; our space forbids it.

The papers on the "Devotional Life" would require, to handle them properly, separate discussion. Dr. Norman Kerr's noble article on "Inebriates" deserves careful reading. The speeches on "The Political Relations of the Church" are full of interest, The debates on "Evangelistic Work at Home and Abroad" ought not to be put aside. It is delightful to see that men of all schools of thought are desirous to bring the Gospel, as far as they understand it, to bear on the masses of the people, though

[1] P. 391.

we cannot see any special virtue in cassocks[1] for itinerant preachers, or that texts selected from the Lessons of the day are necessary to prove their Churchmanship ; and we confess we were sorry to have the subject lowered to a recommendation as to the note[2] on which it is proper to intone.

We should like to add a word or two on the relation of Evangelical Churchmen to these gatherings. In the first place, we would point out a danger which they bring. A Church Congress is apt to soften off the edges of distinctive truth, and to persuade men to cry Peace where no peace is possible ; for how can we have peace without truth ?

It is not true, *e.g.*, as Mr. Wycliffe Gedge[3] seems to have persuaded himself, and wishes to persuade others, that the Baptismal controversy is forgotten, and all men think alike on that subject. The High Church dogma of Baptismal Regeneration is doing abundant evil amongst us to-day. It is not many years since one of Mr. Gedge's colleagues, a prominent Diocesan school inspector, attempted to cram it, in its most offensive form, down the throats of the pupil teachers of his district ; and wherever the theory is maintained of a seed implanted and lying dormant, confusion must take place, which hinders many a soul from grasping the plain doctrines of the Gospel. It is not true, as Mr. Randall Davidson's[4] speech might lead some to believe, that you could go *blindfold* into any London church, at the time of service, and not know to which section of the Church it belongs. His experience must be small, or his powers of discrimination very imperfect. Our fate last summer, during a brief holiday tour, does not support him. At more then one favourite watering-place we heard "*pernicious nonsense*" which, we venture to say, no Evangelical would propound to his people : the crudest view of Baptismal Regeneration, the foundation of all the teaching of the pulpit, and the Lord's Supper pressed on all present who desired to obtain pardon of sin ; while there was not one word to guide an inquiring soul into the way of peace, no exaltation of Christ, no mention of the work of the Holy Spirit.

It is most injurious that such fallacies should be propounded, and grievous that they should receive Episcopal sanction ;[5] and unless a champion of the truth is at hand, and the Chairman is willing and able to give him the chance, the error is disseminated to do its deadly work.

But it is, in the next place, to be remembered—and on this we would insist—that a Church Congress is not the voice of the Church, nor of a Diocese, and has no binding authority. Each assembly of the Congress originates, we believe, not in a public meeting, openly called, but by the operation of a sub-committee chosen no one knows by whom. The only safeguards are—first, that the Bishop in whose Diocese the Congress meets, is responsible for it, and, in some sense, for all its utterances, and that he ought therefore to have, as he has, a paramount influence in its direction ; and secondly, that the voice of public opinion is the weightiest force in England, and has many ways of making itself felt.

Yet, though Church Congresses have no authority, they are of great importance, because the audiences they assemble are large and representative. It is to be hoped, then, that Evangelical men will throw themselves vigorously into them, and though they may feel that it is not pleasant to speak to an assembly not wholly sympathetic, be ready to stand forth for the truth of God. At the Derby Congress it was reported that much influence was lost by the refusal of not a few Evangelical leaders to undertake the work assigned to them. This surely ought not to be. Everything is really in our favour. The truth of God we know is with us ; and the law of our Church, as again and again indicated, is on our

[1] P. 91. [2] P. 85. [3] P. 52. [4] P. 47. [5] P. 48.

side. The Prayer Book, in its true and honest interpretation, is ours. We do not ask for any change in it. Our cause must prevail. By putting forth fearlessly the truths, to the inculcation of which we owe our name, we shall leaven, still more largely than we have already, all parties in the Church with Evangelical opinions. Our cause, we repeat, must and will prevail; but the victory may be postponed if we of this generation fail to rally for the battle and to do our part in it.

PRESBYTER.

Short Notices.

Modern Atheism; or, The Heavenly Father. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France (Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences), late Professor in the University of Geneva. Translated from the French by HENRY DOWNTON, M.A., Rector of Hopton-by-Thetford, formerly English Chaplain at Geneva. Second Edition. London: James Nisbet and Co., 21, Berners Street, 1882.

A member of the French Institute has a right to be listened to, and when the lectures which make up this volume were delivered at Geneva, they excited, as was natural, great interest. This was nearly twenty years ago, at which time the atheistic principles now so prevalent, or at least making so much noise in England, were doing the same in Switzerland and Germany. It takes twenty years for a wave of thought to travel from the continent to this country, and Professor Naville's lectures could not have appeared in a second edition at a more appropriate time than the present. It is a book admirably adapted to meet those various shades of atheistic opinions which encounter us everywhere, in bookstalls and drawing-rooms, in newspapers and reviews, and are more or less disturbing the faith of numbers. Nothing can be more sound than M. Naville's reasoning or more triumphant than his conclusions.

Few French writers have the good fortune to be translated into readable English—Mr. Downton's translation leaves nothing to be desired. No one who did not know the fact would imagine it to be a translation. Even the morsels of French poetry are represented in the text by lines of English poetry, in most cases, to say the least, not inferior to the originals, which are given in foot-notes. Those who are acquainted with Mr. Downton's well-known hymns will not be surprised at this.

Ernest Naville has written many other books on Christian truth and doctrine, which we have not read, but in the present volume there is nothing but the one subject which the title indicates. It is not a defence of Christianity but of Theism. He himself does not hesitate to assert publicly that his "hopes for time and eternity are based on the gospel of Jesus Christ as it is preached to the old women and the little children." But the book before us has to do only with the existence and goodness of God. He does not deal in these lectures with "the grand doctrinal foundations of our faith," nor with the existence of evil, the reality of which

he strongly asserts, but leaves for consideration to a subsequent work. So far as modern atheism is concerned, this is just the book to put into the hands of men who read and think.

Stepping-Stones to Higher Things. By Captain SETON CHURCHILL. Pp. 160. Elliot Stock. 1883.

Every true admirer of Tennyson has thought over the lines from which Captain Churchill has taken the title of this little volume. The title might be interpreted by different persons in different ways; but the gallant Captain has used the poet's thought in the highest possible sense; his work is designed, under the Divine blessing, to help some who now "mind earthly things" to "seek those things which are above." Further, the book will assist those who are now learning in the School of Christ to strive, through grace, to attain to yet higher degrees of spiritual usefulness and joy: "upward," "onward," "more and more," are keynotes of its exhortations. "The contents of the book," says a prefatory note, "were originally delivered in the form of extempore addresses;" and the language is free from what Ruskin calls "conventional art." The book is all the better for it. None can fail to perceive the deep earnestness and spirituality of tone; but the shrewdness, common-sense, and practical way of putting things may be of special service as regards many readers. Captain Churchill makes good use of illustrations and anecdotes: he is neither tedious nor dull. He quotes here and there a striking passage from such writers as Ryle, Bonar, Bickersteth, and Spurgeon; while many of his doctrinal definitions, we note with pleasure, are hewn from that Evangelical quarry (too little thought of by some Mission preachers), the Prayer Book. A bit now and then from deep writers like Mozley, will be attractive to cultured readers of robust thought. There are eighteen chapters—"Divine Standard of Right and Wrong," "Not of Works," "Substitution," and such like. "Conversion," says Captain Churchill, "briefly stated, is a turning from sin unto God." Some of the texts which he quotes are more literally translated (as he will see in the Revised Version) *turn*. ("Except ye *turn*," A. V. "be converted," Matt. xviii. 3.) It is well to distinguish between conversion and regeneration. The latter—the work of the Spirit alone—is never made the subject of a Divine precept; the former, although of course the result of the Spirit's influence, is spoken of as the work of man and *commanded* by God. In heartily recommending the book before us, we may quote from it a few specimen sentences:—

I have lately had the privilege of reading a letter from an earnest Christian officer who took part in the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. It was written before the engagement took place, and finishes with a postscript, descriptive of his feelings, in these beautiful words:—"Peace, perfect peace! *the future all unknown.*" I could not help contrasting the feelings of that officer with those of another, who was one day in command of the advance-guard for the brigade which marched up to the relief of the late Sir George Colley in South Africa. As we were riding alongside each other, I asked him if he was prepared to meet his God, in the event of anything happening to him. His reply was, "Please do not speak to me now about these things; it would unnerve me. Death is the last thing I try to think of." I feel sure that, had the occasion occurred, he would have nobly done his duty; but, at the same time, who can doubt which of the two officers, both nice fellows, had chosen the higher things of life?

Under the title *Holy Footprints*, the Rev. FREDERICK WHITFIELD, Vicar of St. Mary's, Hastings, has published (Nisbet & Co.) seven addresses; a small and cheap gift-book. The style of Mr. Whitfield's fervent appeals is well known; and the author of one of the sweetest hymns of the day needs here no introduction.

A very pleasing and instructive little volume, *The Life of Hannah More* (Religious Tract Society), will gain, we hope, the circulation it so well deserves. When Hannah More was born, religion in England seemed at its lowest ebb. From 1750 to 1780 was a period of pluralities and preferment-hunting. Clergy and Dissenting ministers alike were dull, idle, and worldly. The masses of the people were ignorant and coarse. In the higher circles, said Montesquieu, everyone laughs if one talks of religion. Later, Hannah More wrote: "We saw but one Bible in the parish of Cheddar, and that was used to prop a flower-pot."

We gladly recommend *Through the Khyber Pass* (Stock), an account of temperance work among the soldiers in the Afghan campaign, by the Secretary to the Soldiers' Total Abstinence Society. It is out and out the best book of its kind; bright and instructive. A letter to the author, Mr. GREGSON, from Lord Napier of Magdala, shows what good work the Society has been doing.

Sermons Preached in the Parish Church of Stanhope. Second Series. (To which are added "Letters from Abroad.") By the Rev. CHARLES CLAYTON, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean of Stanhope. Seeley.

We most heartily recommend these impressive and instructive sermons. At one period, at intervals during four years, we had the pleasure of hearing Mr. Clayton; he was then (Tutor of Caius and) incumbent of Trinity. As a rule, perhaps, on a Sunday evening the present writer attended Mr. Jameson's church; dear, good, single-hearted Jameson of St. Catharine's. But whenever we listened to Mr. Clayton we made this note: his sermons were intensely Scriptural; the language was simple, the tone was deeply spiritual; but the chief characteristic was its exhibition and exposition of Scripture. Earnestly and affectionately he preached the Word. How many undergraduates profited by his ministry "THAT DAY" will declare! Oftentimes, during the last twenty years, we have read a sermon by Canon Clayton (his sermons will repay reading twice and thrice), and every one of them seems (if we may so say) saturated with Scripture. For this reason, the volume before us seems an excellent gift for the younger clergy. We may be wrong, but we fancy the pulpit teaching of many (even among Evangelicals) is *thin*, lacks robustness, is too essayish. To make a sermon a string of texts is one thing; to exhibit, explain, enforce a text, in due proportion, comparing Scripture with Scripture, is another thing. Canon Clayton's discourses may be called doctrinal, yet they are neither "dry" nor unpractical; and the solemnity is happily free from severity. In a touching preface to the present volume, the honoured Canon says, that "after a ministry of more than forty-five years, he

cannot expect to be much longer permitted to preach; the nearer he approaches the eternal world, he finds nothing will support his soul but the simple truths of the Gospel."

The Lord's Day in Conferences and Congress. Papers read on various occasions at Home and Abroad. By JOHN GRITTON, D.D. Pp. 115. Lord's Day Observance Society.

An admirable little book; likely to be very useful. Conflict in these days is thickening round the Sabbath. Ably written, thoroughly Scriptural essays like Dr. Gritton's should be read and recommended.

Elisha the Prophet. The Lessons of his History and Times. By A. EDERSHEIM, M.A., Vicar of Loders. Pp. 326. Religious Tract Society.

The greater portion of this book we have read with satisfaction; and nowhere has there seemed a need to make an adverse criticism. The whole book, no doubt, is edifying. Dr. Edersheim uses his stores of learning with literary skill; and he has written a present-day work of real value.

God's Answers. A Record of Miss Annie Macpherson's Work at the Home of Industry, Spitalfields, London, and in Canada. By CLARA M. S. LOWE. Nisbet & Co.

This interesting, well-written little volume has an introduction by the author of the "Life of Duncan Mathieson." It is a noble thing to put down in healthy happy homes in Canada hundreds and hundreds of boys and girls whose circumstances in this country seemed "hopeless."

The Clergy List for 1883 deserves, for fulness and accuracy, a hearty word of commendation. (John Hall, 13*a*, Salisbury Square.) The labour of preparation must have been very great. The dates of ordination as deacon and priest, and the name of the ordaining Bishop, have been added to the alphabetical list in nearly every instance. The *Clergy List* now contains a complete list of the clergy, with the degree and University, the date of ordination, and the appointment held. The alphabetical list of benefices consists of 270 pages, giving the post-town, county, diocese, incumbent, curates, patron, value, and population. In addition, there is a complete list of the Irish, Scotch, and Colonial clergy. The diocesan establishments have been carefully revised, and the rural deaneries, arranged under their ecclesiastical divisions, with the names of the archdeacons and rural deans, have been brought up to date. The list of Public Schools and Colleges, with the names of the clerical masters, has been carefully corrected by returns made, in nearly every instance, by the Principals themselves.

Of the *Official Year-Book of the Church of England* (S. P. C. K.) we had intended to insert a somewhat lengthy notice in the present CHURCHMAN. As matters are, however, we must content ourselves with expressing our hearty approval. The volume is wonderfully cheap, a storehouse of interesting information; and it reflects the greatest credit on all con-

cerned in it. To the venerable Church Society we are indebted for an excellent book; and the Hon. Secretary and Editor of this Year-Book, the Rev. F. BURNSIDE, has done his work with singular skill and good judgment.

The Pulpit Commentary. St. Mark. Exposition by Very Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, D.D. Homiletics by Rev. Prof. J. R. THOMSON, M.A. Homiletics by various Authors. 2 vols. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1883.

Of the volumes of "The Pulpit Commentary," Old Testament series, we have from time to time written in praise. The first portion of the New Testament series, edited by the Dean of Lichfield, promises well; and so far as we have examined it we can pronounce it sound and good. A worthy notice must be given hereafter.

Egypt, Palestine, and Phœnicia. A Visit to Sacred Lands. By FELIX BOVET. Translated by W. H. LYTTELTON, M.A. Pp. 416. Hodder & Stoughton.

This is a translation of the eighth edition of M. Bovet's well-known book. Canon Lyttelton has done his work remarkably well; and this account of travelling in sacred lands will prove as acceptable to English readers, no doubt, as it has done to French, German, Swedish, Dutch, and Italian readers. It is recommended by Professor Godet, a friend of the author (and also of the translator). We had marked several passages for quotation; but we must content ourselves with recommending the book as very readable and instructive.

We have received *The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.* A Paper read at the Second Annual Conference of the Craven Evangelical Union, held at Leeds, on Thursday, November 23rd, 1882, by the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, D.D. Leeds: Printed at the office of the *Yorkshire Post*, Albion Street. In this learned and valuable pamphlet, of singular clearness and point, we read:—

So rapid have been the changeful transitions of High Church teaching in late years, that it may be difficult to seize on that particular phase which is at any moment regarded as most purely "Catholic." Without dwelling on any other, I hasten to that which I believe to be the form of Eucharistic doctrine most widely circulated among the junior clergy—that of which the Rev. M. F. Sadler, Rector of Honiton, is the best known exponent. His "Church Doctrine Bible Truth," and his "One Offering: a Treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist," are two little books very widely circulated, and exercising great influence. Two Bishops, at least, require the former of these from candidates for Holy Orders. In other words, the young deacon, unprepared and unfit to contest the doctrine, is required to imbue his mind with a complete system of modern sacerdotalism.

This system, as far as it respects the Eucharist . . . . . avoids the grosser and more materialistic views of the extreme school; yet it lands its disciple ultimately in a full sacrificial worship. It only glances at early writers, and claims to rest on the direct authority of Holy Scripture. It, therefore, attracts some who can be satisfied with no weaker basis for their faith.

If, on examination, continues Dr. Boultbee, "it shall be found to rest "upon an inexact treatment of the very limited and carefully selected "portion of God's Word; if a more scrutinizing examination of that "limited portion, and a more extended survey of other statements, shall "prove the fallacy of the basis on which the doctrine rests, the whole "superstructure of the sacrificial worship and the offering of the earthly "priest must crumble into ruin.

"At first the author seems to abandon the whole sacrificial position. "For he makes these admissions :—'The sacrificial aspect of the Eu- "charist does not seem prominent in the Scriptures which teach us the "nature of this sacrament. It appears in them rather as an ordinance in "which God offers something to us, than one in which we offer anything "to him.' Further, he says, according to the usual English use of the "word *sacrifice*, 'something voluntarily given up,' there is a difficulty in "applying it to the Eucharist, which presents none of the ordinary "features of sacrifice, as exhibited in Levitical usages. Moreover, he "distinctly states, that on any supposition, the body of our Lord cannot "in the Eucharist suffer over again pain and death, so as to become again "a propitiatory sacrifice. Lastly, he says, 'the holy Eucharist has "scarcely one feature in common with the things which in Scripture are "called, and which English Christians commonly call, sacrifices.'

"Doubtless it is so, and thus the great body of our English divines "have taught. What then? The apparently abandoned position is "reoccupied in full force by a counter-march. The Eucharist is asserted "to possess 'the most intense sacrificial reality' beyond all others, on this "ground: The 'real spiritual value' of the old sacrifices lay simply and "absolutely in their reference to the atoning blood of Christ. The "Eucharist has a still closer reference to that sacred thing, and hence is "yet more of a sacrifice than they.

"I think it must be manifest that either a logical fallacy is being per- "petrated, an adroit substitution of one phrase for another, without any "real equivalence of value—or else that a mere generalization of no "exactitude and no special force is being offered to us.

"If we are to call by the name of sacrifice anything in which a "'reference to the atoning blood of Christ' pervades the transaction, "certainly many very dissimilar acts will be swept within the definition, "as well as Holy Communion.

"But it is no mere generalization that is pressed upon us here, nothing "of that kind of thought which made St. Paul apply the idea of sacrifice "to prayer, alms, thanksgiving, and the like. By this one sudden leap "we are brought to a full sacrificial transaction—priest, altar, offering— "a sacrifice more intensely real than any of old. Certainly, if this is "Church Doctrine, and if Church Doctrine is Bible Truth, many of us "have read both Prayer Book and Bible to little purpose."

Dr. Boultbee proceeds to examine Mr. Sadler's Bible demonstration. He examines his arguments on "Do this . . . ." and proves that "the verbal basis for the sacrificial notion which the words of institution were supposed to lay is abolutely gone."

The learned Doctor then discusses other points in Mr. Sadler's arguments. For instance :—

Rev. viii. 3-4 leads to this conclusion:—"An altar, then, is assumed to be the centre of the ritual of heaven." May we assume a realistic interpretation of all that? Was that seventh seal really a seal? And was it really broken? Had the seven angels seven real trumpets, and did they sound them? Did the great star, called Wormwood, really fall, and blast the waters? Pardon me—but argument of this sort, how is it to be grasped? And then, after all, let us note (v. 3) it was an altar of incense, not of sacrifice, which the rapt Apostle saw. And it was not a sacrifice, but the prayers of the saints, which ascended from it. Need I say more?

Dr. Boultbee then examines passages quoted by Mr. Sadler from the Epistle to the Hebrews, mainly viii. 3, and thus concludes:—

Heb. x. 12: "After He had offered one sacrifice for sins." The same remark holds: it is an act *done*, not *doing*.

Heb. x. 14: "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

Could the idea of the completeness of the offering be more strongly put? However little intended by those who do it, could there be a more marked evasion of the leading idea, than to say, "Observe the offering is going on now, has been going on these many centuries, but inasmuch as it is not a different, or a repeated one, but a continuation of the same act without cessation, therefore it is one offering, not many offerings."

Nay, that idea would have required some such wording as this: "By the perpetual offering day by day He continuously perfects them that are sanctified." How different the clear ring of that perfect tense, "He hath perfected for ever."

Lastly, Heb. x. 18: "Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin"—οὐκ ἔτι προσφορά. Yet the whole point of the theory before us is to omit this "no" and to say ἔτι, there is still offering for sin.

What, then, is the sum of this apostolic teaching? It all runs one way without variation or hesitation. The words, the tenses, the prevailing idea, all set forth one, and one only, conception of the priestly office of our Lord. Whatever there was of offering, whether the sacrifice on the Cross, or the presentation of its merits before the throne, is complete and is past. It is past, because it is complete, and susceptible of no repetition and no continuation. Else were it not complete. This is the fundamental conception of the Lord's priesthood. To shake this shakes the foundation of the Christian's confidence.

The priesthood of Aaron terminated not for the day when he had performed the prescribed ritual. None the less was he a priest because for the moment he had not "somewhat to offer." Christ is none the less a priest because His offering is over, not only for the time, but for ever and ever. Of perpetual efficacy we have all that the most uneasy conscience can desire. Of perpetual, manual, or other mode of offering, we have found no trace.

If we ask further what we may learn as to the continual heavenly work or action of the Great High Priest, the indications are in harmony with our conclusions. The Creeds give us this one object of faith in this regard: "He sitteth at the right hand of God." Nevertheless He is a priest for ever, but it is "after the order of Melchisedek." That is, He is King as well as Priest. His priesthood is that of One sitting on the throne, not of One standing at the altar. "He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne: and He shall be a Priest upon His throne" (Zech. vi. 13).

Can this doctrine of the continued offering then be true? Is it true which Mr. Sadler says, "It is the anti-Catholic view that Christ having once offered Himself on the Cross has long ceased to offer anything, so that, in fact, He is

now a Priest only in name?" Is it, as he further says, "the Catholic view that, being 'a Priest for ever,' He must do for ever a characteristically priestly act; and consequently, according to the same Epistle, 'He must now have somewhat to offer'?" Whence comes that word "now," wantonly inserted into that text? It is born of the mistaken conception of the perpetuity of the *action*, instead of the perpetuity of the *office*; and so after an unlawful birth it is thrust into the text. It seems to be thought that the Apostle negligently omitted it, since it is quietly slipped in.

This hurried review of the salient points in the Scriptural argument of Mr. Sadler is all that time has permitted. How far does that theory go beyond the general Christian belief in the Lord Jesus evermore pleading the merits of His great sacrifice for His penitent and believing people? It is clear that it goes far beyond it by adding to the Christian faith dogmas not borne out by revelation as to the present attitude, work, and, so to speak, occupation of our King. And it goes beyond our own Church doctrine by basing upon this the assumption that our Eucharist is "the earthly representation of that heavenly presentation now going on at the right hand of God." And it goes beyond our legal ritual, by further defending the mass vestment and the mass position of the priest.

Even if the continuous heavenly presentation had been established, it might take much to prove that the earthly priest in mimic show could follow the action of the Great King. But, certainly, if the heavenly fact, considered as an abiding and continuous action, has failed of proof, the supposed earthly counterpart must quite have faded away.

Finally, we have been told that this theory is "the Catholic view." The great name of Chrysostom has been variously invoked by writers on all sides of the Eucharistic controversy. Let us hear some words of his taken from his homily on Heb. vii. 11-14: "When thou hearest Him spoken of as High Priest, think not that He is always doing the priestly act (ἀεί ἱεράσθαι). He officiated as priest once (ἅπαξ), and thereafter (λοιπὸν) sat down. And lest thou shouldst imagine that He is now in heaven, standing and ministering (λειτουργῶν), the Apostle shows that such service is a part of the dispensation: οἰκονομίας τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐστι. As He became a servant, so also He was made both High Priest and Minister. But in like manner, also, as He became a servant, He did not continue a servant; so also when made a minister (λειτουργὸς), He did not continue a minister: for it is not the part of a minister to sit down, but to stand. This, then, gives us to understand the greatness of the sacrifice, which being one and offered once (ἅπαξ), yet sufficed to do what all the other sacrifices could not do." St. Chrysostom is a great Catholic doctor, as all confess. A large and active party boast themselves Catholics, and stigmatize poor Evangelicals as non-Catholic. If Mr. Sadler represents the views (as he is supposed to do) of a large section of them, I leave it to your judgment which of us finds that ancient Catholic doctor most nearly the exponent of our sentiments on this great subject of controversy.

*** *To several friends who have been good enough to send us copies of papers containing review notices of* THE CHURCHMAN *we are much obliged. Several country newspapers regularly reach us, and their notices of the Magazine are read with pleasure. Our clerical readers will pardon us if we once more solicit their kind exertion in regard to lay subscribers. The promoters of* THE CHURCHMAN *earnestly desire to increase the number of supporters among the laity.*

INDEX TO VOL. VII.