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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. VIII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1883

PREFACE.

Our conviction has oftentimes been expressed in this Magazine, that — to quote from one of its contributors — "the measures which would most benefit the Church are not in the region of government, but in the region of service; that not by her courts and decrees, but by the practical arrangements of her ministry, she will best encounter the growing emergencies of the times in which we live, and still more of the times which are at hand; provided always that her conscious dependence is not on these methods, or any methods at all, but on the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, 'from Whom the whole body, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.'"

The principle in these words, which we have quoted from an article on the Diaconate by the Reverend Canon Bernard (vol. v. p. 326), has from the first guided the conduct of The Churchman. The amazing growth of the town population of England, and the glaring disproportion between the endowments of the ancient parishes and of the newly-formed, in which are the masses; the feebleness of the administrative forces of the Church, really regarded as National, and the need for such conservative reforms as shall adapt a system which sheltered a population of ten millions to the requirements of a population of thirty millions; the tendencies of a utilitarian or even materialistic spirit under the increasing influence of democratic agitations, and the lack of worthy representation of the Church in the House of Commons—these

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1883.

ART. I.—THE HUGUENOTS, THE VAUDOIS, AND THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

THE progress of manufactures in England is so intimately connected with the expulsion of the Huguenots from France, that we cannot ignore the debt of gratitude we owe to those who, for conscience' sake, forsook their fatherland and cast in their lot with us.

There can be no doubt that the Huguenots introduced the principal inventions in machinery and handicraft which have converted England from being purely a grazing country for the production of cattle, sheep, and wool, to being the first manufacturing country in the world. It was from the Flemings and French Huguenots the English learned to spin and to weave wool. Worsted, a town near Norwich, first gave the name to worsted stuffs; and the Frères Blanquettes to blankets. They first introduced water-mills, wind-mills, and fulling-mills, saw-mills, wire-mills, and paper-mills; the art of making bricks; linen-weaving, silk-weaving, lace-making, crape, gloves, and felt hats; glass, files, Dolland's telescopes; Paul's spinning roller, afterwards completed by Arkwright. The very names preserved to this day in the cities of Norwich, Manchester, London, Macclesfield, Canterbury, and indeed all the great centres of manufacturing industry, bear witness to the high character and skill and enterprise and ingenuity of these wonderful people. Mr. Smiles has published a list of some 300 names of notable families, now resident in England, who are descended from the Huguenots. To mention a few will be sufficient to suggest many more. Auriol, Bayley, Beauvoir, Beaufort, Bosanquet, Carbonel, Chamberlayn, Chevenix, Trench, Chevalier, Cousin, Cramer, Deville, Duncan, Durant, Dupre, Forester, Gambier, Gaussen, Houblon, Grote, Labouchere, Layard,

Magendie, Nicolas, Ouvry, Pechel, Pierrepoint, Pourtallis, Romaine, Bouverie, Saurin, Tryon. Even our Queen Victoria is of Huguenot descent, from the Marquis d'Olbreuse, whose granddaughter, Sophia Dorothea, married George I. of England; her son was George II., and her daughter married Frederic William, afterwards King of Prussia. And so we have the names of theologians—Newman, Faber, Martineau, Pusey, Hugh Stowell, and Sydney Smith; and peers—Lord Northwich, Lord Rendlesham; and so the Bedford, Devonshire, Leeds, Minto, Taunton, Eversley, and Romilly families are descendants of Huguenot ancestors.

Now it must be borne in mind that these people were driven from their homes, their property, and their country, not because they were rebels and revolutionists, but because they would not submit to the tyranny of the Church of Rome. They were persecuted for their religion. They protested against the corrupt doctrines of Rome (such as the infallibility of the Pope, the worship of images, the sacrifice of the Mass, the transubstantiation of the bread and wine, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin), and hence it was, that upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 at least 500,000 were exiled, a very large proportion of whom came to England.

The question very naturally arises, Were the King of France and the Church of Rome justified in regarding the Huguenots as heretics and immoral people? Was their religion a modern schism and outcome of error? In other words, was their religion a departure from the Catholic faith, or a return to Primitive truth?

It is to be feared that the sympathy and brotherly love, which for many years existed between the Church of England and the Protestant Churches of the Continent, has considerably decreased, and seems to be passing away altogether. The cold spirit in which the Protestant clergy and churches of Germany, France, and Switzerland are regarded by Anglican Episcopalians; the slender and inadequate support given to the Foreign Aid Society—the one only society representing the ideal of Protestant Union; and lastly, the audacity with which the Reformation is spoken of as a schism from the Catholic Church, both by Churchmen and Romanists, are a sufficient proof that the English mind is not duly informed as to the historical relation in which the Protestant Churches stand to the Primitive Church. Take for example the following extract from a sermon reported to have been preached in Dublin a few weeks ago to a crowded congregation:

The Church of England, so-called, sprang from the hands of a king, and after him from his daughter, and the truth is that never yet, from the days when St. Paul underwent his first imprisonment in Rome in the early years of Nero, down to the present time, has there been, or would

there be, a pure Christianity derived from any other source than the See of Peter, which God established with his own hands.

The Church of England [again said the preacher] was not a continuance of anything that had existed before, but it was a new commencement, or, in modern language, a new departure.

Without attempting to bring forward any evidence or arguments which have not been brought forward again and again by ecclesiastical writers, and which have never been answered, the object of this paper is to draw attention to a line of witnesses, not sufficiently known, by which we can trace the continuity of the spiritual life of the Church from the time of the Apostles to the present day, and thus prove that the Reformed Churches are not a schism, but a living branch of the true Church of Christ.

The inquiry I propose to make is into the connection between the Primitive Church and the Waldenses of the Cottian Alps, and the Huguenots of Dauphiné and Languedoc, without touching upon the better known history of the Waldenses of Piedmont; and in speaking of these localities it will be necessary to remove a very common misconception which arises from confounding together the names of religionists in France, which are supposed to have held the same opinions, and to have existed about the same time. For example, the Vaudois, who are sometimes classed with the Pays de Vaud, and the Albigenses, the Huguenots, and the Camissards and Jansenists. With respect to these, we may be reminded that the Jansenists arose about 1625; they were Roman Catholics, who adopted the doctrines of St. Augustine, and were finally reconciled to the Pope. The Albigenses were a sect of Reformers who were exterminated about 1253; they lived in the neighbourhood of Albi, and were charged with holding the Manichean heresy; but this Faber has proved to be without sufficient reason. The Huguenots were converts from Popery, and, in its truest sense, were the children of the Reformation. They were first known after the preaching of Bucer, Calvin and Melancthon about 1520. The Vaudois never had been Roman Catholics, but had from time immemorial inhabited the mountainous district of the south of France, and threw all their influence into the work of the Reformation, and thus became almost identified with the Huguenots; for in the first national synod of Protestants, held in 1559, at which representatives from all parts attended, the delegates from Provence and Dauphiné said:

We consent to merge in the common cause, but we require no reformation, for our forefathers and ourselves have ever disclaimed the corruptions of the churches in communion with Rome.

A glance at the map of the south of France will show that the high road from Rome to Lyons and the mouth of the

Rhone runs through the Cottian Alps and Provence, and that it must have been by this route Hannibal brought his army from Carthage, and it was probably by this route St. Paul made his journey into Spain. At all events, whether by St. Paul or by other missionaries from the Apostolical Church, the Gospel was preached and received by many in those regions in the first and second centuries, for there were thirteen Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis (the country between the Rhone and the Alps) present at a synod over which Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, presided, towards the end of the second century. The language spoken at Lyons was Roman; the language spoken in the valleys of Dauphiné was a patois; and it is upon record that Irenæus learned the Romance or Provençal in order that he might preach to these people.[1]

The fact that Irenæus suffered martyrdom under the persecution of Severus, will explain the cause of the Christians fleeing for refuge into these valleys of the snow-clad and almost inaccessible mountains. We may ask whence it was that, with the fertile plains of the Midi before them, with all its advantages of climate and of access, they should have settled in the barren precipices of Dormilhouse, or at the foot of the glaciers of Pelvoux? Why is it that the caves bear the name, to this day, of the worship which was conducted in them when, as in the valley of Fressinieres, the Christians climbed upon all-fours to the Cave de la Sainte Cené to celebrate the Holy Communion, and the "Citadel" rocks bear their testimony to the protection they have afforded to the little flock in the wilderness? Would these poor people have continued to live under such privations if, without sacrifice of conscience, they could have dwelt in peace and safety in the sunny plains of the South? There, then, with Primitive doctrine, they continued until the fourth century, when we find that the Presbyter Vigilantius, grieved at the errors which had already crept into the churches of Italy, protesting, both in his preaching and by his writings, against the worship of saints and martyrs, and the burning of tapers before their shrines, paid a visit to the Christians of the Cottian Alps, and settled amongst them as their teacher, and bore his testimony to their orthodoxy. Faber gives an account of the controversy between Jerome and Vigilantius, which was referred to two of the Presbyters of that district, Riparius and Desiderius—who both declared that the charges brought against Vigilantius were true, but that the Bishops of the district where he sojourned perfectly agreed with the so-called heretic.[2] Another

[1] Iren. lib. i., Adver. Hær. Prefatio.
[2] Faber's "Vallenses," etc., p. 278.

witness, who lived in the seventh century, is mentioned by Pilichdorf (a writer of the thirteenth century, and the same fact is stated by Usher in his "Book de Successione") as preaching the same doctrines as Vigilantius, in the same locality, and who was called Peter the Vaudois. Usher says (p. 237, "De Success."): "The Waldenses say, if we are to believe Peter Pilichdorf, 'that a man named Peter arose in the region of the Waldes three hundred years after Constantine, who taught the life of poverty,' from whom the sect of the Waldenses has arisen." Another link in the evidence is the history of Claud, Bishop of Turin, at the commencement of the ninth century. He says "that, upon his appointment to the Episcopate, he found all the churches at Turin stuffed full of vile and accursed images, and alone began to destroy what all were sottishly worshipping." This, of course, drew down upon him much reproach; and in another work ("Comment. upon Leviticus"), he speaks thus:

In standing up for the confirmation and defence of such truths I am become a reproach to my neighbours, insomuch that they who see us do not only scoff at us, but likewise one to another even point to us. God, however, the Father of mercies and the author of all consolation, has comforted us in all our afflictions, that in like manner we might be able to comfort those who are weighed down with sorrow and affliction.

Now, it is upon record that there was a part of his diocese which thoroughly sympathized with the orthodox Bishop; for we find Dungal writing a book "in honour of God and the Emperor, against the mad and blasphemous dirges of Claud, Bishop of Turin," and describing the state of his diocese thus:

The people in this region are separated from each other, and are divided into two parts concerning the observations of the Church, *i.e.*, concerning the images and holy pictures of the Lord's Passion. Hence, with murmurs and contentions, the Catholics say that that picture is good and useful, and that for instruction it is almost as profitable as Holy Scripture itself. But the heretic on the contrary, and the part seduced by him, say that it is not so, for it is a seduction into error, and is, indeed, no other than idolatry. A similar contention prevails respecting the Cross; and in like manner concerning the commemoration of saints there is a dispute as to the approaching them for the sake of prayer, and as to the venerating their relics.

Thus, from the pen of a bitter opponent, we find that Claud took part with those who held the doctrine of Vigilantius (whom Dungal mentions), and who protested against the growing heresy of cross-worship, image-worship, and relic-worship.

We have abundant evidence to prove that these Protestant

doctrines were not introduced into the valleys by Claud, but had been maintained there from the earliest times. In the year 1630, Marco Aurelio Rorenco, Prior of St. Roch at Turin, was employed to institute a strict inquiry into the doctrines and antiquity of the Waldenses, and the following passages occur in two works which he published. In the first, published in 1632, entitled "A Narrative of the Introduction of Heresies into the Valleys," he says:

> The Waldenses were so ancient as to afford no absolute certainty in regard to the precise time of their organization, but at all events that in the ninth and tenth centuries they were even then not a new sect.

In the second work, published in 1649, entitled "Historical Memorials of the Introduction of Heresies," he says:

> In the ninth century, so far from being a new sect, they were rather to be deemed a race of fomenters and encouragers of opinions which had preceded them. Among these Claud of Turin was to be reckoned, inasmuch as he was a person who rejected the veneration and invocation of saints, and was a principal destroyer of images.

Having thus far traced the line of Primitive truth, we may pass on to the twelfth century, when the "Poor Men of Lyons" began their remarkable mission, and sowed the early seeds of the Reformation; but before entering upon this link of the evidence, it may be as well to insert one or two testimonies to confirm the statements which have been made as to the antiquity of the Vaudois. In 1535, the Vaudois being in possession of all their ancient documents and manuscripts (but which were destroyed in the persecutions of 1559-60), caused a translation of the Bible to be made into French, by Robert Olivetan, this being the first French Bible that was ever printed. It was published at Neufchatel, in 1535. In the preface, the translator dedicates it to

> The poor little Church, together with those thy faithful ones who have truly learned and known God in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord. I mean not that Church which triumphs with pomp and riches; neither do I mean the Church militant which defends itself with force of arms. No, it is to thee alone to whom I present this precious treasure in the name of certain poor people thy friends and brethren in Jesus Christ, *who, ever since they were blessed and enriched therewith by the Apostles and Ambassadors of Christ, have still enjoyed and possessed the same.*

Reinerius, Pilichdorf, and Claud Scypel (Archbishop of Turin), all admit the claim of the Vaudois to have existed from the time of Pope Silvester, A.D. 314, and the Apostles.

About the year 1170, a rich merchant of Lyons, like the young ruler, came to Christ. We are not told by what influence or by what means his eyes were opened; but it is

certain that he sold his property and gave to the poor in the truest sense, for he not only provided for their bodies, but for their souls. He employed persons in different places to translate and copy the Scriptures—for there was no printing-press in those days—and by this means he gathered out a number of converts from the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, which at that time were excessive; and these, by reason of the persecution to which they were exposed, went about everywhere preaching the Gospel. They were called "The Poor Men of Lyons;" but as they agreed in doctrine with the old inhabitants of the valleys on either side of the Cottian Alps, and had frequent communion with them, they were called Valdenses, or Vaudois; and this I believe to be the reason why Peter, the merchant of Lyons, was called Peter Waldo, as his predecessor in the seventh century had been before him. This revival of spiritual life spread in every direction. We may trace its progress by the decrees which were fulminated against it by Popes, Councils, and Roman Bishops. We find them scattered through Dauphiné and Lombardy, in Provence, Languedoc and Aragon, and in Metz, and Flanders, and Bohemia, where Peter Waldo died, in the birthplace of the Moravian Brethren. It was here that the first embers of the Reformation, which broke out in Huss, and Jerome, and Wickliff, and afterwards in Luther and Beza, and in Cranmer and Ridley, in our own country, were kindled. Now, it must be borne in mind that up to the commencement of the thirteenth century there had not been any systematic persecution of the Vaudois; but it was during the Popedom of Innocent III. that the first organized system was employed to exterminate heretics, as they were called. Pope Innocent III.!—a name to be well remembered in England. It was this Pope who compelled King John to surrender his crown to the Pope. It was Innocent III. who excommunicated the barons for signing the Magna Charta, the foundation of our civil and religious privileges; and it was Innocent III. who instituted the Inquisition, and the order of St. Dominic to go forth against the Vaudois, and hale men and women, and cast them into prison, and persecute and torment them even unto death. It was Innocent III. who said, "Unless this error was repressed by the swords of the faithful in a short time, it would corrupt all Europe." And the decree went forth that the Albigenses should be exterminated, and so they were. And the same bloodthirsty decree went forth against the Waldenses; but they were scattered in all directions, and although multitudes were put to death, many survived; and we find in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the frightful extent to which the persecution had gone. Huss and Jerome

were burnt alive in 1415 and 1416 in Bohemia. The bones of Wickliff were burnt in England in 1428. The sufferings of the Vaudois beggar all description. We read of the horrors of the persecutions under Roman Emperors, of the brutality of tortures in China inflicted on criminals; but I will venture to say that there has never been, and I trust never will be again, such refinement of cruelty, such inhuman and cold-blooded atrocity, as that which was perpetrated in the valleys of Piedmont and Dauphiné in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. A short glance at the history of Sir S. Morland's visit to the Vaudois, in the time of Oliver Cromwell, the turning over only of a few pages, is sufficient to convince the reader that this is not a book to leave upon a drawing-room table, nor one which can be read without a shudder. Then, in Italy, we have the martyrdom of Savonarola, a Dominican monk of unimpeachable morals and of great learning, who was put to the torture and with two of his friends burnt alive. It is enough to allude to the Dragonades in the Cevennes, to the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in 1572, when 70,000 perished by the sword, and when the Pope held a festival of rejoicing in Rome, and caused a medal to be struck recording the fact that the heresy was extinguished. It is enough to mention the sufferings of Huguenots until the Edict of Nantes, when, for a brief space, the churches had peace, although this edict was not granted until above a million of people had been slain in war, nine cities had been destroyed, 400 villages, 2,100 churches, and 10,000 homes desolated. The edict of toleration lasted from 1598 to 1685, when the edict was revoked by Louis XIV. Then the Protestants had to flee for their lives; above half a million, as has been said, left France, the greater proportion of whom came to England, where they found an asylum and sympathy from those who preferred the infallibility of the Bible to the infallibility of the Pope of Rome.

But, it may be asked, what evidence have we of the soundness of their faith? While we can prove their local and lineal descent from Apostolic days, we must also give evidence that they kept the faith once delivered to the saints. This I will proceed to do.

It has already been mentioned that the documents and records of the Vaudois were destroyed in 1559, but that some were discovered by Sir S. Morland and others and brought to England, where they are preserved in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Trinity College, Dublin, of which I will refer to three: I. Their "Confession of Faith," bearing date 1120; II. The "Noble Lesson," which is about the same period; III. The "Treatise upon Antichrist," which is about

1130, at the time when Peter de Bruys was burned at St. Giles, in Languedoc.[1]

I. In the "Confession of Faith," bearing date 1120, in which they declare their agreement with the Apostles' Creed, Article VII. has these words:

> Christ is our life, truth, peace, and righteousness, as also our Pastor, Advocate, Sacrifice, and Priest, who died for the salvation of all those that believe, and is risen for our justification.

In Article VIII. they say:

> We hold firmly that there is no other Mediator and Advocate with God the Father save only Jesus Christ; and as for the Virgin Mary, that she was holy, humble, and full of grace, etc.

In Article XIII.:

> They "acknowledge no other sacraments but Baptism and the Lord's Supper."

II. The Vaudois poem, called the "Noble Lesson," was written in the Provençal language. As the antiquity of this document has been questioned, three arguments may be given to prove that it could not have been in the fifteenth century, as the Roman Catholics assert:

(1) If it had been composed in the fifteenth century there must have been some reference to the unparalleled persecutions through which the Vaudois had passed, but there is nothing of the sort; the inference, therefore, is that it was written in early days, when separation from the growing apostasy of the Church became inevitable, and before the organized persecutions commenced.

(2) The language in which it is written has been pronounced to be the ancient language of Provence. Mons. Raynouard, whose competency to form an opinion is confirmed by Mr. Hallam in his "Literature of the Middle Ages," says that the dialect of the Vaudois was formed from the Latin at a period of most remote antiquity, and that the persons who spoke that dialect must have inhabited the valleys before the breaking up of the Roman Empire.

(3) In the MS. in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, the line is written "in mille et cent," etc.; but there has been a scratch made in the parchment, underneath which, it has

---

[1] Dr. Gilly says of some of these documents ("Mem. of Vigilantius," p. 487), "on examining a fasciculus of the MSS. formerly belonging to Archbishop Usher, and now in possession of Trinity College, Dublin, I have discovered internal evidences of antiquity which cannot be disputed . . . others contain proofs that they are copies of the treatises which Reiner and Stephen de Borbone had seen about 1250, Moneta about 1240, and Walter Japes and Lucas Tudenses at an earlier date."

been stated, the Arabic figure 4 has been inserted. But be this as it may, the metre would not admit of the change, even if the parchment did; you could not make the line to scan by inserting "mille et quatre cent," etc.[1]

We have not space for more than one or two extracts. It commences:

O Brethren, give ear to a noble Lesson!
We ought always to watch and pray,
For we see the world near to a conclusion.
We ought to strive to do good works,
Seeing that the end of the world approacheth;
There are already a thousand and one hundred years fully accomplished
Since it was written thus, "for we are in the last time."

Speaking of the unfaithful clergy:

> By this we know they are not good pastors,
> For they love not the sheep but only for their fleeces;

concerning the confessional,—he commandeth his children to examine their faults, and buyeth of the priest his absolution:

> The Priest acquits him for a hundred pence,
> And sometimes for less when he can get no more,
> Telling him he is very well absolved.
> But alas! they are but sadly confessed
> Who are thus faulty, and will certainly
> Be deceived by such an absolution.

III. The "Treatise on Antichrist" was written about the time when Peter de Bruys was burned at St. Giles, in Languedoc. I give one extract:

It is falsehood itself in opposition to the truth, covering and adorning itself with a pretence of Beauty and Piety not suitable to the Church of Christ. Iniquity thus qualified with all the ministers thereof, great and small, together with all them that follow them with an evil heart and blindfold: such a congregation comprised together is that which is called Antichrist, etc.

Such were the doctrines taught before the Reformation, and such they have been ever since. The writings of St. Leger, Muston, J. Bresse, Peyron, Sir S. Morland, Henri Arnaud, Dr. Gilly, and Faber, the life and labours of Felix Neff, all prove what Milner has said in his "Church History" that—

The Waldenses are the middle link which connects the primitive Christians and Fathers with the reformed, and by their means the proof is completely established that salvation by the grace of Christ, felt in the

---

[1] Hallam says (p. 38): M. Raynouard, an indisputably competent judge, observes, "Les personnes qui l'examineront avec attention jugeront que le manuscrit n'a pas été interpolé."

heart and expressed in the life by the power of the Holy Ghost, has ever existed from the time of the Apostles to this day, and that it is a doctrine marked by the cross, and distinct from all that religion of mere form and convenience or of human invention, which calls itself Christian, but which wants the Spirit of Christ.

It would be impossible to give a sketch of the persecutions of the Vaudois in the Hautes Alpes; to visit the district, as Mr. Smiles and Bracebridge and Reveillaud and others have done, is enough to excite the deepest sympathy for the little remnant which has survived the accumulation of misery which has been heaped upon them, and which has remained faithful to the truth as it is in Jesus. The change of seasons and the severity of winter has at length desolated their homes, and they are now emigrating to Oran through the kind and liberal love of Christians in England, France, America, and Switzerland, where they are already unfolding the banner of the Cross and witnessing a good confession for Christ.[1]

In bringing this paper to a close it may be well to add a word of encouragement to those who are engaged in the same battle for Primitive truth in the present day. In tracing such a history do we not realize the vitality of the religion of Jesus Christ? By vitality I mean its self-existent power. For it had its origin and organization in the Divine presence of Christ. It was not dependent upon human patronage, but upon the truth of God. And this has been its testimony in all ages; Jesus, its Divine Author, was despised and rejected of men, and had not where to lay His head; His disciples were fishermen, and were persecuted because they were ignorant and unlettered men; and although in after-times the Church grew in wealth and pomp and power, yet this was not the time of its greatest spiritual prosperity. On the contrary, errors and heresies sprang up; and if we are to search for the conservators of the truth we shall find them among the little flock and the little despised ones who, like the Waldenses, were driven into the holes and caves of the rocks by the hand of violence and persecution. And there, deprived of all external help, without a church or a minister, without protection for their worship, they had only their Bible for their refuge; and yet they kept the faith, and in due time God brought them out of their hiding-places, and made the light to shine out of darkness. And thus, instead of enabling them, as He might, to retaliate upon their enemies, and by force of arms revenge the blood that had been shed, we find them in every case returning good for evil, and using the Sword of the Spirit and the Gospel of Peace to save souls and promote the everlasting

[1] See an article in *Good Words* for January, 1883.

happiness of all those among whom they dwell; and this is what is now taking place in Italy and France.

A second important inference may be drawn from these facts—namely, the continuity of the religion of Jesus. Whatever changes in its external organization the visible Church may undergo, yet there will always be the same unchanged inward chain of truth. Thus we have proved that the Protestant Reformation was not a schism or separation from the true Catholic Church, but a reproduction of the Primitive Church; and if we are asked, "Where was your Church before Luther?" we can reply by asking, "Where was the Parliament of England before the Reform Bill?" Our Liberal friends would say it was corrupted by rotten boroughs, by bribery, and placemen, and that reform became a necessity. And this is just what we say of the Church of Rome; it had become intolerable through its abuses and disputations, and a complete reform became necessary. And just as in the time of Irenæus, of Claud, of Peter Valdes, in the second, seventh ninth, and twelfth centuries, the Word of God was the rule of faith, so it was in the time of Luther. And in speaking of continuity we must not omit the enormous influence which the Press has exercised in the circulation of the Scriptures. The principle of fixing and stereotyping the Word of God was shown at Mount Sinai when, God with His own finger wrote the commandments upon two tables of stone, and forbade a single word to be altered, to be added, or diminished. Throughout His whole ministry Jesus referred to the Scriptures for the confirmation of His doctrine. "It is written," "It is written," was His constant argument; and thus by the invention of printing the Bible was put into the hands of thousands in the early dawn of the Reformation, and has now reached a circulation in about two hundred languages, exceeding even those in which the Gospel was preached on the Day of Pentecost. Luther flung his inkstand at the devil when he was passing through one of his strong temptations, and the blotch remained upon the wall at Eisnach for many years. Let us use the printer's ink in the same good cause, in presenting the Word of God and the truth as it is in Jesus in every possible way, and thus counteract and overflow the tide of sceptical and immoral and infidel publications which has been setting in upon us.

W. R. Fremantle.

Art. II.—THE CHURCH AND PARLIAMENT.

"IN the belief that the attention of the Legislature will now be likely to be directed to matters of domestic concern, to a greater extent than has been the case during the last two Sessions," the executive committee of the Liberation Society declare to their supporters that they are preparing to act "with increased vigour." Individuals wishing to obtain special information on any branch of the Disestablishment Question are requested to communicate with the Society. The Lecture List published by the executive committee for 1882-3, available for "Liberal associations, working men's clubs," etc., etc., is a long one. Mr. Carvel Williams contributes "The Struggle for Religious Equality; or, Reminiscences of a Liberationist;" Mr. Fisher, "The Present Position of the Burials Question: what has been Done, what has to be Done;" Mr. Briggs, "The National Church a Hindrance to National Religion and Progress;" Mr. Higgins, "The Advantages," and Mr. Rowlands, "The Reasons," "for Disestablishment and Disendowment." These are mere samples taken at random from the headings of the Lecture List.

We have no complaint to make against the methods of the Liberationists; on the contrary, though we believe their aims mistaken, their methods are constitutional. They wish to educate the minds of the electors. There is nothing religious in their programme: it is purely political. They are trying to effect a change in the law by convincing the electorate that a change will be beneficial.

Now let us recall the words of an eminent Bishop of the Church of England, whose tracts are read by the million, spoken at the Church Congress at Derby. "We cannot do without the masses," said Bishop Ryle. "The Church whose adherents are in a minority in the land will not be long allowed to retain her endowments and her connection with the State in this age." No advice can be sounder. But how many Churchmen act on it?

We are sometimes told that the House of Commons is an assembly of which four-sixths are Churchmen; and that we ought not to doubt its good intentions. We believe the late Dean Stanley used to think so, until one day the House of Commons, at the instance of a Mr. Briggs, passed a vote of censure upon him for exercising his undoubted privilege in respect to the erection of a monument in the venerable Abbey. But let us test this point a little further. Is it a ground for confidence that four-sixths of the members of the House of Commons and nine-tenths of the members of the House of Lords are Churchmen?

And is their Churchmanship any guarantee of the loyalty of Parliament to the Church of England? Why everyone knows that most Dissenting constituencies are represented by Churchmen. A Churchman who adopts the shibboleths of political Nonconformity is a far more eligible candidate for such a constituency than a Nonconformist; and for the very intelligible reason that a Nonconformist must belong to a sect, and all the other sects are a little jealous of being represented by a Dissenter who dissents from themselves. They prefer an outsider. So we find Flintshire represented by Lord Richard Grosvenor, Denbighshire by the Right. Hon. Osborne Morgan, Denbigh Boroughs by Sir Robert Cunliffe, Montgomeryshire by Mr. Rendel, Montgomery Boroughs by the Hon. F. Hanbury-Tracy, all of them members of the Church of England.

The House of Commons is the creature of the constituencies; the members merge their own personality in the personality of their constituents. Even the Prime Minister's personal attachment to the Church has not prevented him from dealing her many political blows when political occasions made it necessary to rally the Liberal party.[1] We should like to know which Parliament of late years has deserved the absolute confidence of Churchmen. Do we owe to this present Parliament, upon which the Liberationists are bringing their utmost influence to bear, so firm an allegiance that we ought not even to express our united opinion on Church legislation, lest our action should imply suspicion of its omniscience and good intentions?

Every alteration in the temporal or quasi-temporal affairs of the Church requires an Act of Parliament. There are many ecclesiastical matters which lie on the border line between the Doctrinal and the Civil—questions such as those touching Ecclesiastical Courts, rubrics, ceremonial. Parliament has shown some inclination to deal with these. Again, all the questions relating to such matters as burials, marriages, fees, tithes, cathedrals, Church property, patronage, fall under the cognizance of Parliament. How are these questions to be settled to the satisfaction of Churchmen, if Churchmen provide no means by which their wishes can be authoritatively stated, and efficiently supported in the division

[1] In a letter written immediately after his defeat for the University of Oxford in 1865, and significantly published now by his leave in the "Life of Bishop Wilberforce," he speaks of his "revenge in the future," and declares himself "a person wholly extraneous on one great class of questions" (*i.e.* Church questions), though still a "unit in Legislative and Cabinet matters." His third and last great "political transmigration" is now being accomplished. Only the other day the Attorney-General, Sir Henry James, foreshadowed a means of eliminating Churchmanship from the representation of the Universities by disfranchising the non-resident Masters of Arts.

lobby? Shall Churchmen in the House of Commons leave such questions alone altogether? Some of them urgently require alteration. Changed conditions require change. Are we to wait until an anachronism or an inconvenience has become a scandal before we apply a remedy? or shall we leave all remedial legislation in the hands of the anti-Church party? Under present conditions no change, as we have said, can be effected without an appeal to the House of Commons. Yet there is no man in the House of Commons or in the country who can assert, without fear of contradiction, what is the mind of the Church on any given question. A general agreement does in fact exist quite sufficient for practical purposes; and the Church is guilty of blamable negligence in failing to give adequate expression to this unanimity; we blame Churchmen for not calling forth the substantial numerical support which they have in the constituencies. Why are the Nonconformist Members of Parliament and their allies always in their places when a Church question is before the House? Simply because their seats depend upon their votes. Why are the friends of the Church absent? Because they know that their constituents have not yet been roused to take any deep interest in the subject. So it comes about that the Church allows itself to be practically represented in the House of Commons by some half-dozen individuals, who are regarded by the general opinion of the House as "clericals" or "fanatics" not worth listening to, because they have no outside backing, and deserving only of a contemptuous shrug of the shoulder from the occupants of both front benches. It is an old saying that eloquence is in the audience, not in the speaker: of Parliamentary eloquence this is entirely true. Popular support is more regarded than logic or reason or principle, and numbers in a division are the practical test of Parliamentary wisdom. Commercial men know this, and maintain their Chambers of Commerce; farmers know it, and maintain their Chambers of Agriculture; Sir Wilfrid Lawson knows it, so does Mr. Parnell. But the Church of England feels such confidence in the House of Lords and the House of Commons that she will not use the means which others use. She has, forsooth, the Conservative party, and the Bench of Bishops and Convocation on her side, so she may fold her arms and close her eyes in the assurance that no harm can come! There can be no greater political danger for the Church of England than that she should be, or that she should even be supposed to be, the monopoly of one party or of one class of the community. If such were the fact she would be untrue to herself: the suspicion of such a fact is a hindrance to her influence. "How fortunate," said the Bishop of Meath the other day, "that the recent crusade

against the landed interests in Ireland did not find the Church as closely associated with them as she was before the Disestablishment!" Each political party is always carrying on war against the other; and neither is very scrupulous about the means it uses. It is ruinous in the long-run for the Church to be identified with either. But if one party is more likely to bring her into misfortune than the other, it is the Conservative party, as hitherto constituted. The Church is democratic—"Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" are moral principles preached from her pulpits. We believe the interests of the Church as an establishment are safer in the tempests of the Lower House than in the great calm of the Upper. Of late years we know by experience that her successes have been more conspicuous amidst the manifold antagonistic influences of the great towns, than in the apparently unruffled quietness of country parishes. Happily the Church has not yet allied herself irrevocably to either political party: she must for the future disengage herself absolutely from both. Her immediate political advantage might seem to be to strengthen herself upon the Liberal benches. But such a policy, if conducted with a selfish object, would be ruinous. Her true wisdom is to ignore both parties, and to refuse to allow herself to be made the tool of either. To accomplish this she must not shrink from asserting herself in the constituencies. She must not be nervously afraid of pressing her demands upon candidates on the day of election.

How is this to be done? By the drudgery called organization. The clergy must lead—as the Nonconformist ministers lead their people, as the Roman Catholic priests lead their people, as Mr. Bradlaugh leads his followers; or rather, we should say, better than they. For an influence may be not less real, and a leadership not less effectual, because the leader is directing the plan of battle instead of himself storming the outpost. It is probable that a compact body of two hundred Churchmen, voting together irrespective of party, in their several constituencies, could decide at least one hundred elections, and could influence a great many more. Many Liberal members give a "Church" vote now at the risk of their seats. To such men such a contingent in their constituencies would be a security which they have not at present. In many decidedly Liberal constituencies a Liberal Churchman might be brought forward against a Liberal hostile to the Church without in any way appealing to the constituency to change the political colour of its representation.

In this latter way Churchmen might successfully assert their legitimate influence. The very fear of an avoidable contest would have a sensible effect upon the Churchmanship of politicians. It is reported that several elections were

decided in 1880 by Churchmen. The Liverpool election is supposed to have been materially affected by the annoyance created in the minds of Churchmen by certain utterances of the Conservative candidate. We have no fault to find; on the contrary we would wish to encourage a spirit which will assert itself at the polling-booths. But let it be exercised according to reason. If as electors we withdraw our support from one candidate, let us take security from the other on the matter we have at heart. Otherwise we perform the silly but time-honoured operation of cutting off our noses in order to spite our faces. In the cases which have come under our own notice this precaution was not taken.

As long as there is solidarity in the political organization of the Church, its form is of secondary importance. For ourselves, we believe that the old ecclesiastical areas of the diocese, the archdeaconry, the rural deanery, are well suited to our purpose. But the weakness of ecclesiastical organisations is that they have not yet begun to influence the conduct of members of Parliament. The Diocesan Conference includes all Churchmen. The appointment of a diocesan committee, whose special duty it shall be to watch Church legislation, seems a natural part of the regular business of every Conference. Yet very few Conferences have such committees. The duty of such committees would be to acquaint themselves with the attitude of every member of Parliament in the diocese towards the Church; to approach him when occasion requires, as every member is liable to be approached by any one of his constituents. To represent to him the wishes of Churchmen, and to explain to him the reasons for opposition or support to such and such measures of Church legislation; to publish his answer to inquiries; to support him, or, if necessary, to oppose him. If it be impossible to influence him, then to endeavour to influence a portion of his constituency. United action in a number of constituencies would give a national impulse and strength to Churchmanship, which could not be despised by any candidate, party, or Ministry. Every English member of the House of Commons would be thus brought face to face with Church questions from a very practical point of view, namely that of his constituency, and through the mouths of those whom he is bound to listen to, because he represents them.

The exaggeration of our differences forms an easy excuse at present to our lukewarm friends to desert us, and for our opponents to attack us. Each diocese, nay, almost every incumbent, acts, or rather seems to act, independently. We value the independence of the incumbent in the system of the Church of England, but it may be carried to a point which

destroys corporate work. Beaten by an overwhelming majority in his Diocesan Conference, or clerical meeting, or in Convocation, a clergyman, like the British soldier, ignores the fact, and writes a brilliant letter which appears in large type in some well-known newspaper, reasserting the arguments which have been overruled. His signature itself will often carry authority to the half-instructed; the unanswered letter may appear to some conclusive; if answered, the spectacle is presented of divided opinions, without the possibility of a decision, and the lay mind, especially the Parliamentary lay mind, is perplexed.

We have endeavoured to show that the first and most pressing need of Churchmen is to prevent Church legislation from being governed by party politics. A great step would be gained towards this end if we could obtain a working Church majority, as undoubtedly we have a theoretical Church majority, composed of members of both sides in the House of Commons. We ought not, however, to rest contented should we succeed thus far. Our ultimate object ought to be to relieve Parliament from whatever Church business may be better done elsewhere. It is unfitting that Roman Catholics, Jews, Presbyterians, Nonconformists, and supporters of Mr. Bradlaugh, should decide questions touching the rubrics, ceremonials, or courts of a Church to which they are opposed. Therefore we ought ever to look forward to some method by which we can utilize Convocation as a constitutional body for preparing schemes of legislation, as was suggested in the Bishop of London's "Draft Bill;" or else we ought to devise some other means of remodelling the relations of the Church and Parliament. Such should be the line of our policy in the future. But at the present moment our first and most urgent duty is to assert our position in the House of Commons. If we fail there, we must expect hard measure.[1]

We do not wish to exaggerate the political side of Church questions. We know very well that Establishment and Endowment are the accidents and not the essentials of a living Church. We esteem all the questions raised in this article as of secondary importance from a religious point of view, as matters of expediency touching the temporal circumstances of the members of the Church of England, both clergy and laity. But such are precisely the subjects with which politicians deal. There is more than one course open. We may fold our arms and accept with resignation whatever a

[1] Two new Burial Bills, a Tithe Bill, a Church Boards Bill, an Affirmation Bill, a Marriage Bill are only some of the measures introduced this Session into the House of Commons in antagonism to the principles of the Church of England.

Parliament, three-fourths of which are professing Churchmen, may provide; or we may engage in a long and arduous struggle, not over-confident in the issue, but determined to fight, as men fight who are in earnest. The third course we will not willingly adopt, and yet at the moment it seems the one most generally acceptable to our leaders. For our part, we shrink from the shame of drifting into Disestablishment and Disendowment, speaking much and doing little.

STANLEY LEIGHTON.

ART. III.—OUR LORD'S PRESENT WORK AS THE HIGH PRIEST OF HIS CHURCH.

A VIEW of the Holy Communion is not unfrequently maintained in the present day, which the following quotation fairly represents:

> Thus what the Christian priest does at the altar is, as it were, the earthly form and visible expression of our Lord's continual action as our High Priest in heaven. As the most holy Body and Blood of Christ, the alone acceptable Victim to make our peace with God, are offered, that is, continually presented and pleaded, by Jesus Himself in heaven, naturally, as we may say, and openly, so the same most holy Body and Blood are continually presented and pleaded before God by Christ's representatives, acting "in His name," and "by His commission and authority" (Article xxvi.) on earth.[1]

The view thus stated rests on two assumptions, both of which must be substantiated before it can be accepted. It must be proved, first, that Christ is really doing as our High Priest in heaven what is here alleged, that He is offering, continually presenting and pleading, His most holy Body and Blood; and secondly, that He has delegated to His ministers on earth the power here claimed for them, to present and plead continually before God the same most holy Body and Blood, as His representatives.

Both these pillars must stand firm, or the arch which is constructed upon them will fall. Even if the first were clearly established, it would by no means follow that the second could be made good.

It is, however, with the first of these statements that we now intend to deal. We propose to inquire whether it accurately describes the present work of our Lord, as High Priest of His Church, so far as it is revealed to us in the Word of

[1] *The Church and the World*: "On the Eucharistic Sacrifice," p. 339. Edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley.

God. What, let us ask, do we learn, either in express terms, or by fair inference, from Holy Scripture as to the Priestly action of Christ, now in heaven? Do we find support there for the view to which we have referred? And if not, what becomes of the theory of priestly action on earth, which is based upon it?

In this first paper our object will be to show that Christ's present work is properly *sacerdotal;* that as the High Priest of His Church He is now in heaven.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews states that to intercede for His Church is the aim and purpose of our Lord's life, now in heaven. "He ever liveth," he says, "to make intercession for them."[1] But intercession is not necessarily a priestly act. The word employed to describe it is not restricted either by derivation or by Biblical usage to priestly intervention.[2] There are, however, other considerations which undoubtedly give a priestly complexion and character to the intercession of our Lord, as it is now exercised on our behalf in heaven.

And first there is the fact, which in approaching a subject like this it is impossible to ignore, of the prevalent if not universal belief in the necessity of a sacrifice, and therefore of a priest, to secure the favour of God for man in his present condition. There is a barrier that must be broken down, a chasm that must be bridged over, an estrangement that must

---

[1] Heb. vii. 25.

[2] As regards derivation, the proper meaning of the word is "to light or chance upon," to "meet with." Then, through the idea of conversing or having intercourse with, it passes up to its secondary sense of interceding or pleading for another with the person met with. In New Testament usage it represents not only the pleading of Christ for us at the right hand of God (Rom. viii. 34), but also the pleading of the Holy Spirit for us in our hearts ("likewise the Spirit also maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered," Rom. viii. 26, *ὑπερεντυγχάνει*); as well as the pleading of men with God for (1 Tim. ii. 1) or even against (Rom. xi. 2; comp. Acts xxv. 24) one another, and the impetration of the blessing of Almighty God on the good creatures of His hand, when we are about to partake of them (1 Tim. iv. 5).

In the Old Testament these Greek words are not employed by the LXX. in any passage of canonical Scripture. They occur in some few places in the Apocrypha, of prayer of man for himself to God (Wisdom viii. 21), and of man to man against his fellow-man (1 Macc. viii. 32, x. 61). The words "intercede," "intercession," as they are found in the Old Testament in our English Bibles, are always, I believe, the translation of a Hebrew word which also means properly to light upon, or meet with. Their reference, like that of the Greek word in the New Testament, is quite general. Of our great Advocate with the Father we read, "He made intercession for the transgressors" (Isa. liii. 12). Of Elnathan and Delaiah and Gemariah we are told that they "made intercession to the king, that he would not burn the roll" (Jer. xxxvi. 25).

be removed, a wrong that must be atoned for, before the two parties, whom sin has severed, can be brought together again. And only by the shedding of blood, only by the surrender of life, only by the intervention of a priest, can reconciliation be effected. The Intercessor who would not plead in vain, the Daysman who would lay his hand upon both must not come between them empty. With altar and with sacrifice, himself the ministering priest, he must stand in the middle space of separation and turn it into the meeting-ground of peace. It is this truth which is recognised more or less clearly by the rite of sacrifice and the institution of priesthood in almost all known religions of the world, and to which the universal conscience bears witness, not only by the religions which it frames, but by the ready response which it renders. It is this truth to which Holy Scripture bears consistent testimony in every part. Whether we regard it as the Word of God or not, whether we see in this fact an argument for receiving or a reason for rejecting it, it is impossible to deny that the fact is so.

In nothing is the unity of the Bible more conspicuous than in the perfect accord with which its many writers, ranging over 1,500 years, agree in representing all access of sinful man to God, all favour of God to fallen man, as conditioned absolutely by propitiatory sacrifice and a sacrificing priest. In the more excellent sacrifice of Abel, offered, it may be, in that first temple of the human race before the gate then closed, but not closed for ever, of the Paradise of God, in presence of the flaming sword of justice and the living cherubim of mercy, those august symbols in which it lay hid as in a parable, that by "mercy and truth meeting together, righteousness and peace kissing each other," the way of the Tree of Life, even then kept for man by the one, as it was kept from him by the other, should be restored to man again; in the burnt offering of Noah, of which the sweet savour went up to heaven, and by which, in a figure, he consecrated anew to God the human race born again by the waters of the Flood; in the altars reared on every memorable spot and on every great occasion in the lives of the Patriarchs, as they sojourned in the Land of Promise as in a strange country; in the solemn rite of the shedding and sprinkling of blood, by which the first covenant was inaugurated in the wilderness; in the costly and elaborate sacrificial system and sacerdotal institution, which was the corner-stone of the whole Jewish economy; above all, in the sacrifice of the Cross, by which the new and better covenant was introduced and ratified, and which, reaching forward in its all-prevailing efficacy to the end of time, reached backward also, gathering up into

itself and for ever satisfying every genuine type, every true idea of propitiatory sacrifice and atoning priest, whether of untutored heathen or divinely educated Jew; in each and all of these does the truth stand forth conspicuous, that except on the basis of sacrificial action and priestly intervention, no prevailing intercession can be made with God for man.

But when these premises are established, it does not follow as a necessary consequence that the intercession of Christ as now exercised in heaven is sacerdotal in its character. It is quite conceivable that the priestly functions which human conscience and Holy Scripture alike assign to Him might have been adequately discharged by His offering Himself here on earth at once Priest and Victim without spot to God, and then entering into heaven once for all with His own blood, having obtained eternal redemption for us. In these acts, done once and done for ever, His Priesthood might have been fulfilled and have determined. But in correction of this, which might have been, the teaching of Holy Scripture is explicit and consistent in representing His Priesthood as eternal and unchangeable. He is a Priest still; He is a Priest for ever. In some sense (in what sense we are to inquire hereafter, for it is the fact, not the nature, of His abiding Priesthood with which we are now concerned) He is exercising priestly functions on behalf of His Church now. It is in some sense sacerdotal intercession which He is now carrying on for us in heaven.

In the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament the perpetuity of His Priesthood is clearly revealed. The 110th Psalm, though it employs human imagery, is a direct and exclusive prophecy of Christ. It admits of no primary human reference, and for that reason, perhaps, is quoted more frequently, and built upon more extensively, by our Lord and His Apostles than any passage of equal length in the Old Testament. The subject of the Psalm is the session of Christ at the right hand of the Majesty on high, and His victorious course, "conquering and to conquer," till all enemies are put under His feet. It commences with "the saying," the divine sentence or oracular utterance, "of Jehovah to [or, with reference to] my Lord," which stamps it with a directly prophetical character:

> Sit Thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.

But no sooner is He seated there, than His warfare commences and His victories begin:

> "The sceptre of Thy might," O King Messiah, "shall Jehovah stretch forth from Zion" ("beginning from Jerusalem" was the law of develop-

ment of the Gospel kingdom): "rule Thou in the midst of Thine enemies."

Yet not in person does He as yet make war.

"Thy people shall be willing;" not for gold or by constraint, but with the ready service of loyal love shall they willingly offer themselves,[1] and flock to Thy banner "in the day of Thy battle."

"In the beauties of holiness."—In holy attire, shall they come, as in Apocalyptic vision the armies of heaven are seen following their King, "clothed in fine linen, white and clean." Numberless, too, shall they be as the dewdrops, the children of the morning, the multitudinous offspring of her teeming womb.

"From the womb of the morning, thou hast the dew of thy youth" (young men).

Yet not for ever shall the session of the King at the right hand of God continue. Not always shall He fight by His servants only. The day of His grace shall at length be ended. The day of His wrath at last shall come. Then shall He rise from His throne and go forth in person to complete the subjugation of His foes:

"The Lord," the King Messiah, "at Thy right hand," O Jehovah (verse 1), "shall strike through kings in the day of His wrath," etc. (verse 6).

Nor shall He pause in His triumphant course till His victory is complete. "Of the brook in the way," snatching a hasty draught of the refreshing stream that springs beside His onward path—like Gideon's brave 300 who lapped, putting their hands to their mouths, and bowed not down on their knees to drink—of the brook in the way "He shall drink;" "therefore," refreshed and invigorated for His yet unfinished work, "He shall lift up His head."

But in the midst of this description of the Victor and His armies, there is interposed abruptly a sentence which represents Him to us in another and far different character:

The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

King upon Thy throne, Warrior in the heat of battle and of conquest, yet still a Priest Thou art. Neither crown nor helmet can displace the mitre from Thy brow. "For ever," and not least, assuredly, in this time between Thy session in glory and Thy return to judgment, to which the prophecy belongs, Thou art a Priest.[2]

---

[1] Compare Judges v. 2.

[2] It is worthy of notice that this is the only mention of Melchizedek between the time of Abraham and the writing of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and that on this one verse of the Psalm the argument of that Epistle largely rests.

Another passage of the Old Testament proclaims, by mingled type and prophecy, the same truth of the abiding nature of the Priesthood of our Lord. The rebuilding of the Temple promptly commenced by the liberated Jews on their return from Babylon, but soon interrupted and long abandoned through the obstacles raised by their enemies and by their own supineness and irreligion, had been actively resumed under the auspices of Zerubbabel the Jewish Governor and Joshua the high priest, instigated and encouraged by the prophetic utterances of Haggai and Zechariah. At this juncture there came to Jerusalem a deputation from the Jews who still remained in Babylon, bringing gifts and offerings for the completion and adorning of the house of God. From these persons Zechariah is directed by God to take some of the silver and gold which they had brought, and forming, as it should seem, a fillet of each metal, to intertwine them into a wreath or crown, and place it upon the head of Joshua the high priest. The act was in itself significant. It seemed to say that the high priest, shorn as he now was of much of the pristine glory of his office, should hereafter enjoy a dignity and receive an honour which had never attached to the priesthood in its earlier and more palmy days. Royal, as well as sacerdotal, should his office become. King, as well as priest, should he one day be. Not yet, indeed, should that combination be effected. Not on Joshua in his own person, but only in type and in prophecy should that distinction be conferred. The crown placed by Divine command upon his head, was by Divine command removed from it again. The prophet was instructed to hang it up in the Temple of the Lord as a memorial of His gracious acceptance of the votive offerings which had been brought, an earnest of the time when they that were far off, not Jews alone, but Gentiles also, should come and build in the Temple of the Lord; but also as a silent prophecy, hanging there, as it were, till He came to claim it, of One Whose of right it was, Who alone was worthy to wear the double crown, because He alone was indeed both Priest and King. To the significant act was added, as though to place its meaning beyond all doubt, the commentary of a Divine prediction:

Thus speaketh the Lord of Hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The Branch; and He shall grow up out of His place, and He shall build the temple of the Lord; and He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon His throne; and He shall be a Priest upon His throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.[1]

[1] Zechariah vi. 12, 13.

"A Priest upon His throne." When, therefore, He had by Himself purged our sins, it was as Priest as well as King that He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High. It is as Priest as well as King that He sits there now. "Between them both," between the Priest and the King, the counsel of peace shall be. The counsel which the Priest and King, each in the unrestricted exercise of his office, shall mature and execute between them for the good of the Church and nation shall be a counsel of peace, of perfect accord and harmony, neither office infringing upon the other, each office helping and supplementing the other, because the two offices are combined in one and the same Person. Or, if by the counsel of peace we are rather to understand the counsel which has peace for its object and its end, the great plan of salvation by which peace with God and peace on earth are secured, still none the less does the prophecy insist upon the co-ordinate and simultaneous exercise of both offices in the one Person of Jesus Christ our Lord, in order that that counsel may be carried through to its accomplishment. A Priest upon His throne none the less He is. The later prophecy, like the earlier, goes back to the more august and ancient order, the royal priesthood of Melchizedek. King of righteousness, King of peace, but also priest of the Most High God, the subject of both prophecies shall be.

On passing to the New Testament we are met by the fact, which has been observed as noteworthy, that in only one of its books, the Epistle to the Hebrews, is our Lord called a Priest, and that to that one Epistle the sacerdotal aspect of his death and work is almost exclusively confined. References and allusions which connect Him with the sacrificial system of the earlier dispensation, and claim for it fulfilment in Him, are indeed scattered throughout the writings of the New Testament. In Him the Baptist sees the Lamb of God, prefigured through long ages in spotless innocence and in atoning death by the Paschal celebration and the daily sacrifice, doing in reality what they could only do in promise and in shadow, taking away the sin of the world.[1] Of Him St. Paul speaks as "Christ our Passover sacrificed for us."[2] By His "precious blood" St. Peter says we are redeemed "as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."[3] Him St. John sees in Apocalyptic vision as "a Lamb as it had been slain."[4] He it is who is set forth by God as "a propitiation,"[5] or, as some would render it, "the true Mercy Seat," the antitype of that mystic plate of gold which, resting on the ark of the Covenant and the tables

[1] John i. 29, 36. [2] 1 Cor. v. 7. [3] 1 Peter i. 18, 19 [4] Rev. v. 6.
[5] Romans iii. 25; comp. Heb. ix. 5.

of the law, the symbols of the awful justice of a Holy God, was at the same time the seat or throne of Jehovah, the God of Israel and of grace, who dwelt between the cherubim; on which in the highest act of propitiation the atoning blood was sprinkled, thus satisfying the requirements of the offended law and making way for the manifestation of unclouded grace: thus showing how God could be "just," and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

But though such references and allusions plainly set forth our Lord as a sacrifice, they do not, for the most part, go the length of even indirectly describing Him as a Priest. Once, indeed, St. Paul declares that He "gave Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour;"[1] where, though the name of priest is not bestowed upon Him, the priestly function is clearly ascribed to Him. Once again St. Peter would seem to indicate that He is to be regarded as both priest and victim when using the sacrificial word "bare," and introducing the emphatic pronoun "Himself," he writes: "Who bare Himself our sins in His own body on the tree;"[2] like, and yet unlike, the Jewish high priest, who bore indeed, as is expressly stated, the sins of the people, yet not himself in his own body, but in the body of the animal which he offered on their behalf.

But besides these passages there do not appear to be any in the New Testament, except in the Epistle to the Hebrews, from which the priesthood of our Lord could be satisfactorily deduced. In that Epistle, however, in accordance with the method of Divine revelation in some other instances, the immediate requirements of one section of the Church in the Apostolic age have been made the occasion, in the manifold wisdom of God, of bringing out into bold relief a hitherto obscure aspect of the truth, for the benefit and instruction of the whole Church in all subsequent ages of her history. The imminent peril to which the Hebrew Christians of Jerusalem were exposed by the shock which awaited them, in the approaching overthrow of their Temple and worship, called forth from a writer who shall stand forth conspicuous in that day when no good thing shall remain of uncertain authorship, but each shall receive his own reward according to his own work, a treatise in which the Priesthood of Christ is shown to be the great ideal after which the sacerdotal types and prophecies of the Old Testament were framed, and in which it is emphatically declared that He is "a Priest for ever." Because He "continueth ever," "after the power of an endless life," therefore His Priesthood is like Himself, "unchangeable;" therefore "He is able to save to the uttermost

[1] Ephes. v. 2. [2] 1 Peter ii. 24.

them that come to God by Him, seeing He ever liveth a Priest to make intercession for them."[1] This, then, is our conclusion so far. The work of Christ in heaven is properly sacerdotal. It satisfies in this respect the cravings of the universal conscience and the requirements of the whole revelation of God.

Of the things we are speaking this is the sum: "We have such an High Priest Who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens."[2]

T. T. PEROWNE.

ART. IV.—LAY WORK IN THE ARMY.

THERE are many good people who hold the opinion that Christian work in the army is a subject altogether too remote to be of interest to them, as they have no connection with military affairs. They attach no more importance to what is being done to promote the moral, spiritual, intellectual, and social welfare of our soldiers, than to any other good work which they approve of, but which does not personally affect them. I believe, however, that it is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of paying attention to work done among soldiers, and for the following reasons.

In the *first* place there will, if the short-service system exists long enough, be upwards of one million[3] men scattered all over the country, who have passed six years, more or less, of training as soldiers. It cannot be a matter of indifference to anyone who desires the welfare of his country, whether that training shall have a tendency to develop dissolute, lawless, drunken habits on the one hand, or to cultivate orderly, sober, industrious habits on the other. In the one case, the country would suffer considerably from the effects of the introduction of the new system of short service; in the other, it would be a considerable gainer. This will be all the more apparent when it is remembered that these young men will, in their turn, become husbands and heads of families. Out of the 30,000,000 inhabitants of England, when half are deducted for the female sex, and a large number are deducted for children and old

[1] Heb. vii. 24, 25, 28. [2] Heb. viii. 1.

[3] Roughly speaking, 30,000 men enlist annually, and as the army does not increase, that number, after deducting a small percentage for deaths, passes into the Reserve, and from thence into civil life. If the majority enlist at twenty years of age, and leave the army at twenty-six, according to the scale of the probabilities of life they will have thirty-five years to live. 30,000 multiplied by thirty-five makes a little over a million, not one of whom would be over sixty-one years of age.

people, the men who have passed through the army will form no inconsiderable percentage of the manhood of the nation.

In the *second* place, when we consider that upwards of 80,000 men are serving in countries abroad, subject to the careful scrutiny of Hindoos, Buddhists, Mohammedans, Parsees, and Fetish-worshippers, it must, I think, be admitted that the influence of soldiers for good or for evil, as a body who "profess and call themselves Christians," must be very considerable. The two great missionary societies of our Church, and all the Nonconformist societies put together, are unable to maintain more than 800 missionaries, a small number when compared with the 80,000 soldiers. It must be very obvious, therefore, that one solitary missionary will have very uphill work, if, while he is delivering his message to the heathen, a hundred men, who call themselves by the same sacred name, practise something very different. It is useless for people at home to say that soldiers, beyond merely bearing the name, are the last to wish to be thought Christians, and that as a body they make no profession of religion. The Hindoos, Buddhists, and Mohammedans by whom they are surrounded make no fine distinctions of this kind. It is enough for them that our soldiers are called Christians. Every young officer who has been to India knows the time-honoured story of the cringing native who wanted a situation as servant, and, by way of self-recommendation, said, "Me Christian; me eat beef, pork, drink, and get drunk same like master." They very naturally judge of Christianity by its professors, and consequently often consider our national failings to be the result of the teachings of our religion.

The natives of a conquered country are extremely observant of the habits of their conquerors. I remember hearing, during the last war in South Africa, an officer say that one day, when the troops were all at Divine worship in the open air, a Kaffir came up to him, and, in broken English, asked what all the regiments were about, making such a noise? The officer replied that they were worshipping God. The Kaffir then asked *why* they worshipped God? To which the officer replied, "I suppose they want to go to heaven." The next question the Kaffir asked was, "Where is heaven?" The officer pointed upwards. He was then asked if it was a good place? On his replying in the affirmative, the Kaffir laughed and said, "Then why English not annex it?" His idea—no doubt a common one among many—was that the prominent characteristic of Christian Englishmen is to annex everything good that comes in their way. The sale of opium in China, the annexation mania, the traffic in intoxicating

drinks, are all more or less associated, in the minds of the heathen, with the teaching of Christianity!

Having attempted to show that the army, in addition to being a mere fighting machine, has an influence for good or for evil at *home* and *abroad*, I shall now proceed to give a brief account of some of the voluntary agencies that are at work among our soldiers. In doing so I shall confine myself to the voluntary agencies only, in contradistinction to the paid Government officials, such as the chaplains, who are the recognised State instructors of religion in their respective Churches and denominations. The divisions which seem naturally to suggest themselves are:

1. Army Scripture-Readers.
2. Soldiers' Homes.
3. Temperance work.
4. Soldiers' meetings.

I am afraid space will forbid my going into details on other branches of work, such as soldiers' gardens, reading and recreation rooms, cricket, and games of all sorts, coffee-shops, mothers' meetings, Sunday schools, penny readings, and many other influences which must have a civilizing and ameliorating effects on the men, and, to a certain extent, must combine to prove a counter-attraction to the public-houses, low music-halls, and dancing-saloons.

1. *The Army Scripture-Readers' Society.*—During the Crimean War two societies were formed for the good of the soldier. The one had his temporal, and the other his spiritual welfare at heart. These two societies afterwards united under the name of the Army Scripture-Readers' and Soldiers' Friend Society. Its object is to spread a saving knowledge of Christ among our soldiers, both at home and abroad. It employs about ninety-four agents, almost all of whom are old soldiers. The Scripture-readers are directed not only to aim at bringing souls to Christ, but also to try to gain an influence over the men, and thus to become their true friends. They carry on their work by visiting the men in their barrack-rooms, in hospitals, in the prison-cells, in the married men's quarters, and wherever they find that they can gain admittance.

These men thus occupy a most important position in the carrying out of Christian work in the army. The chaplain and the officer, from their social position and rank, often find it difficult to get at men. The Army Scripture-readers, however, have no social difficulties to overcome. As a rule they are old non-commissioned officers, and thus understand the ways of the men in their barrack-rooms, and can sit down for a quiet chat on a bedcot, or go out for a walk, without any special

attention being called to the fact. Yet, as they are rather better educated than the men, they can hold their own in conversation, and in conducting meetings and Bible-readings.

The Bishop of Madras, who is, I believe, the oldest bishop in Asia, and one who has for a long time had soldiers under his episcopal care, made use of the following words in his Charge to his chaplains at Madras:

> But where the number of soldiers is large, you should not fail to secure the assistance of a Scripture-reader. Such an agent is now indispensable in a military cantonment. He can be useful at seasons and under circumstances when the clergyman cannot. He can ascertain more exactly the character and feelings of individual soldiers. He can greatly assist in bringing religion into their homes and hearts. And wherever there is a considerable number of troops, I strongly recommend that application be made to the Army Scripture-Readers' Society for a reader.

This shows the value Bishop Gell places upon the work of the Society.

Among the earnest Christians in the army there are necessarily men belonging to different sects and denominations. It requires, therefore, the greatest tact and judgment to work among them. Narrow and exclusive sectarian views will not do. If ever there was a profession in which the Christian man must "learn to live and let live," that one is the army. Earnest vital godliness, combined with a large-hearted catholic toleration of the special peculiarities of others, is what is needed for a worker who would win souls in the army. The committee of the Army Scripture-Readers' Society, therefore, wisely forbid their agents ever to attempt to proselytize. Each agent on joining the Society should take for his motto, "I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified."[1] As long as these large-hearted, catholic-spirited principles are adhered to by the Society, so long, I believe, will it be a real power for good among our soldiers. What nobler conception, or what higher object, can any Society have than that of spreading a saving knowledge of Christ by means of reading and expounding the Word of God? To say

---

[1] I remember many years ago hearing a story told of a dying soldier, which struck me at the time as what ought to be the characteristic of all work among soldiers. A visitor said to the dying man, who was a humble rejoicing believer, "What Church do you belong to?" The man looked up and said, "The Church of Christ." "But," said the visitor, "of what persuasion are you?" "I am of this persuasion," said the dying soldier, "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate me from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus my Lord." He purposely avoided the question of his own particular denomination.

that it has faults, and that all its men are not perfect, is merely to admit that its affairs are managed by human beings. But the committee of the Army Scripture-Readers' Society, nevertheless, are making an earnest and honest attempt to get the best men they can to do the work of reading and explaining Holy Scripture among our soldiers.

2. *Soldiers' Homes.*—Another institution that acts a very important part in Christian work in the army is the Soldiers' Home. I believe the first one started was at Sandgate for the use of the troops at Shorncliffe. Miss Papillon, who still carries it on, may thus claim to have been the originator of the movement. Very shortly afterwards, however, a very much larger and more important Home was started by Mrs. Daniells, an officer's widow, at Aldershot. The great success which attended it was, no doubt, the cause of other Homes being started elsewhere. There are very few regiments in the British army that have not been stationed at Aldershot for a longer or shorter period during the last twenty years, and there are very few of these regiments, I believe, which are without men who have derived benefit from having come in contact with that Home. Nor has this been the case only among the men, for I have met some officers, and heard of many more, who have reaped great blessings at the Aldershot Home. When Mrs. Daniells died the officers and soldiers of the Aldershot camp, headed by General Sir Hope Grant, showed their appreciation of her devoted services by following in very large numbers her remains to their last resting-place. Her daughter has most ably supplied her mother's place. She has also extended the work very much by forming Homes at Chatham, Colchester, Plymouth, and elsewhere.

There are now very few, if any, of the larger military stations without Soldiers' Homes, based more or less on the model which was found to work so well at Aldershot. Of all these Homes and Institutes, perhaps none are so worthy of attention as the one at Portsmouth, planned and carried out, in the face of much opposition, by Miss Robinson, "The Soldier's Friend," who was, I believe, at one time a fellow-labourer with Mrs. Daniells. I have heard the complaint made that the Portsmouth Home is conducted on too secular principles, and has become merely a philanthropic, rather than a religious work. This complaint may, however, arise from a misunderstanding of the surroundings and needs of Portsmouth, which are very special, and which differ very much from those of any other station. Portsmouth is the one port from which all troops embark for foreign service, and to which all troops return on the completion of their tour of foreign service. Thus, in addition to its being a very large

naval station, it is an enormous military one. It enjoys the unenviable reputation of having attracted a very large proportion of Jewish money-lenders, "land-sharks," and improper characters of all sorts, whose sole object is to prey upon the British soldier. At one time there was hardly a respectable house where a poor woman could get a lodging for the night.[1]

When regiments arrive at Portsmouth after many years' service abroad, often before a month is over the hard-earned savings of ten years are spent, with nothing to show for them but lost good-conduct stripes, missing chevrons, and stained characters. I write entirely from memory, but I do not think I am exaggerating when I say I heard of one regiment which within one month after arrival had lost five hundred good-conduct badges, and had spent nearly £3,000: that is, an average of about one good-conduct badge and about £6 for each man.

Miss Robinson's object in the formation of an Institute was not only to provide a place conducted on very much the principles of Young Men's Christian Institutes, where soldiers might resort to find amusement, recreation, instruction, and edification, but also to provide a place where soldiers' wives and children might find a decent lodging, and where widows who had returned home alone and desolate might receive a sympathetic welcome. This, I think, she has succeeded in doing. I remember coming home as Adjutant to one of the Indian troop-ships, bringing six hundred and seventy invalids, many sick wives, children, and widows. The great bulk of them were sent on at once to Netley, but several, especially the widows, had to land at Portsmouth. An agent for Miss Robinson visited our ship directly we came into the docks, and called on me in my official capacity, and asked me to introduce him to the Commanding Officer, so that he might inform him about the Institute. Those who were not otherwise provided went there, and found a warm welcome, with food and beds ready at hand.

Those who have never left England can perhaps hardly understand what it is to return, as many of these poor creatures do, alone and friendless, to a country in which they have not been for many years. England is called "home" by many in a foreign land, and around its memory are asso-

[1] Yet Portsmouth, be it remembered, is a place where an enormous number of women, who have been married without leave and whose husbands have been ordered abroad, arrive to see the last of their husbands. Many of these poor young wives, left behind, almost penniless, find it so nearly impossible to live respectable lives, and so very easy to live a life of sin, that it is hardly matter of wonder which they choose when purity often means starvation.

ciated bright hopes of happiness and joy. Well would it have been for some had they never returned, to have their bright dreams dissipated and to curse the day when they set foot on their native shore! Never has anyone better deserved the name of "Soldiers' Friend" than she who formed the idea, and carried it out, of welcoming these returning ones to a real Soldiers' Home.

The other Soldiers' Homes, though not on the magnificent scale of Miss Robinson's, are all of them quite large enough for their requirements. They consist generally of a large hall, for meetings, temperance lectures, magic-lanterns, penny readings, Gospel addresses, etc.; a reading-room and library; and a smoking-room, which is also used for games. There is usually one room set apart as a prayer-room, where soldiers can retire alone. The daily or weekly prayer-meeting is usually held in this room. There is also a bar and a refreshment-room, where men can buy tea, coffee, cocoa, or other non-intoxicating drinks, also bread and butter, cold or hot meat, etc.; in fact, everything is done to make these places a counter-attraction to the resorts where the men can receive only injury to both body and soul.

Each Home has a lady superintendent and one assistant, who do all in their power to make the Institute attractive to the men. These ladies soon get to know the names and characters of those men who attend frequently. They form among them singing classes and glee clubs; and in a thousand and one little ways, by their self-denying efforts and services, which are rendered free of any charge, help to make the men feel at home and happy. When the regiments leave for another station the ladies write off to the lady superintendent of the Home at the new station, giving the names of the men who attended; thus, on arrival at another place, they receive a warm welcome, and are made to feel quite at home. As long as such spheres of usefulness exist for unmarried ladies, England will want no convents for women to shut themselves up in. These are, in the truest sense of the words, Sisters of Mercy.

3. *Temperance Work.*—Having mentioned the "Soldiers' Friend" of England, I feel that I must not omit to mention one who has received the name of the "Soldiers' Friend" in India. Almost every adherent of total-abstinence principles in the army has heard of the Rev. Gilson Gregson, who was the originator of the Indian Temperance Association, which, though not yet ten years old, has upwards of 10,000 adherents among the soldiers in India alone. Curiously enough, India has taken the lead in temperance work as far as soldiers are concerned. There are, of course, other causes; but I cannot help

thinking that the main cause of this is to be found in the earnest, energetic, and sensible way Mr. Gregson went to work in the matter.

There were, of course, many disintegrated temperance units scattered about throughout that vast empire—almost as large as Europe—before Mr. Gregson took up the work. It was he, however, who united all these together in one large and powerful Association. At this present moment, I believe, there is hardly a regiment or a military cantonment throughout India that has not got a more or less flourishing temperance society. The Association has become a real power for good in the country; and if one may judge from the generous subscriptions of the different Viceroys, Governors, Commanders-in-Chief, and principal staff officers, from time to time, the Association certainly has something more than their official support. I believe that some of the recent improvements in the canteen regulations have been brought about through the exertions and influence of the originator of the Temperance Association.

Mr. Gregson went out to India as a missionary to the natives; but finding that the drunkenness of the English soldiers was such a stumbling-block in the way of sober Hindoos and Mohammedans, who met him with the taunt, "Preach *first* to your own countrymen," he acted on their advice, and made this a part of his occupation. Gradually the work grew upon him, and he felt more and more that he was called to that particular sphere of action. Eventually he withdrew from all connection with distinctly missionary work, and devoted his energies and abilities to the spread of the Gospel and temperance among soldiers. His plan during the six or seven cold and moderately cool months is to itinerate from place to place; during the remainder of the year he resides in one of the numerous hill stations, writing, organizing, and consolidating his work, and preparing for the next cold-weather campaign. He edits the Indian Temperance Magazine, *On Guard*, which is the recognised organ of the Association. As he is utterly unable to prepare papers during his tours of itinerating, the main part of this has to be done in advance, when at rest in the hills.[1]

The temperance work among soldiers in England does not appear to be carried on so systematically as in India: true, there are many regiments, depôts, and military stations with good, healthy working societies. In addition to this, almost all the Soldiers' Homes and Institutes have a temperance

[1] At present Mr. Gregson is in Egypt, endeavouring to do for our brave soldiers there what he has so successfully done in India. I am pleased to observe that his interesting little book, "Through the Khyber Pass," was warmly commended in THE CHURCHMAN.

society in connection with their work; beyond this I know of no one organization which attempts to band all these societies together in one association. There are of course such societies as the Church of England Temperance Society, the National Temperance League, and the Order of Good Templars, all of which are doing an admirable work in the army: these, however, are composed mainly of civilians, and are not distinctly military organizations, though the National Temperance League has a military branch; but I am not aware that any information or statistics are published with regard to the work of temperance reform in the army. The different societies are not brought in any way into connection with each other; they exist as so many disintegrated units. I have never yet been able to ascertain how many abstainers there are in the army in England. In India, out of about 60,000 men, there are upwards of 10,000 abstainers; each abstainer on joining feels that he is one of a large number. Lists are published monthly showing the number of abstainers in each regiment; thus attention is called to the fact of the increase or decrease month by month. All this excites friendly emulation. Each regiment naturally vies with the others to head the list, and each president and secretary of a regimental temperance society feels a personal interest in the matter.

The authorities are, I feel sure, anxious in every way to help forward the cause of temperance in the army; but at present, without any organization, they are unable to ascertain the wishes of the great body of abstainers. A solitary society here and there does not represent this great body, nor can they expect to have their requests attended to. If, however, they were all united in one body, I feel sure that they would have every consideration paid to them. Just to give one illustration from among many: For many years the ship-ration at sea included porter. Whether men drank it or not they were charged the 2½d. for ship-rations; lately, however, the authorities have decided that the men who do not drink shall not be charged; and, if they elect, they may have an equivalent in the way of tea or coffee. No doubt the change would have taken place before if the matter had only been pointed out. There are so many little ways in which the cause might be advanced by the authorities without doing injustice to anyone else: these have only to be pointed out in the proper way, and they would be attended to.

It is an interesting thing to observe how differently the temperance movement is treated now by the powers that be in the army, from what it was at first. It was then looked upon with suspicion, and it was even considered an unsafe thing to permit associations among soldiers at all. One Colonel told me that he had been directed by a General to prevent all

societies of any sort in his regiment. Strangely enough, such secret societies as Freemasons were allowed, while Temperance Societies were discouraged. Now, however, all is changed; and not only are they allowed to exist, but frequently the Commanding Officer of the regiment presides, and one often hears of Generals attending and giving a few words of kindly encouragement to the men to remain firm in the paths of sobriety. His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief has, I am informed, expressed his approval of a form of pledge; and it certainly is no secret that the Duke of Connaught and Lord Wolseley are open supporters of the movement.

If it is true, as is so often asserted, that five-sixths of all crime in the army is due directly or indirectly to the influence of drink, the authorities certainly show their wisdom in giving encouragement to any voluntary system that does so much towards decreasing crime. They can make regulations with that object, but here their power ceases. They cannot possibly exercise any influence over the moral and spiritual nature of the men. Soldiers are not like the component parts of a rifle: mere interchangeable *things*, to be cleaned by regulation. Though they move *en masse*, like a machine, yet they are composed of units, each of which has high moral and spiritual powers, capable of development in a good or bad direction. If it can be proved that the sober, God-fearing soldier is more amenable to discipline, and performs his duty more conscientiously than his comrades, it would indeed be a very short-sighted policy to discourage such voluntary agencies as temperance societies, which do more than the provost-marshal, and a whole tribe of provost-sergeants and military police. It must ever be borne in mind, to the honour of the temperance soldier, that during the Indian Mutiny, on a sudden emergency arising, when many of their comrades were unfit for service through drink, it was "Havelock's Saints" whom the Commanding Officer felt he could rely on.

Moreover, if it is found that an enormous number of men, during peace-time, can perform their duties well without the use of intoxicating drinks, it will go far at all events towards showing that their use, however nice they may be, is not essential to the welfare of the soldier. This will remove intoxicating drink from the list of necessaries to the list of luxuries. But no soldier need expect luxuries on a campaign, so that one great item of expenditure and inconvenience may be abolished—the conveyance of intoxicating drink. If, however, the authorities were to attempt to make any experiments on the men, what an outcry would at once be raised about "robbing a poor man of his beer"! But what the authorities cannot insist on, they can greatly assist by encouraging volun-

tary agencies and societies to unite men together to forego willingly that which has been proved to be a great source of crime and of a considerable amount of disease, and which has not been proved to be absolutely essential to the welfare of a large body of healthy men, however useful it may be to the sickly.

Great as the encouragement has been on the part of the authorities, and zealous as many have been in the propagation of temperance principles, yet still much remains to be done. The love of drink is recognised as one of our vices as a nation, and soldiers are no exception to the general rule. Wherever the British army goes, there is the way marked out with broken bottles, old casks, and empty cases of spirits. I observed, even on the top of Majuba Hill, in South Africa, that the temporary cross erected over the grave of one of our bravest officers was formed out of an old brandy-case. On one side was recorded the name of the officer, and on the other the well-known three-star Hennessy's Cognac. No other wood in that advanced spot could be obtained. What a commentary on our national habits! When moving up the river to one of our frontier stations in Burmah, my old regiment halted for the night. On the banks were a few houses. Going to one shop—the only one in a distance of some 300 miles—I asked if I could obtain any stamps. The Chinaman who kept the shop evidently did not understand me, and said, "Brandy, sahib?" On repeating my request in another way, he replied, "Brandy-pawnee?" (water). Brandy, or brandy-and-water, were the only things he thought an Englishman could want. Certainly he kept little else in his small shop.

In poetical language we are told—

> "The longest lane must have an ending,
> And the tide will turn at last."

Dark as may have been the history of our army in the past, I believe the worst is over, and a healthier sentiment is setting in on the subject of drink. Drunkenness has quite ceased to be the universal thing it is reported to have been among officers, and soon one may hope to see it very much decreased among the lower ranks. I believe that already soldiers, far from being behindhand in this matter, are decidedly in advance of men of the same age and living under the same conditions in civil life. Almost every regiment now has a Total-Abstinence Society, and many of them are in a very flourishing condition. Even those men who do not join these societies, cannot but be influenced to a certain extent by them. They at all events see that a man can be a good soldier of his Queen and country, and yet be a sober, God-fearing man; and that not

to be a drunkard does not necessarily mean being either a "muff" or a "milk-sop." The whole training of a soldier has a tendency to make him clean, respectful, and orderly. If, in addition to these qualifications, by means of regimental temperance societies, the other qualification of sobriety can be added, the civilians of the future, instead of being ashamed of a relative who "'listed to be a soldier," will become proud of him, as they have every right to expect that he will return a better citizen and a nobler man.

4. *Bible-Reading and Prayer-Meetings.*—One prominent feature of Christian work in the army is the little gathering of some form or other that usually takes place in many regiments and stations. It sometimes takes the form of a Bible-reading, and sometimes of a prayer-meeting. At other times an address is delivered by the one who presides. Whatever form it may take, and however much outsiders may ridicule it, there is no denying the fact that these little meetings are the centres around which the religious instincts of the men gather. Soldiers have not very strong views of Church government and organizations. Their Church-membership as a rule ceases the hour church-parade is dismissed. After that, they gladly unite with all "who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth." Those who are really in earnest do not find much sympathy in the barrack-room among their comrades, so by natural instinct they are all the more strongly bound with those who, like themselves, seek to serve the same Saviour.

It seems to be a law deeply implanted in human nature, that the few who find themselves cut off from the great majority, should unite together in small gatherings to discuss their one common bond of union. It is an instinct like that of self-preservation. Not only their very existence depends upon it, but without it there would be no hope of propagating their views. In a large number there are always a few timid, retiring ones, who have not quite decided to adopt the views of the despised minority. Like Nicodemus, these may attend stealthily one of these gatherings. Contact with others gives them confidence; and many of these shy ones afterwards become the boldest of the party. These little bands or societies of praying, God-fearing men are to the timid ones what the firm old oak is to the weak, clinging ivy that gathers around it. Without the support given by the oak, the ivy would fail to attain any height, even were it not killed by being trampled under foot. Many a solitary unit with religious convictions, would soon be lost sight of in the common herd of careless, indifferent men. Their convictions would soon be smothered or hidden carefully away. In contact with others, especially as among the few there are generally one or two bolder spirits,

they gain courage and confidence, and in their turn help to inspire others with those qualities. In the darkest days of the Jewish people, we are told that there were always a few who served their God, of whom it is recorded, "They that feared the Lord spake often one to another."

The late Lord Lawrence, when Viceroy of India, gave orders that in every barrack a room should be set apart for the purpose of soldiers' religious meetings. It was called the Scripture-Reading Room. I am afraid that in many barracks in India this order has not been carried out. But the Order of Council still exists, giving dimensions and fittings, and in a great number of stations there is still the Scripture-Reading Room, a standing memorial of the earnest piety of one who, by prompt energetic measures, saved India during that terrible ordeal of the Indian Mutiny.

The Christian men of a regiment will meet together, whether rooms are provided or not. I remember at one station in India, where our men, finding that they could obtain no other place, appointed the rifle-butts as their rendezvous. In South Africa, one regiment, which was separated from the standing camp in which the field-force remained for a time after Sir George Colley's death, erected an arbour of branches of trees, where they held their evening meeting. In the standing camp itself, the General kindly allowed the men the use of a large tent which during the day was used as a library. If those who think that the devotional life is inseparably connected with ecclesiastical-shaped buildings and surroundings had only seen the heartiness and warmth of these gatherings, with no seat but a few sods, no lights but tallow candles, shaded by inverted beer-bottles with the bottoms knocked out, they might change their minds. I remember, when driving through Dublin one day, being much amused to see an advertisement, in large letters, assuring the public that "Aids to devotion were obtained direct from the French manufactories"! I can only say that I have never been present at more really devotional gatherings than those I witnessed in that camp, where absolutely all external so-called "aids" were entirely absent. The hearty singing, the earnest prayers, the deep attention, all bespoke intense reality and the true devotional spirit. Every Sunday night, and almost every week night, that large tent was crowded.

As in the case of the temperance movement, so in the matter of religious meetings, there has been a decided change in the right direction in the opinions of the powers that be. At one time there existed a very strong prejudice against any religious meetings in the army, with the exception of the one solitary church-parade every week. Now even the strictest

disciplinarians have to admit that, if religious meetings do no good, they at least do no harm, and consequently the old prejudice on the score of discipline has given way to a more tolerant spirit. I once asked a commanding officer for leave to conduct a meeting, and the answer I received was characteristic of what I mean. He had a habit of thinking aloud, and reasoning with himself, while at the same time giving his answer. It was to the following effect: "Men have theatricals, dances, concerts, and penny readings, and I do not see why they should not be allowed to have Bible-readings and prayer-meetings. Officers take part with the men in these things, and I do not see why they should not do so in religion. I hope your presence will have a moderating influence on the men, and prevent them from going to any extremes."

This officer was a man who made no profession of religion himself. He had, however, a peculiarly fair and impartial mind. He always acted on the principle that unless an actual breach of discipline was likely to occur, no restriction should be put on the pleasures or occupations of the men. Everybody, he thought, had a perfect right to choose their own way of amusing themselves and occupying their spare time, which was their own. Though very strict in matters of discipline and on parade, yet during recreation-time he left each one to enjoy himself as best he could, though personally he might not care for their particular form of enjoyment. Looking at it from this standpoint, which it must be remembered is the one every commanding officer has to view it from, it is certainly difficult to see what the objections can be to religious meetings. Among upwards of a thousand men, there must of necessity be diverse tastes and inclinations. Some like one thing and some another. Those who are fond of gardening need not run foul of those who devote themselves to cricket. The object of all officers should be to cater for the good of the men, and in some way or other to endeavour to get all to occupy their time profitably and sensibly. It is certainly difficult to see why religion or temperance, even if not encouraged, should have in bygone days ever been excluded from the list of rational enjoyments.

There may have been injudicious officers who acted unwisely, and there may have been hypocritical professors among the men who joined these meetings from unworthy motives, more especially to "curry favour" with the officers. But what position in life is there where we are not more or less accustomed to this sort of thing? Anyone, however, with a fair amount of judgment, can see through these characters. I believe that in the army far less of this kind of hypocrisy occurs than elsewhere. There is too much scoffing and

sneering, as a rule, for men to make a profession of religion which is not supported by reality.

If a breach of discipline occurs, it would of course be dealt with in the same way as if it occurred in any other place. I have, however, asked many experienced officers, who have taken a deep personal interest in the spiritual and moral welfare of the men, and they all bear testimony, as is only natural, to the good behaviour of the God-fearing soldiers. My own experience of them is that there is an earnest desire among them to do their duty honestly and conscientiously. Those who serve their God well are not the men to neglect the service of their Queen and country. They render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. I have known many who have acted on the principle of the young shoeblack, who when converted said: "If I have to clean boots, I will try and make them brighter than anyone else," to the glory of God.

Enough has been advanced, I trust, to interest my readers in the welfare of the soldiers, and I hope that those who have the opportunity will show their practical sympathy with Christian work in the army. The better the man, the better the soldier. Other things being equal, that army will be the best that contains the most heroes, to whom the description would be applicable:

"Truest friend and noblest foe."

I feel I cannot better bring this article to a conclusion than by quoting the words of our late beloved Archbishop. In a speech at Exeter Hall, he said:

> We sometimes hear people scoff at the idea of a psalm-singing general or psalm-singing soldiers; but there was a day in England when psalm-singing generals and soldiers showed that they were not to be despised. I will not say that there were not great faults in those men. I pronounce no opinion as to what they did politically; but this I will say, that their singing of psalms did not make them less terrible in the day of battle, and I believe everyone present feels that those who love Christ most may be expected to fear death least.

SETON CHURCHILL.

ART. V.—CURIOSITIES OF PARISH REGISTERS.

READERS of all classes will be obliged to Mr. Stanley Leighton for his admirable but too brief paper on our parochial registers, in the February number of THE CHURCHMAN. It was not less able than opportune, for indeed the subject is immediate and pressing. Mr. Borlase's Bill "To make

Provision for the better Preservation of the Ancient Parochial Registers of England and Wales," introduces to us a new and advanced stage in the history of these priceless manuscripts. Hereafter, according to the tenor of its resolutions, and if the House of Commons approves, all parish registers, and all diocesan transcripts, will be handed over to the custody of the Master of the Rolls. It is often said that "London is the only place worth living in." Soon it must be said, "London is the only place it is possible to live in." Even the antiquary will have to betake himself, like a pilgrim, with staff (a stout quill) and bottle (best black ink) to seek a sanctuary in the "Goswell Streets" of the metropolis.

A few words about these said registers may be considered not out of place at this time. Few are aware how interesting are their contents, over and above genealogical grounds. No doubt the genealogist does good work, and good because it is honest. That we all came over with the Conqueror was becoming all but a postulate; and that the battle of Hastings was a myth, since there was no one to fight with William when he came, was in due course becoming a recognised fact. The further deduction that no one had "come over" since 1066 was receiving the attention it deserved, when a race of genealogists began to spring up of a strictly positivist school, and many of these theories became exploded. It was time they did, for everybody of the slightest pretension was perpetually trying to come William the Conqueror over us. Certain books of peerage, baronetage, and landed gentry (I am speaking rather, though not altogether, of the past), helped to feed this proposterous idea. With the assistance, among other aids, of the parish register, the honest genealogist is daily putting his foot down on these vague guesses and flattering but hasty conclusions. To parody Messrs. Gilbert and Sullivan's song, he is, and I trust will go on, "jumping," not on the father, but the great-great-grandfather of a good many people who seem to derive a subtle and exquisite satisfaction from the assertion that they are the extract of a progenitor who came over *viâ* Calais and Dover, in the year 1066, without a return ticket. Why the aroma that hangs over this year should be so quintessential, I have never fully understood.

But it is not the genealogist alone who may extract pleasure from the study of our parochial treasures. The antiquary may find much to charm him. To compare a register in the north with one in the south, is to find that there were distinctly county favourites among our Christian names, and that a name that is still popular in one district has been long extinct in another. He can trace the force of social and religious revolutions, and see by the fact of the existence of "Pentecost,"

"Tiffany," and "Pascow,"[1] in Cornwall registers of the present century, that the old Romish names lingered on in the far south-west of England, generations after they had been utterly uprooted in other parts of the country. The etymologist will find old titles of occupation that will gladden his heart. In my own register to this day, a basket-maker is a "swiller," a mason a "waller," and, till fifty years ago, a weaver is a "webster." The historian will discover local visitations of the black plague, as in my own register, or that of Cartmel, or those in the publications of the Harleian Society already in print. He will observe how for centuries the list of surnames in each separate village register ranges little beyond twenty or thirty; and that some half-dozen rule almost supreme. He will not be long in noting that these names are local, and hail from hamlets similarly styled, within a radius of ten or fifteen miles: a significant proof that our forefathers, leading their round of monotonous days, in field and stable, had no migratory tendencies. He will notice, too, perchance with a sigh, that the old order is changing, that, with the introduction of railways, a sudden confusion has taken place, and that old local names are now rapidly becoming lost in an admixture of new. Carlyle was born within a few miles of Carlisle. Such things will cease to occur, except by accident, in the near future. A book might be written out of the thoughts suggested by this fact alone. Then, every register has its one, or two, or maybe three remarkable entries, to be shown to visitors, the birth-register of some humble lad who died Lord Chancellor, or Bishop of a distant diocese; or he became a national poet, or a world-famed painter. Again, we can trace how deplorably drunk was the clerk at some of the funerals, that great time of revelry in olden days; we are lost in amazement at his caligraphy, till amazement is quenched in horror of his orthography. Yesterday a single neatly recorded line sufficed; to-day his pen has sprawled over half a page, every letter looking as intoxicated as himself: a record of both dead and living, the sepulture of one, the degradation of the other. Sometimes a wedding has had the same effect on him, but mostly the funerals.

---

[1] Pascal, Pascoe, Pask, and Pasche, for children born at Easter were in common use for centuries. Tiffany was the popular rendering of Theophania, or Epiphany: and Pentecost represented Whitsunday. The registers of St. Columb Major, Cornwall, contain the following entries:

1582, June 14. Baptized Pascow, son-in-law of Pascowe John.
1600, June 21. Baptized Tiffany, daughter of Henry Hake.
1610, May 27. Baptized Pentecost, daughter of William Tremain.

Vide my "Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature," pp. 96-99. Chatto and Windus.

To the man of merely literary tastes, some little eccentricity of the parson will crop up to interest him—his courtly penmanship; his little flourishes in Latin; his love of a particular phrase; his delicacy, or the reverse, in registering illegitimacy; his determination to father the babe on somebody in the parish, in a way that would now suggest a case for libel; his loyal thankfulness at the restoration of Charles II., and his ingenuity in weaving the expression of it into the burial-register of a bitter Presbyterian; his deference to the Squire's position, by recording his sepulture in characters of pica, while Hob and Dick must depart this life in longprimer at the best—a thought suggested possibly by the difference betwixt the Squire's raised pew and the rest of the benches. There are a hundred other things curious enough, and fascinating enough, to him who loves to linger over these yellow parchments, and watch from page to page the slow growth of what is from what has been.

Take the matter of orthography alone, for it is impossible to treat of more than one. As I write, two books stare me in the face. One is inscribed "Concordance to Shakspere," by M. Cowden Clarke; the other is "Shakespeare," edited by A. Dyce! How an educated Hindoo would stare to be told both books treated of the same man. But *how* are we to spell him? Every day some fresh form of the name is turning up, thanks to the industry of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps and others. The poet's signature to his will is "Shakspeare." In the probate of the will it is "Schackspeare." His father's name is spelt "Shakyspere," in 1555, in the register of the bailiff's court, and in 1558, on his appointment as Constable of Stratford, he is enrolled as "Shakspeyr." Among some debts due to Sadler, occurs "Shacksper;" and in a bond arising out of the intended marriage of the poet, he is "Shagspere." In fact, the forms are endless. If we went by the origin of the name, we must now spell it "Shakespear;" but we might as well demand that our Smythes should be "Smith," and our Taylors "Tailor."[1] On the other hand, a family named Arch-

[1] There is not the slightest difficulty in coming at the origin of this patronymic. It is a nickname pure and simple: just as much a nickname, in fact, as Longfellow, which is found in the earliest Yorkshire records as Langfelay. The American poet, it is well known, traced back to that county. We find that all such officials as the bailiff, the serjeant, or the catchpoll (the modern policeman), were nicknamed after the weapon, badge, or wand they carried. It is to good-humoured raillery of this kind we owe such surnames (some obsolete, some still existing) as Drawsword, Wagstaff, Waghorn, Bruiselance, Crackshield, Bendbow, Shootbolt, Hurlstone, Winspear, Fewterspear, Breakspear, Shakeshaft, Shakelock, and Wagspear. I have met with specimens of all the above in our older records. The attempts of some philologists to reject this most natural solution are quite distressing.

deacon went back the other day to the old form "Arcedekne;" but who would dare to propose "Chacsper" or "Shaxper" for our poet, both of which forms appear in old Warwickshire records? Very happy, in fact, is the expression used by Edward Coote, Master of the Free School, Bury St. Edmunds, in his "English Schoole Master" (1621): "Our English proper names are written as it pleaseth the painter, or as men have received them by tradition."[1] He adds: "Yea, I have knowne two naterall brethren, both learned, to write their owne names differently." Coote might safely have asserted that for one man to write his own name in half-a-dozen different forms was no uncommon occurrence. Fuller (1662) says in his "Worthies": "Hence it is that the same names have been so often disguised unto the staggering of many, who have mistook them for different:

> The same they thought was not the same,
> And in their name they sought their name.

Thus I am informed that the honourable name of Villers" (Villiers) "is written 14 several ways in their own evidences, and the like, though not so many variations may be observed in others." This latter statement is scarcely true. The family archives of the Mainwarings of Cheshire discover no less than 137 variations of the name! and Waynflete is found in 17 different dresses. But even these sink into insignificance by Mr. Chaloner Smith's statement that he has jotted down no fewer than 500 separate and distinct spellings of the word "cushion." I saw it the other day in a Yorkshire will as "qwhysshon," so I am not surprised. The elder Disraeli went so far as to suspect that estates have been lost and descents confounded by the uncertain and disagreeing signatures of one and the same person. Without denying or substantiating this remark, we may truly say that up to a hundred years ago there were hundreds of large landowners who knew the geography of their property far better than the orthography of the proprietor. Isaac Disraeli states that he has seen Ben Jonson's name written by himself with an "h,' and Dryden with an "i." How curiously this tallies with Max Adeler's "Pirate":

> The scoundrel fibbed most shamelessly: in truth, he only knew
> A lot of Smiths without a "y"—a most plebeian crew;
> His Johnsons used a vulgar "h;" his Thompsons spelled with "p;"
> His Simses had one "m," and they were common as could be.

Dryden, I believe, is only found in this dress now; but "y" and "i" in Smith divide the honours; while in Taylor

[1] Dr. Lithgow, *Antiquary*, Nov., 1880.

"y" rules supreme. A Taylor may wear a coat, but only a Tailor makes it. It must be confessed that it almost takes off the fine edge of one's esteem for "rare Ben" to see, however correct, an interloping "h" in the very centre of his cognomen, for there are some abuses we learn to cling to. Yet Richard Broome, in his "Elegy on Fletcher," says:

> I knew him in his strength; even then, when he
> That was the Master of his art, and me;
> Most knowing *Johnson* (proud to call him son),
> In friendly envy swore he had outdone
> His very self.

Nay, the poet's own lines to Fletcher on his "Faithful Shepherdess" are signed "Ben Johnson." Many dishes are liked for their garniture. Somehow or another one feels a greater relish for the writings of Jonson than Johnson. It is a vulgar emotion, no doubt.

Ralcigh is familiar, because the name of one of England's worthies; but Sir Walter and his contemporaries wrote it indifferently as Ralegh, Raleigh, Rawleigh, Rawely, Rawley, and Rawly. But whatever be the orthography, the orthoepy is unquestionable: it was Rawley. The endless epigrams on his name prove it. When first introduced to James I., that monarch, who disliked him, gave him but a curt reception: "Rawley, Rawley! true enough; for I think of thee very rawley, mon!" An enigma of the time also preserves the pronunciation:

> What's bad for the stomach, and the word for dishonour,
> Is the name of a man whom the king will not honour!

Another skit by a contemporary critic sets the matter at rest. Attacking Sir Walter's supposed atheistic notions, he says:

> *Raw* is the reason that doth *lie*
> Within an atheist's head,
> Which saith the soul of man doth die
> When that the body's dead.
> Now may ye see the sudden fall
> Of him that thought to climb full high:
> A man well known unto you all,
> Whose state, you see, doth stand *Rawly*.

Both king and critic pronounce "rarely" *rawly*. Possibly that was the fashionable orthoepy of the day.

Well-known men of the same race, by the variety of spelling, are sometimes compelled to allow their relationship to go unrecognised. In my work on the "Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature," I had occasion to mention Faithful Teate, sometime minister of the Word at Sudbury. Teate wrote the "Ter Tria," a work still consulted, explanatory of the doctrine of the

Trinity. Chishull, in allusion to this same treatise, played upon his name thus:

> Let all wise-hearted, savouring things divine,
> Come, suck this Teate, that yields both milk and wine.

But why do I mention *Teate?* Because he was the father of Nahum Tate, a co-translator of the last authorized metrical version of the Psalms.[1] Here not merely spelling but pronunciation has varied.

Take another instance. Isaac Barrow, who wrote the treatise on the "Pope's Supremacy," was great-grandson of Philip Barrogh, who wrote the "Method of Physic." Or turn to political characters. Mr. Foster has shown in his "Lives of British Statesmen," that Oliver Cromwell was related to Thomas Crumwell, Earl of Essex. In the case of Barrow, we may presume the orthoepy to have slightly changed. If the Cavalier's toast, "Wash this crumb well down," represent the pronunciation of the day, then the orthoepy of the two Cromwells was the same, though the orthography was not. That the names of the founder of Methodism, and the hero of Waterloo, were originally identical need not be doubted. The following variations are found in the records that relate to the family: Wellesleigh, Wellesley, Westleigh, Westley, Weisley, Weisly, Wesley. The Duke of Wellington was son of Richard Colley, who, under the name of Wesley, was adopted by Garret Weisley, of Dangan, Ireland, who had previously offered, on the score of relationship, to adopt one of the Wesleys of Epworth. Wellesley was not so spelled by the Duke till the year 1800.

This reminds us of the poet Cowper. To this day he is constantly called Cow-per by the larger proportion of his readers; but Cooper, Couper, and Cowper, are all forms of the same name found in our parochial records, springing originally, of course, from the occupation. An Act of Parliament (5 Elizabeth iv. 30) says, "It shall be lawful to any person, exercising the occupation of a Smith, Wheelwright, Millwright, Sawyer, Limeburner, Tyler, Slater, Helier (*i.e.* Thatcher), Turner, Cowper, Fuller, otherwise called Tucker, or Walker (hence all these surnames), or Shingler, to have, or receive the son of any person as apprentice," etc. In our parish registers of the seventeenth century, Cooper is more frequently found as Cowper. Richard Stock, whose commentary on "Malachi," recently published under the able editorship of Dr. Grosart, will be familiar to many of the clergy, curiously enough inscribed himself on the title-page of his "Churche's Lamenta-

[1] *Notes and Queries*, 1853, p. 624.

tion" as Richard *Stock;* and in his "Epistle Dedicatorie," a page further on, as Richard *Stocke.* But who would conceive that "Truth's Champion," by an individual bearing the name of "Stooks," was written by the same man? What can prove the want of orthographic law better than this? Barebone's Parliament has created much food for pleasantry; but Barbon's Parliament would have stripped the phrase of all its comicality; yet Peck, in his "*Desiderata Curiosa,*" calls him Mr. Barborne, while Echard writes the name Barbon. Dr. Barbon, who was one of the leading re-builders of London after the great fire, was a near relative.

Sometimes we have in the present spelling of our names a reminiscence of the earlier pronunciation of the name of the place whence the patronymic arose. Some of our Stopfords represent an old local rendering of Stockport; and our Bristows mostly hail from Bristol, once styled Bristow. Latimer, in a letter (Parker Society) to Lord Cromwell, speaks of "Gloucester and Bristow." Who does not understand that the Premier is a Scotch Gledstane of that ilk, and that his great-grandfather probably wore a kilt? but this may have come under the scope of his silent reforms! Who does not recognise in Dr. Ray Lankester another form of Lancaster? or in Lester a memory of Leicester? Mr. Windom, one of the secretaries of State at Washington, subscribes himself in that form; but it is manifest that he is an English Wyndham; while Mr. Barnum, whom Jumbo, by making himself immortal, immortalized, is as evidently a Barnham from the diocese of Ely, or Chichester, for there are at least two places of that name.

The orthoepy of Lester and Leicester is the same: also that of Carlyle and Carlisle. Sometimes it might be convenient to make a difference. Charles Lamb tells a good story in his own inimitable manner. He met an ardent but young *littérateur,* and, in the course of conversation, happened to praise the "Epithalamium" of Spenser. The young gentleman was somewhat mortified that he did not know the poem, asserting that Spencer was an author with whose writings he was particularly conversant. Lamb offered to show him the poem if he would come to his lodgings. On the way the *littérateur* muttered compassionately, "Poor Spencer!" Asked why "poor," he again heaved a sigh, and with a more solemn tone of pathos than before repeated, "Poor Spencer! he has lost his wife!" It was not Edmund Spenser with an "s," who lived in Elizabeth's reign, but the Honourable William Spencer with a "c," "one of the living ornaments, if I am not misinformed, of this poetical era, 1811."[1]

[1] Lamb's Works, p. 408, edit. Chatto and Windus.

But if our most learned men were thus subjected to such indignities and themselves encouraged them, how utterly were the unlettered at the mercy of the parish clerk! They could not write themselves, and the only difference between them and the clerk was that while he could write, he could not spell. Even with Christian names he came some "frightful croppers" at times. A new name was a five-foot fence, with a ditch at the other side, to him; so he usually refused it, and went round leisurely—very much round indeed. If Pamela became a sudden candidate for favour, he transformed it into Pamelea or Paramelia: no one would have read Richardson's famous story so styled. Vincent is Fenson, and Ursula in half a hundred registers is Oursley; Agnes is Annis; Thomasine is Tamsin, or Tamzen; and Alice is Alse, or Als. Anne looks odd as An, where economy was not imperative, but that was the usual form; and Peter was a perpetual stone of stumbling as Petter, Peater, and Petre. Anna-Maria, when double names were coming into fashion (*circa* 1700), is inscribed as Anammeriah. The clerk, however, could plead in defence of this monstrosity that he had never heard of two names in baptism before. It is just possible he deemed it illegal, and in the child's interests deliberately ran the two into one. Cheerfully accepting this extenuation, it still looks curious.

But with regard to surnames, it was not always the clerk's fault that they met with such inhuman treatment. Many of these barbarities must be laid at the door of the owners themselves. The orthoepy was constantly fluctuating. The son pronounced the family name differently from his father, and the grandson from the son. Chanonhouse in the sixteenth century is Shannonhouse in the seventeenth, and Chandlehouse in the eighteenth. The father will be entered Chamney, his son Chamley, his grandson Charnley. Nay, the boy at baptism will be registered Pattinson, at marriage Patterson, at death Pattison. You never know where you are. Generation after generation of the same stock is before us, and through the vestry window we can see the house in which each successively dwelt; but the house will not have bulged out of position nearly so much as the name.

These freaks become still more noteworthy when we see two or three families dwelling in the same village, each bearing a distinct name, yet each sprung from the same nominal ancestor, as the parish register would easily prove to them. Thus you will find Hodson, and Hodgson, and Dodgson within a stone's-throw; or Perkins and Purkiss separated only by the orchard-fence. They don't know that they are related, and would stoutly deny the impeachment. Mashiter and

Masheder are familiar names in my immediate neighbourhood, but the bearers recognize no kinship. The 'split' in the family took place too long ago for them to recall it. As I write this I am staying for a night in Ellesmere in Shropshire. I see two signs up within fifty yards of one another: one bears the name of Povah, the other Povey—no doubt they are related. These are the things that give an interest to our parish registers. They link the present with the past. It is not merely the lineament of some face of to-day that is recalled, as we scan these faded characters, but the dimmer outline of an age which is past beyond all recall.

I have merely to add, that the only satisfactory plan of preserving our registers I can suggest is to print them. I am now, with the assistance of a local committee, printing my own. We have 180 subscriptions of a guinea each, and we hope to clear £50 for some parochial object, after all expenses are paid. I would earnestly impress upon every clerical guardian of these priceless treasures to set about their publication at once. County families, local magnates, public libraries, genealogists, and antiquaries at a distance are always ready to subscribe, some for more copies, some for less; and with a strong circular sent through the length and breadth of the parish, the thing is easily done. Would that my brethren would make the experiment!

C. W. Bardsley.

Art VI.—THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL'S "CAN THEY BE BROUGHT IN?"

Can They be Brought In? Thoughts on the absence from Church of the working classes. By John Charles Ryle, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. W. Hunt and Co. 1883.

THE absence of the "working classes" from public worship has lately been much discussed. A voluntary census in some of the largest towns, a year or two ago, attracted attention; and many thoughtful Nonconformists, as well as Churchmen, were startled at the statistics then published. Figures, no doubt, are oftentimes fallacious; and the figures of Nonconformist census-takers which bear upon the influence of the National Church, should, just now, be very carefully considered. Nevertheless, in the face of keen criticism, the voluntary census movement has proved, on the whole, a statistical success. In many towns the clergy and leading Church workers have carried out a census of their own; they have ascertained the religious profession of their parishioners (whether Nonconformists or Church-people), and also the average attendances in the sanctuary. As a rule, perhaps, the statistics of the voluntary

census, whether carried out by friends or foes of the Establishment, may be accepted as sufficiently accurate. One result is plain and positive, the absence of the working classes from public worship is extremely serious. Again, apart altogether from the recent amateur counting in churches, or voluntary voting-papers distributed from house to house, Churchmen come to the same conclusion. In the great centres of population more churches are undoubtedly needed; but, at the same time, it must be admitted that of the churches built to meet the needs of the working classes, no small proportion are almost useless. A district parish has been made; a building has been consecrated, and a pastor provided; outside are working men in thousands, but the church, at any service, even on a Sunday evening, is nearly empty. The statements made by Mr. Hubbard and others, the other day, in the London Diocesan Conference, as to the religious condition of the metropolitan working classes can scarcely be questioned; and the able paper by Mr. Kitto, "The Church and the Masses," in the January CHURCHMAN, tells its own tale. From another great diocese has come an earnest appeal, based upon a statement of serious and most pressing wants. The diocese of Rochester, says its honoured Bishop, is still a Missionary diocese, and sorely needs both money and men.[1] Masses of the population are, if not neglected, at least pretermitted, not provided for. The Bishop of Liverpool, in the pamphlet before us, gives similar statistics, and pleads in the same strain.

Before turning to the case as presented by the Bishop of Liverpool—the needs of the present—it may be well briefly to look back to the neglect of the past. How is it that such a large proportion of the English people are unprovided for by the National Church? The question is often asked; and yet it needs only an elementary effort to afford the answer.

The Church's endowments are those of a population of some four millions; they were sufficient, no doubt, for a period when the country was mainly agricultural. But the population over which the Church, as the National Church, by profession takes charge, is now twenty-six millions. And of these twenty-six millions "the masses," we may say, reside in urban

[1] The diocese of Rochester is the third largest in the kingdom in point of population (1,800,000 souls). An appeal for the Diocesan Society says: "Those who intimately know the low, coarse, wicked lives which thousands upon thousands lead in our crowded cities—those who recognize the fact that drunkenness and indifferentism are the two great enemies of the present day—must feel that the coming question of the immediate future is, How can we support, render most efficient, and push forward in an eager and aggressive spirit the Home Missions of England, that we may recapture for God and His Church the strongholds within which Satan has entrenched himself."

parishes. While the population of agricultural districts has remained stationary, the population of manufacturing towns, as a rule, has largely increased, and in certain centres the addition has been enormous. As regards the Establishment, then, this is the state of things; its country parishes have the money, while its town parishes have the masses. Some exaggeration in this statement may be pardoned; it is well to mark the contrast. To put the case in another way. The ancient parishes were endowed; they have tithes, glebe, etc. For the statutory parishes, however, nothing of the sort was provided, and there are myriads of the people in the mining and manufacturing and commercial centres, as well as in the suburban districts of the metropolis, for whom no endowment whatever exists in any shape or form. One result of the Evangelical revival was the building of chapels of ease and churches; private Acts of Parliament were obtained; and after the year 1818, the real *terminus a quo* (Parliamentary impediments being removed), the Church building movement grew strong. But the arrears were heavy, and could not be overtaken. The endowments of few town churches were sufficient to bear division, and it was difficult to raise money at the same time for building churches and for clergy endowment. Another result of the Evangelical revival was the utilizing of schoolrooms, and in populous places the Gospel was preached in buildings of various kinds, usually "licensed." Nevertheless, the Church of England has been and is, in the towns, both undermanned and (if the word may be excused) undermoneyed. While in the rural parishes, as a rule, one finds a church quite large enough, and a Rector, or Vicar, with sufficient stipend, in the great towns, very often, an Incumbent is sadly overworked, his ecclesiastical income is miserably small, and over the population committed to his charge he cannot possibly exercise due pastoral influence. How dependent upon voluntary support the Established Church is, with regard to the masses, may be understood from a single statement. The Incumbents to whom grants are made by the Church Pastoral Society have under their charge an aggregate population of more than four millions and a half. In other words, each of the Incumbents aided by that excellent Society, has a parish or district of some eight thousand souls. Their average income, it may be stated, is £330 a year, while one hundred and fifty-six of these aided parishes have no parsonage-houses.[1]

[1] The Church Pastoral Aid Society was established in the year 1836, a period when, on the lowest calculation, 3,000,000 of the inhabitants of England and Wales were utterly destitute of the means of grace. In many of the new parochial districts which were formed the minister's stipend was paid by the Society for several years.

The problem before the Church, therefore, at the present time is twofold: first, How to provide churches, clergy, and Church workers, in proportion to the growth of the population; and secondly (in some respects the more perplexing portion of the problem), How to get hold of the working-classes so as to induce them to "assemble themselves together." All will admit, of course, that "our land will yield her increase" only when of the tens of thousands of our artisans and labourers, the question needs no longer to be asked, "Can they be brought in?"

We come now to the pamphlet of the Bishop of Liverpool. A man of great ability, as everybody knows, whose statesman-like gifts would have made themselves felt had he sought to be a Ministerial administrator, Dr. Ryle is peculiarly well qualified as a Bishop to give advice upon this great question: "Why are the working-classes absent from Church; and how can they be brought in?"

The pamphlet consists chiefly of the address which the Bishop delivered at the Derby Congress;[1] but from lack of time many things were then left unsaid, and several pages, dealing with two special suggestions, have been added to the address. The two fresh suggestions are these: (1) The Church must have a great increase of living agents in the large overgrown parishes where working-men chiefly reside; (2) the Church ought to provide facilities for an organized system of aggressive evangelization in her large parishes.

Under the first heading the Bishop writes thus:

No man, however zealous, can do more than a certain amount of work. To suppose that the Incumbent of a parish of 10,000 people in a mining, manufacturing, or seaport district can keep pace with, or overtake, the spiritual wants of his parishioners, so long as he is single-handed and alone, is simply absurd. The thing is physically impossible. When he has every week read the Services and preached sermons, married, baptized, and buried according to requirement, visited a few sick, and superintended his schools, his week will be gone. There will be hundreds of houses which he has no time to enter, and even thousands of men and women whom he does not know, and who hardly know his name. Can anyone wonder if the isolated Incumbent of such a parish breaks down in health and heart, and resigns or dies? Have we any right to be surprised if the working-classes in such a parish live without religion, and are a prey to drunkenness, gambling, extravagance, improvidence, Sabbath-breaking, unchastity, and general immorality? What else can be expected from human nature, if half-educated men and women are never visited, and are left to themselves? What right have we to be surprised and indignant if many of them join some Nonconformist body, or go

[1] In the November CHURCHMAN were mentioned the three divisions of the Bishop's paper, as read at the Congress.

over to the Church of Rome? Why should they care for a Church which does not seem to care for them? To frown on seceders in such a case as schismatics is senseless and foolish. If the Church of England really wants to get hold of, and keep hold of, the working-classes in such a district as I have described, she must send more living agents among them. If she does not begin here, she will certainly lose them, and in many cases has lost them already. If she does not go down to the people, the people will not come up to her.

When I speak of living agents, I mean Missionary Curates, Scripture-readers, lay-agents, Bible-women, and voluntary lay-helpers. To begin spiritual operations by building churches in huge, overgrown, neglected parishes of working folks, is useless waste of money and time. It is beginning at the wrong end. You may build the churches, as certain well-meaning men did in Bethnal Green, forty-five years ago, and find them, by-and-by, as empty as barns in July. The right course is to walk in the steps of the Apostles, and begin with living agency.

"This then is our first step," says the Bishop; "we must send living agents from street to street, and lane to lane, and alley to alley, and house to house, and room to room, and garret to garret, and cellar to cellar, until there is not a working man or woman in the parish who has not been looked in the face, or shaken by the hand, and until not one can say, 'The Church of England does not care for my soul.'"

In unfolding his second suggestion the Bishop speaks with laudable plainness, especially in regard to neglected parishes. "The extremely critical position of our beloved Church in many of our large parishes," says his lordship, "makes plain-speaking a positive duty;" and, certainly, of all administrative blunders few are worse than to shut one's eyes to damaging defects, or apply mere surface treatment to serious sores.

The parochial system of the Church, unquestionably, is an admirable and beneficent system when it is properly worked; but when it is worked badly, or not worked at all, the parochial system becomes a most damaging institution, a weakness, and not a strength to the Established Church:

Now it is nonsense to deny [says Bishop Ryle] that there are some large parishes in almost every diocese in England where the parochial clergyman, from one cause or another, does little or nothing. The parishioners are not visited, and are like sheep without a shepherd. The bulk of the people never come near the church at all. Sin, and immorality, and ignorance, and infidelity increase and multiply every year. The few who worship anywhere take refuge in the chapels of Methodists, Baptists, and Independents, if not in more questionable places of worship. The parish church is comparatively deserted. People in such parishes live and die with an abiding impression that the Church of England is a rotten, useless institution, and bequeath to their families a legacy of prejudice against the Church, which lasts for ever. Will anyone pretend to tell me that there are not many large English parishes in

this condition? I defy him to do so. I am writing down things that are only too true, and it is vain to pretend to conceal them.

But what does the Church of England do for such parishes as these? I answer, *Nothing, nothing at all!*—It is precisely here that our territorial system fails and breaks down altogether. So long as the parochial minister does his duty up to the bare letter of legal requirement, it is a ruled point, both in theory and in practice, and a matter of ecclesiastical etiquette, that nobody must interfere with him? His people may be perishing for lack of knowledge! Infidels, Mormonites, and Papists may be going to and fro, and beguiling unstable souls! Dissenters of all sorts may be building chapels, and filling them with the families of aggrieved and neglected Churchmen! The children of the Church may be drawn away from her every year by scores! But no matter! The Church cannot interfere! The Church of England looks on with folded arms, and does nothing at all. Can anyone imagine a more ruinous system? Can anyone wonder that some irritated and disgusted Churchmen become confirmed Dissenters, and that others despise or loathe the Church which allows such a state of things to go on, and that thousands relapse into a state of heathenism?

One matter may here be touched upon. As the law now stands the Bishop is not without power to effect a plainly needed division in an overgrown parish. The difficulty is, of course, the finding the funds. It may be better, however, in certain cases, to cut off a portion of the parish, according to law, whether the indolent or incapable Incumbent agree or disagree; and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are by no means unready to strengthen local efforts. Granted, however, that some thousands of the parishioners may be placed, legally, under another Pastor, what advantage then would the people in the untouched portion of the parish have obtained? None at all. The old Vicar would be their Vicar still. Clearly, something else is needed. Now the Bill brought in last year by the Bishop of Exeter, and approved by Convocation, may do good service; it is, at all events, a step in the right direction. This measure (The Pluralities Act Amendment Bill) was adopted in the House of Lords, but, like other good and timely measures, was not even discussed in the House of Commons.

Upon one point we thoroughly agree with the Bishop of Liverpool. "The 'Incumbent's Resignation Act,' which enables a clergyman, after a commission of inquiry, to resign his living, and retire with one-third of the income for his life," says the Bishop, "is open to grave objections. To ask the old incumbent of a living worth £300 a year to resign, and finish his days on £100 a year for himself, wife, and family, is senseless and unreasonable. Nor does the defectiveness of the Act end here. The patrons of the living after a resignation are hampered and limited in their choice of a successor by one-third of the

income being taken away. A well-devised superannuation fund is greatly wanted in the Church of England."

Bishop Ryle suggests the institution of an order of diocesan "Evangelists." "Let the Bishop of every diocese," he says, "be empowered to call into existence a new class of ministers, to be named 'Evangelists.' Let him be empowered, with the advice of a select Council of presbyters and leading laymen, to arrange with any Incumbent of a large overgrown parish to separate from such parish a district of 3,000 or 4,000 people, and place them under the charge of an Evangelist, to work in any way that he can. Let the Evangelist be licensed to the Bishop, and responsible to him and his council only, they undertaking to superintend and maintain him. Let the Incumbent of the mother Church be set free from any responsibility whatever for the separated district."

Now this suggestion, of course, is open to objections; but the objections are certainly not insuperable.[1] The beneficial results of the London Diocesan scheme are well known; and in the diocese of Rochester Evangelists, both clerical and lay, are working with great success. For ourselves, we have long been of opinion that fresh legal powers are needed for a Bishop in regard to overgrown or scandalously neglected parishes. Without a new Act of Parliament, however, much may be effected by amicable arrangement with Incumbents who are overworked; and although we have no personal knowledge of the diocese of Liverpool we shall be much surprised if this pamphlet—an earnest and stirring appeal—does not soon bear fruit in gifts for Scripture-readers, Mission Curates or "Evangelists," and other workers, paid and voluntary, who are "attached."

That the Church needs money in the large towns, and needs it sorely, is admitted on all sides. The Bishop of Lincoln pleads for increased support, and he points to Nottingham, as needing both new districts and mission clergy. Some portion of his Lordship's most recent appeal, containing a reference to the funeral of M. Gambetta, may well be quoted here. The Bishop said:

[1] "Some man," says Bishop Ryle, "will object that the scheme I propose would break up the parochial system, and greatly damage the Church of England. I do not believe it a bit. I believe, on the contrary, to begin with, that it would do immense good among the laity. It would rally them round the Church of England, and show them that they were not entirely forgotten. It would keep them within the pale of the Church, and preserve them from being carried off by Dissenters and Plymouth Brethren. But I go a step further. I believe it would do good eventually among the parochial clergy. They would see at last that the diocesan Evangelist did not come into their parishes as an enemy, but as a friend. They would gradually learn to value his aid." Other objections the Bishop answers with his usual skill.

The fact is not to be forgotten, as among the most striking phenomena of the present day, that on that great Christian festival of the Epiphany, in the capital city of the nation whose Sovereign was formerly styled the most Christian King, and which was itself called the eldest daughter of the Church, and at the funeral of one of its greatest citizens, who was followed to the cemetery of Père la Chaise by almost a whole population, there was not a ray of light gleaming from the Star of Bethlehem to enlighten the darkness of the tomb; not a single sunbeam of the Gospel of Christ to gild the black pall and bier of the dead, and to cheer the gloom of that national mourning; not a single whisper of Christianity was breathed in all those funeral orations over the corpse, not a single syllable of reference to the awful realities of death, resurrection, judgment, and eternity. Why do I mention all this? Because if we, in our English towns, do not encourage efforts to Christianize the almost heathen masses of our own vast populous cities—if we do not encourage home missionary enterprises by spreading the Gospel of Christ, and the knowledge of God's Holy Word, and to inculcate the belief in His omnipresence and omnipotence, and in the responsibility of all men, and in a judgment to come, and in future rewards and punishments, then our Nottinghams will become like that great and illustrious Continental city to which I have referred, and the perishable things of earth will be our all in all, and national restlessness, confusion, and anarchy will be the result.

The Bishop of Rochester issues an appeal for ten new churches in South London; and he asks his diocese to contribute at least £10,000 a year for diocesan Mission Work.[1] The Bishop of Liverpool makes certain statements; taking a broad view of the facts of the case, he offers suggestions: if these remedies "could be vigorously applied," says the right rev. prelate, "I should have no fears for my beloved country or my Church. If they are not applied, I see nothing before us but ruin." Now, in the forefront of his remedies comes the question of money. If the Church's wealthy children among the laity will not come forward and enable her to multiply her living agents, she will be ruined. Certainly there is no point on which Church folk need educating more than on that of giving. It is one consequence of an Establishment, and a very

[1] The Rochester Diocesan Society, at present, provides 19 Clergy for Mission Districts, 24 Scripture Readers, 46 Mission Women, with other "living agents." MANY MORE CLERGY ARE REQUIRED.

A deeply interesting little pamphlet has lately been sent to us by Mr. Grundy, the able organizing Secretary of the Rochester Diocesan Society, viz., "Bishop's Visits to the Mission Districts." It seems that at the November meeting of the Council, Canon Money forcibly impressed the desirableness of making a thorough investigation into the working of the Mission Districts, and the Bishop at once proposed to visit them himself, and report orally to the Council. The account of the Bishop's visits, as we have said, is full of interest. Bishop Thorold is an able administrator, judicious, unsparing in labour, and of a loving missionary spirit. May God touch the hearts of many wealthy Church people who read this report!

evil consequence, that people think too much of the endowments.

Again, reforms are needed. In our great towns, the interest of the working classes in their own church ought to be more largely fostered.[1] In these democratic days it seems specially necessary to increase the number of voluntary Workers. The Church, we think, is too aristocratic, and the Incumbent is too much of an autocrat. Reforms are needed. As Bishop Ryle well says, the "Church is sadly wanting in elasticity and power of adapting herself to circumstances. Its organization is stiff and rigid like a bar of cast-iron, when it ought to be supple and bending like whalebone." The leading journal[2] lately pointed out some flaws in our system. "There is no Church," said the *Times*, "there is no Government, there is no institution in the world that so little adapts its means to its ends, its resources to work, its men to its positions, as the Church of England. The fact is proved, the want supplied, and the evil mitigated by the surrounding atmosphere of Nonconformity, everywhere pressing in to fill the void." Again. "The good work to be done," says the *Times*, "is as plain and as universal as the sun in the heavens."

The school and the field of true faith is all the world, and knows no demarcations or prohibitions. An artificial and cumbersome establishment, standing upon gone-by ages, and inheriting innumerable anomalies, hindrances, and scandals, may be too sacred a thing to be rudely handled. But it cannot cover the ground, or reap the harvest. Part—indeed, the greater part—must be left to those who, if less privileged, are less trammelled, and who have the power not of authority, but of freedom. In such a case there must be some jarring, some antagonism. How shall it be cured? How shall the Established Church acquire for itself that full liberty of action which it continually sees employed against itself? It must condescend to gather all the lessons it can from the organization and tactics of those whom it only too naturally regards as its rivals, if not foes. How do they get possession of the ground? How do they advance everywhere, and hold the ground they win? They do it by the use of common-sense.

---

[1] The Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, M.P., a year or two ago, made use of these words: "Would that more power could be given to parishioners to associate themselves with the management of the Church, which, whatever the definition of the law may be, is after all *their* Church! Would that the laity might be given some voice in parish business connected with the church, its services, and its charitable work! The despotic sway of the parish incumbent is opposed to the whole spirit of the age. It is, in my judgment, dangerous to the interests of the Church. But a distinct and visible connection of the national lay element with the local management of the Church would strengthen the foundations of religion, soften sectarian distinctions, and open up a fresh and most ennobling influence in local life."

[2] *Times*, Feb. 14, 1883, quoted by the Bishop of Liverpool.

Several suggestions, of course, have been made in regard to the working classes. The lay Diaconate, as the readers of THE CHURCHMAN are aware, seems to us an urgent reform. How otherwise can money and men enough for the Church's need be got? We have pleaded, also, for a diocesan system of mission-preaching; in parishes where Missions are sorely needed they are never held. Again, as regards our services, simplification and elasticity are needed; but upon these and other matters of Church Reform we do not now touch. We desire, with all earnestness, to recommend the Bishop of Liverpool's pamphlet; and the prayers of all true Christian people in this land may well be sought, that with more of hope the question may be asked about the myriads of our working classes—How shall they be brought in?

Reviews.

The Honourable Henry Erskine, Lord Advocate for Scotland, with Notices of certain of his Kinsfolk and of his Time. Compiled from Family Papers and other sources of information. By Lieut.-Colonel ALEX. FERGUSSON, late of the Staff of Her Majesty's Indian Army. Pp. 560. Blackwood, Edinburgh and London.

IN the year 1806, Thomas Erskine, the leader of the English Bar, was elevated to the Peerage and the Woolsack. Henry Erskine, after filling a corresponding position at the Scotch Bar, had been made Lord Advocate. As to which of these two brothers was the more highly gifted, not a few of their friends would have found it difficult to give an opinion. Thomas, perhaps, was the more eloquent, while Henry excelled in wit. Both were great lawyers, and gave ample proof of genius. Henry was born in 1746, Thomas three years later. The eldest son of the family, David Henry, Lord Cardross (the eleventh Earl of Buchan,) was born in 1742. Earl David, on one occasion, was speaking of the brilliant talents of his family, and the Duchess of Gordon inquired whether it was not the case that the family talents had come by the *mother's side*, and so were all settled on the *younger* sons. The "mother," of whom the brilliant Duchess spoke, was a woman of extraordinary intellect, highly cultured; the father, the tenth Earl of Buchan, was an amiable much-respected man, of no particular power. Certainly, the history of the "long descended" Erskines is curious, and presents many points of interest. A glimpse of the ancestry of *Harry* Erskine is given in the book before us. A learned professor, on looking over the display of great names which is laid before the reader—Visconti, Della Seala, and Doria, Bourbon, Lenox, Mar, and Royal Steuarts, Stair, Fairfax (and not the least honourable), Sir Thomas Browne—has remarked that if there be any faith to be placed in the

theory of the inheritance of mental qualities, especially through the female line, we should expect to see here, following this scheme of descent, "true genius or great eccentricity—perhaps both."

The wife of Henry David, the tenth Earl, was, as we have said, greatly gifted; she was both good and beautiful. The influence of maternal blood was never more strikingly illustrated than in the case of this lady's children. She was the daughter of Sir James Steuart, of Coltness, and his wife the witty and beautiful Anne Dalrymple.[1] Her grandfather was Sir James Steuart, the Lord Advocate, who occupied so prominent a place in Scotch affairs after the Revolution and in the reign of Queen Anne. This Sir James was the idol of one party and the abomination of another. Of his character Macaulay writes severely; on the other hand, according to Wodrow, he "was wonderful in prayer and mighty in the Scriptures," one of the excellent of the earth. The wife of this "great man and extraordinary Christian" was Agnes Trail, a member of an ancient Fifeshire family. Her father was the Rev. Robert Trail, who attended the Marquis of Montrose on the scaffold, and who became minister of Greyfriars' Church, in Edinburgh. Of Sir James Steuart many pieces of poetry, both in praise and blame, were published. For example, one began with these lines—

> "Quam formosa tua et facies tenebrosa Steuarte,
> Quam simplex, duplex, quam falsum pectus honesti,"

and in the vestibule of the Library of the Writers to the Signet is a fine portrait of this Steuarte, in which the countenance "formosa et tenebrosa" is strikingly recognisable. One thing is clear. The death of the Lord Advocate, as our author says, "was felt to be a heavy blow to the State and the Church of Scotland." According to Miss Mure, of Caldwell, a lady of an honourable house, the funeral remarkably displayed the esteem in which he was held.

It will readily be believed, writes our author, "that if ever there was a household, in more recent times, which might have been expected to be pervaded by the very atmosphere of the Solemn League and Covenant, it was that of the Earl of Buchan and his excellent wife, Agnes Steuart. In both their families the experience had been very much the same. In both, the memories of suffering, imprisonment, and exile, were fresh. In the case of Lord Buchan, doubtless, the traditions of the good Lord Cardross had some share in inspiring him with a strict, if not rigid Presbyterianism in opinion and manners, little differing from that of Lady Buchan herself, tempered though her views, no doubt, were by the enlightenment of a highly cultivated mind. Mr. Walter Bagehot has said that pure Whiggism is a character more than a political creed. One can well conceive it being so in a case like this, where precept, example, and family tradition all tended to a like result; and it is not difficult to understand how Whiggism became part of the character of Lord Buchan's three sons. His lordship is described by his grandson in the MS. which has been mentioned as partly forming the basis of this memoir, as 'a zealously religious man, strong in his anti-Roman con-

[1] Anne Dalrymple was niece, and Agnes, Lady Buchan, grandniece, of the "Lammermuir," that is to say of Janet Dalrymple, daughter of the first Viscount Stair.

victions, though he inclined, in a quiet way, towards the Stewarts.'" He was cautious, however; by no means disposed to run risks for doubtful advantages. When Prince Charles Edward held his Court at Holyrood, Lord Buchan, though urged by his brother-in-law, Sir James Steuart, of Coltness, declined to present himself to pay his respects to the Pretender.

The two great lawyers, Henry and Thomas Erskine, were born at the family house at the head of Gray's Close. At that time the fortunes of this branch of the Erskines were far from being in a flourishing state.[1] Lord Buchan had sold the estate of Cardross to a cousin, and from one cause or another the family income was reduced. There remained enough, however, for a *ménage*, which, though on a comparatively limited scale, was sufficient, according to the notions of those days. The cosy "dish of tea," which was then an institution, and almost the only form of social entertainment, cost little and availed much in the way of unpretending hospitality. The countess had the name of a notable manager; and although a woman of "brilliant imagination," and of singular accomplishments—she had even studied mathematics under the famous Colin Maclaurin, the friend of Sir Isaac Newton—she had the useful qualities of a "careful house-mother." "My Lady Buchan's cyder," wrote Mrs. Calderwood, "is the best I ever tasted." The *entrée* to the little establishment, presided over by this excellent lady, became a thing to be sought after. The society to be met there was singularly attractive; as to others so also to the leaders of the general assembly. The countess, as has been said, was eminent for her earnest piety; and it was no wonder that distinguished Presbyterian ministers should pay every respect to the Erskine family.

At the country house at Uphall, the three Erskine lads were taught by a Mr. Buchanan, afterwards a professor at Glasgow. Lady Buchan's housekeeper was very economical, and the lads were sometimes made very cross by her canny cautions. For instance, when some dainty dish was set upon the table she was heard to say: "Noo, boys, ye're no to tak ony o' yon; I've just sent it up for lo'e o' my lord." This frugality on the part of the old housekeeper was the cause, no doubt, of the following effusion from Tom's pen, the first specimen of the future Lord Chancellor's "Thread-paper Rhymes":—

Papa is going to London,
And what will we get then, oh!
But sautless kail, and an old cow's tail,
And half the leg of a hen, oh!

Lord Buchan, it appears, had a high notion of the use of the disagreeable as a salutary discipline for young people. His children disliked veal, so veal was ordered every day as part of their dinner for a long while. To his children, at that time and in later years, overstrictness in such matters does not seem to have commended itself.

Thomas Erskine, after his naval and military service, matriculated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1776. Henry matriculated as a student

[1] In his "Life of Lord Erskine," Lord Campbell exaggerated the poverty of the Erskine family. He desired, no doubt, to *point* the rapid rise of his hero. But, instead of the squalid flat, readers of Lord Campbell's "Life," ought to see a substantial town house; and instead of a half-ruined castle, a comfortable country house.

at St. Andrews in 1760. In that year the family had removed to St. Andrews, apparently on account of the younger boys' university education. Henry's instructor in natural philosophy was Professor Wilkie, an odd creature, author of the *Epigoniad*, which Hume rated highly; now utterly unknown. One of the professor's oddities was absence of mind. Meeting a former pupil in the streets, he said: "I was sorry, my dear boy, to hear you have had the fever in your family; was it you or your brother who died of it?" "It was me, sir," was the reply. "Ah, dear me, I thought so! very sorry for it—very sorry for it."

In the year 1763, the family removed to Bath.[1] Before leaving Scotland, the arrangements for sending Tom to sea, as midshipman, were completed. Sixty years later, when Thomas Erskine had become the most distinguished Scotchman of the day, he recalled the "long, lifeless, unadorned street of St. Andrews . . . ." To this description Lord Campbell rather demurred; but we think Lord Erskine was not far wrong. When his parents removed to Bath, Henry Erskine went to Glasgow, where, in 1764, he matriculated:—

Henricus Erskine, filius natu secundus viri adprime honorabilis Henrici, Comitis de Buchan.

With Lord Buchan's son matriculated William Hervey, only son of the Hon. Thomas Hervey, who was designated "*admodum* honorabilis."

In Bath, at this time—we quote Colonel Fergusson—the plain, old, simple, unfashionable gospel was preached in purity, under the auspices of George Whitefield and Selina, Countess of Huntingdon:[2]

No doubt the good old lord saw in the Calvinistic tenets which were characteristic of this section of the Methodist body, and the system of Church membership obtaining in Lady Huntingdon's party the nearest approach to his own ideas of doctrine and Church government that he was likely to find in the Church of England.

Moreover, the acquaintance of the Erskine family with both Lady Huntingdon and Whitefield is likely to have influenced the Earl in his choice of Bath as a residence. His sister, Lady Frances Gardiner, had been for years a friend and correspondent of Lady Huntingdon; and when Whitefield paid his first visit to Scotland he had made acquaintance with and been kindly received by more than one member of the family.

Indeed, the first invitation to Whitefield to come to Scotland was from the Earl's "far away cousins," the well-known Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine, who had but recently seceded from the Church of Scotland. They strongly pressed Whitefield to come to Dunfermline and preach, though they said he would find the Scotch "lifeless, lukewarm, and upsitten." Whitefild came to Edinburgh, but would neither preach nor stop till he had reached his hosts at Dunfermline. But a heavy disappointment befell them, for when they looked that their guest should have opened the thunders of his eloquence in execration of the demon patronage, and in praise of the Solemn League and Covenant, they found that he literally

[1] Horace Walpole writes from Bath: "There was [at the rooms] a Scotch countess of Buchan carrying a pure, rosy, vulgar face to heaven, and who asked Miss Rich if that was not the '*author of the Poets*.' I believe she meant me and the 'Noble authors.'" The sentiments of that witty worldling regarding everything Scotch are well known.

[2] In the society of Lady Huntingdon, and of the elder members of the Hawkstone family (the Hills), Lady Anne Agnes Erskine, at this time twenty-four years of age, found a companionship perfectly suited to her taste. On the death of her father, Lady Anne Erskine permanently took up her abode with Lady Huntingdon. In 1779 was opened Spafields Chapel; the house attached to the chapel Lady Anne made her home.

cared for none of these things, and that his one fixed idea was the saving of souls, and that so far from confining his preaching to the sect originated by the Erskines, he was ready and willing to preach in the Pope's pulpit if his Holiness would lend it to him.

Whitefield's work was stated to be nothing but "diabolical delusion." It is painful to read of such bitter sectarianism. The quarrel, however, after a time was "made up." By Lady Jean Nimmo, and others of the Scotch nobility, the great preacher was most graciously received.

In 1766, Lord Buchan, who had been the college companion of Pitt at Utrecht, obtained an appointment for his eldest son. Lord Chatham suggested to Lord Shelburne that he should appoint Lord Cardross, the son of his "intimate friend," as Secretary to the Spanish Embassy under Sir James Gray. The appointment was duly gazetted. Lord Cardross, however, declined to proceed to Madrid, alleging forsooth that the Ambassador was a person of inferior social rank. Sir James's father, according to Walpole, was first a box-keeper and then a footman to King James II. Boswell relates that at Sir Alexander Macdonald's a discussion arose whether the young lord was justified in his refusal. Dr. Johnson said that perhaps in point of interest he did wrong, but in point of dignity he did well. Sir Alexander held that he was altogether wrong, and said that Lord Chatham intended it as an advantageous thing for him. "Why, sir," said Johnson, "Lord Chatham might think it an advantageous thing for him to make him a vintner, and get him all the Portugal trade ; but he would have demeaned himself strangely had he accepted of such a situation: Sir, had he gone Secretary, while his inferior was Ambassador, he would have been a traitor to his rank and family!" It is curious in these days to read such a discussion. Mr. Croker's query is pertinent. Would Johnson have dissuaded Lord Cardross, on such grounds, from joining the army ?

When the old Earl died at his home at Walcot, Mr. Whitefield conducted a funeral service. On the narrative of the proceedings,[1] Colonel Ferguson makes certain comments, in which many of his readers, no doubt, will concur. Yet it ought not to be forgotten that at the time when Whitefield was carrying on his great work, few "noble" persons ranked themselves on the Lord's side ; and, further, that pure evangelical preaching in Established Church pulpits or anywhere else was seldom heard either on the north or the south sides of the Tweed.

Whilst studying at Glasgow University Henry Erskine spent his vacations at the house of the Erskines, of Cardross. Mrs. Erskine was ever proud of Henry, her charge ; and when he became famous she delighted to recall traits of his boyhood. After expressing admiration for his bright smile and happy temper, she would add, "But, dear sakes! he was a desperate laddie for lozing his pocket hankies!" In the year 1768 he was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates. His rise to eminence in his profession began at once, and was soon established ; his superiority as a lawyer was never afterwards questioned. According to his son, the Earl of Buchan, he began his law career in Edinburgh

[1] *Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon* (by a Member of the Houses of Shirley and Hastings). Vol. ii., pp. 16, 17.

with reluctance; "he wished to go into the English Church;"[1] and he did not exert himself. However this may be, he attained the highest rank in his profession without difficulty. His first success as a pleader was attained in the debates in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; so it was with his great rival Henry Dundas. His manners were in the highest degree polished; he was witty and amiable; he was one of the handsomest men in Scotland. No wonder that he so soon in the Courts, as elsewhere, became "a success." His speeches were brilliant as well as learned. "All his wit," said Lord Jeffrey, "was argument." If at times his language was "dashing and free," it betokened thought, and was effective. "Erskine's playfulness," says Lord Cockburn, "was always an argumentative instrument. He reasoned in wit; and, untempted by the bad taste and the weakness of desiring to prolong it for his own sake, it ceased the very instant that the reasoning was served." On one occasion, having to address "the fifteen" judges, in a case which presented no difficulty, the young man began: "My lords, the facts of the case are so exceedingly simple, and the evidence that I shall adduce so perfectly conclusive, that I am happy to say I shall not need to take up much of your lordships' time. I shall be very brief." This exordium, however, did not harmonise with the expectations of some of their lordships, had settled themselves down for an intellectual treat, and one of them called out: "Hoots, Maister Harry, dinna be brief, dinna be brief."

In 1772, Henry Erskine was married to Christian Fullerton, an heiress, who made him an excellent wife. His brother Thomas had been married two years before; but his income was almost nothing.[2] Mrs. Henry Erskine's four o'clock tea (the dinner hour being three) was much appreciated. At these teas a strict ritual was in force. What guests taste their tea with the tea-spoon nowadays, the hostess asking if it be "agreeable"? The routine of four o'clock teas in those days, when the tea-spoons were numbered, is described by Sir Alexander Boswell:—

> The red stone teapot with its silver spout,
> The tea-spoons numbered, and the tea *fill'd out!*

when "to all again at once" the hostess granted the boon, "dispensing her gunpowder by platoon." Henry Erskine was always a temperate, indeed an abstemious, man; but society in Edinburgh, at that time, sadly lacked refinement. Sydney Smith's language about "barbarous sounds, bad suppers," and so forth, in his day, might with much more justice, perhaps, have been applied to the period of 1740—1780. At the tavern suppers there was a great deal of heavy drinking; and many educated men, lawyers as well as lairds behaved like Balmawhapple in "Waverley." The picture in "Guy Mannering" was drawn from the life; and ac-

---

[1] Mr. Erskine, Colonel Fergusson opines, saw beauty in the regularity of Episcopal order, and admired the noble thoughts and language of rhythmical cadence in the Church of England's Liturgy. To come to a later date, Mr. Erskine engaged a clergyman, we may mention, Dr. Sandford (afterwards *Bishop*), to undertake the direction of his boy's studies.

[2] Another Lord Chancellor of England, who began his career in the Royal Navy, has described a midshipman's income as "Nothing a year and keep yourself;" a young barrister's as "Nothing a year and keep yourself and your clerk." To this last definition add the item of a wife, and something not very far removed from the position of the Hon. Thos. Erskine at this time is described.

cording to Dr. Alexander Carlyle, ministers and elders were also prone to strong potations. "Convivialities," were, in truth, but feebly blamed. A warm joviality was apt to be looked upon, even among well-educated men, as a sign of good-fellowship. Of all the boisterous free-livers of the age, Thomas Erskine's cousin, the "musical" Earl of Kellie, was perhaps the most unruly.

Lord George Gordon, after the Gordon riots, was tried on a charge of high treason; he was successfully defended by Thomas Erskine, whose speech has been warmly and justly commended by Lord Campbell.[1] Thomas Erskine, it may here be stated, "was very proud and fond of his sister," Lady Anne, who carried on the work of the Huntingdon Connection. According to his nephew, the twelfth Earl of Buchan, he never let many days pass without going to see her, "in her little house in Spafields." Mr. Venn's expression touching the Countess of Huntingdon, "a star of the very first magnitude in the religious world," may in some sort be applied to her very sensible and spiritually minded successor, Lady Anne Erskine.

The volume before us contains a good many anecdotes, and some of these help us to understand the manners and customs of Edinburgh in that period. One relates to an ill-favoured, half-starved looking advocate named Arnot, of *quasi*-atheistical opinions. On a certain occasion, returning from a Sunday afternoon ride, on his well-known white horse, he met Mr. Erskine, who had been attending in divine service. Arnot called out to him, "Where have you been, Harry? What has a man of your sense to do consorting with a parcel of old women? I protest you could expect to hear nothing new;" adding, with an extra sneer, "What now, was your *text?*" "Our text," replied Harry, with a voice of impressive solemnity, his eye sternly fixed the while on the white horse and his rider, "was from the sixth chapter of the Book of Revelation and the eighth verse: 'And I looked, and behold a *Pale Horse:* and his name that sat on him was DEATH, and *Hell* followed with him.'" This was too much for the sceptic, and he rode off.

A young counsel, who was with Mr. Erskine in a case before "the fifteen," ventured to say, after some discussion, that he was *surprised* to hear their lordships say so and so. A sharp reproof followed, to the confusion of the junior and the probable prejudice of the client. When Erskine rose, he expressed the fullest concurrence in the regret felt by his young friend for the thoughtless expression; "when he has practised as long at this Bar as I have, I can safely say he will be *surprised at nothing* your lordships may say." The laugh that ensued had the effect desired.

When Dr. Johnson was being lionised in Edinburgh, Mr. Erskine did not seek an introduction; but as he passed the lion (or bear) and his leader, he slipped a shilling into Boswell's hand.

In 1783, under the Coalition Ministry, Mr. Erskine became Lord Advocate. An interview between the new and the old Lord Advocate (H. Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville) was held; and Mr. Erskine playfully remarked that he ought to order his silk gown. "It is hardly worth while," said Dundas drily, "for the time you will want it; you had better borrow mine." The new Lord Advocate replied he would not

[1] *Lives of the Chancellors*, viii. 250.

have it said of Henry Erskine that "he adopted the *abandoned habits* of his predecessor." But Dundas saw clearly; Erskine had but little use of his silk. When the short-lived Whig Ministry came to an end, Erskine was succeeded by Mr. Ilay Campbell, a shorter man than himself, and on offering to hand on the gown, he said, "My lord, you must take nothing off it, for I'll (*sic*) soon need it again." "It will be *bare* enough, Harry," retorted Campbell, "before you get it again." He did get it again, but not till after twenty years had passed.

When the Prince of Wales made a progress among the Whigs of the northern counties, Mr. Erskine was invited to meet His Royal Highness at Wentworth; and Lord Buchan writes that the Prince "appropriated" his father whenever he was in London. He was presented to "the sleepiest prince in Europe," as the Prince of Wales described the Stadtholder in an *aside* to Erskine, and his witty conversation served to keep the Stadtholder from nodding. Sleepy as this prince was, however, he was by no means stupid; on some occasions he showed himself inconveniently wide awake. An instance is given in a book which was noticed in THE CHURCHMAN some three years ago. According to Gunning's "Reminiscences," when the Stadtholder paid a visit to Cambridge, he was officially attended by the Vice-Chancellor to and from St. Mary's Church. When we were all assembled at the Stadtholder's inn, writes Gunning, he unfortunately asked whence the text was taken. "As we were none of us very clear on that subject, we held our tongues; but Beverley, with his usual intrepidity, answered, 'It was from the Second Epistle of Jude.'—'There is but one epistle,' said the Stadtholder.—'Certainly not,' said Beverley, 'I intended to have said the second chapter!'—'Unfortunately,' said his serene Highness, 'there is but one chapter!' Beverley's blunder soon spread, and two lines of a university song on it ran thus:—

For the future be shy, nor dare to reply,
But remember the Second of Jude!

As to the pronunciation of certain terms by Scottish lawyers, we may quote from Colonel Fergusson as follows:—

On one occasion, it is related, Harry Erskine was addressing a committee of the House of Lords regarding some trust business. In the course of his speech he had frequently occasion to mention the "cūrātors," always pronouncing the word in the manner approved in the Scottish Courts—that is, with the accent on the first syllable. One of the English judges—Mr. Erskine's son understood that it was Lord Mansfield who was so fastidious—could stand this no longer, and exclaimed:—

"Mr. Erskine, we are in the habit in this country of saying *curātor*, following the analogy of the Latin, in which, as you are aware, the penultimate syllable is long."

"I thank your lordship very much," was Erskine's reply; "we are weak enough in Scotland to think that in pronouncing the word *cūrātor*, we follow the analogy of the *English* language; but I need scarcely say that I bow with pleasure to the opinion of so learned a *senātor*, and so great an *orātor*, as your lordship."

Lord Mansfield being himself an emigrant from Scotland, was doubtless not unwilling to show his own superior attainments in the direction of civilisation, forgetful how ticklish a question is that of the quantities of classical words in English.

Several passages in this volume, relating to the Moderates and the state of religion in Scotland before the time of Chalmers, we had marked for comment; but our space is exhausted, and we must forbear.

Central Palestine and Phœnicia. By WILLIAM M. THOMSON, D.D., forty-five years a Missionary in Syria and Palestine. With 130 illustrations and maps. Pp. 680. London: T. Nelson & Sons, 1883.

Central Palestine, comprising Samaria and Lower and Upper Galilee, was not only the largest, but also the most beautiful and fertile portion of the land of Israel, and is now pre-eminently distinguished for the number, variety, and importance of its historic sites and sacred scenes. There lived and laboured most of the great prophets mentioned in the Old Testament, and there also dwelt the Saviour of men during nearly the entire period of His life on earth. Though He was born in Bethlehem, Nazareth was His home, and in Capernaum, "His own city," on the shore of the Sea of Gennesaret, many of His mighty works were accomplished. He may not have entered those ancient Phœnician towns, still He visited "the coasts of Tyre and Sidon," and there performed one of His acts of tender compassion and healing mercy.

The preceding paragraph we have quoted from the preface to the volume before us, Dr. Thomson's work on "Central Palestine and Phœnicia." To the intelligent tourist, to the devout believer, and the student of the Bible, the entire conntry from Bethlehem to Dan, and from Dan to Hermon, the Mount of the Transfiguration, and from there to the "coasts of Tyre and Sidon," is invested with unparalleled interest. Dr. Thomson's "personal acquaintance with that region," we read, "has been exceptionally intimate; for through every part of it he has wandered with delight for forty years and more, and to describe it has been a labour of love." Where he has been he guides his reader, through that "good land" of mountain and vale and lake and river: to the shepherd's tent, the peasant's hut, the palace of kings, the hermit's cave, the temple of the gods—to the haunts of the living and the sepulchres of the dead—to muse on what *has been* and converse with what *is*, and learn from all what they teach concerning the oracles of God.

There is hardly a page of this book—readable and instructive from beginning to end—from which a reviewer might not take something of interest. The author's pen-pictures have life and truthfulness, and not a passage in either his descriptions or expository-illustrations is in anywise dull. Open the book where one may, a choice historical allusion, or a pretty bit of scenery, or a suggestive criticism, or some attractive local gossip, is sure to meet the eye. For instance, of the city of Zacharias and Elisabeth, 'Ain Kârim (Luke i. 39), we read:

> Forty-five years ago 'Ain Kârim was nearly deserted, and the buildings about the sacred localities were in a state of wretched neglect. The Franciscan monks have now restored all the dilapidated sites, and have also erected one of the finest convents in the Holy Land. . . The dwelling-house of Zacharias has been erected since my first visit, and the entire appearance of the place is so changed for the better that I can scarcely recognise in the flourishing village of nearly 1,000 inhabitants, with its impressive monastery, the all but deserted hamlet of 1834. The name 'Ain Kârim means "fountain of the vineyards," and the rough hillsides above and south of it are clothed in many places with flourishing vines.

Again, of Nâblus, the ancient Shechem, we have a pleasing picture:

> One may be excused for becoming somewhat enthusiastic over the pretty vale of Nâblus,[1] sparkling with fountains and streams, verdant with olive-groves and fig-orchards, interspersed with walnut, apple, apricot, orange, quince, pomegranate, and other trees and shrubs. . . All this exceptional fertility is due to

[1] Nâblus, the modern name, is the Arabic for Neapolis, or New City, the name given by Vespasian.

those noble fountains. . . Nothing is more delightful than "the laugh of the mountain," the music of rills and brooks as they leap from terrace to terrace in garden or field. . . The houses of the city are solidly built of stone, having the same sort of courts, gates, doors, windows, and roofs as those at Jerusalem. . . The streets are narrow, crooked, dirty, and dark.

Again of Samaria, the royal borough of the Kingdom of Israel, and the seat of Samaritan worship in the time of Christ, the description is very good:

The hill Samaria, rising symmetrically to a considerable height westward, terrace above terrace; the ruined Church of St. John the Baptist overhanging the eastern brow of the hill; the village above it, and beyond the cluster of large columns crowning the western summit—these are the principal features of that first view. And the outlook from the standpoint on the top of "the hill," over the wide expanse of mountain and valley and plain, to the sea-coast of Cæsarea, and the Bay of Acre, north of Carmel, was precisely the prospect I was prepared to see.

The hill of Samaria, adds Dr. Thomson, could have been encompassed by a single wall, and it appears to have been strongly fortified. Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, besieged it three years before he was able to capture it. The entire site of Samaria is covered with rubbish, indicating the existence and repeated destruction of a large city. Ruins everywhere; in the valley, on the hillside, and on the mountain-top, amidst the olive-groves, the wheat-fields, and the vineyards, according to the word of the Lord (Micah i. 6).

Dr. Thomson's description of Mount Gerizim is full and clear. A plan of the ruins is given.

Opening at another passage we meet with this description of the little village of Nain, or Nein, as it is now called:

Nain was once a village of considerable importance; now it is little more than a shapeless cluster of ruins, amongst which dwell a few families of ignorant and fanatical Moslems. The site was so overgrown with weeds and tall grass when I was here last that it was difficult to find an open place from which to take a photograph. It is in striking accord with the one Biblical incident in the history of Nain that renders it dear to the Christian heart, that about the only remains of antiquity are tombs.

Endôr, now a small and wretched hamlet, is well described. There are caves in the hillside, and some of the habitations are made by merely building rude walls around the entrance to them. Cattle are stabled in the lower part of the cave, while their owners occupied the other. And so it was probably when Saul came to Endôr the night before his death. The "witch" may have dwelt in one of these caves. We know that she had "a fat calf" in her dwelling; and the doomed king was prevailed upon to partake of a quickly prepared meal. She must have been extremely expeditious in her cookery. With the Bedawin, says our author, it is nearly universal to cook the meat immediately after it is butchered, and to bake fresh bread for every meal. Visit any Arab sheikh, and you may see the entire process. A sheep or calf will be brought and killed before you, thrust instanter into the great cauldron which stands ready to receive it; and ere you are aware, it will reappear on a large copper tray, with a heap of cracked wheat, or of boiled rice and sour milk. In Cincinnati a hog walks into a narrow passage on his own feet, and comes out at the other end bacon, ham, and half a dozen other commodities: at the sheik's camp, it is a calf or sheep that walks past you towards the cauldron, and comes forth a smoking stew for dinner.

The natural history paragraphs of "The Land and the Book" are full of interest, as are also the historical-parallel allusions. In a Missionary sense, of course, this work has a peculiar value. The veteran traveller will be listened to with regard and respect; and his polished and pleasing literary labours are in themselves a testimony of no small weight. We tender our own sincere and grateful thanks.

Dr. Thomson's previous volume, "Southern Palestine," was warmly commended in THE CHURCHMAN when it appeared, and was also reviewed by the Dean of Chester in one of his Essays on the Holy Land in these columns. Of the illustrations in this charming work we can hardly speak too highly. The maps are very good. There are two indices. We have much pleasure in recommending this very attractive gift-book.

Short Notices.

The History of Preaching. With two chapters on the Matter and the Manner of Preaching. From the manuscript of the late Rev. THOS. GRINFIELD, M.A. With a Preface by ROBERT EDEN, M.A. (late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford), Hon. Canon of Norwich, and Vicar of Wymondham. Pp. 90. Griffith & Farran.

BY an inadvertence, which we regret, this little book, which we read with pleasure when it was issued about two years ago, has been laid aside. Thomas Grinfield, who died at Clifton in 1870, was an accomplished scholar who loved to preach the truth of the Gospel; the deep conviction of that truth "which dwelt first in his father and mother," says Canon Eden, "lay at the foundation of his elevated religious character and equally high excellence as a writer of sermons."

Canon Eden has done well in publishing Mr. Grinfield's essay on preaching, and his excellent preface adds much to the interest of the book. He points out that if a preacher is so indolent (so averse from taking trouble, οὕτως ἀταλαίπωρος) as to leave matters to the last moment, and then pick up something at hand, some sermon skeleton, or "notes" (which oftentimes nobody but the man who wrote them can use), the rough and ready "impromptu" adventure—the sermon which "*will do*," is not likely to either interest or edify the unfortunate congregation.

Mr. Grinfield's keynote remark is sound: the essence of all good composition, or discourse, is *Unity in the midst of Variety.* Without unity, he says, there will be no strong effect at last:

Denique sit quod vis, simplex duntaxat et unum.

Without variety there will be no strong interest all along. You may have infinite variety in the details, yet absolute unity in the leading design. How richly in the Apostle Paul, you observe, appears this combination of great versatility of address with the utmost simplicity of intention! "Many preachers, however, content themselves with an extremely narrow range of subjects, and are pretty sure to be found ringing changes on two or three doctrines, justly their favourites, as the whole sum of the discourse, to the exclusion of all interesting and instructive variety." He proceeds:

The immense comprehension and grandeur and opulence of revealed religion perishes or declines in their hands. The riches of the household are forgotten,

and an artificial scarcity created, while minds of a vigorous and excursive character groan under the confinement, and are dejected or disgusted by the poverty of the entertainment. But let it be well remembered that we "are not straitened in" our materials, but in ourselves. "All things are ready;" only let us be ready also. "All fulness is" there; only let our "mouth be opened, and our heart enlarged" to receive it. . . The mind of man, too, not less than the model of Scripture, craves variety of entertainment. Attention is to be strongly arrested, and continually detained, only by variety: without it we grow languid and averse. In this sense the preacher should spread his sail to "every wind of doctrine;" he should court and indulge variety to the utmost extent compatible with that all-important, all-pervading "unity" of design to be mentioned hereafter. He plays upon an instrument of ten thousand strings, and, instead of harping upon two or three favourite chords with a tiresome sameness, he should aim to pass from one to another, and to give to each its different tones and powers, with a masterlike and delightful versatility. . . Let him intermix an Old Testament "text," or topic, with a New Testament; or illustrate the bearing of one on the other; or dwell on a fine prophecy in the morning, and an edifying psalm in the evening; or seize upon some passing occasion of the day, with art and discretion; or come down to the common cases and relations of busy life, after having treated of some high spirituality, walking on the plain ground after having been rapt into the heavens. A perpetual series of variegated subjects might thus be sustained, without the slightest departure from Scripture as a model: and in keeping close to the good old ways, and not turning aside either to the right hand or the left, new scenery, or new objects, or the same under new aspects, might be displayed in endless succession. Was not such the example of Him Who "spake as never man spake"?

Religions of the Ancient World. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. Pp. 276. The Religious Tract Society.

This work, as might be expected, is carefully written and sufficiently complete. The religions of which the learned Professor treats are those of Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, Persia, India, Phœnicia, Etruria, Greece, and Rome. Naturally, perhaps inevitably, much that is advanced, a going over oft-trodden ground, has no special interest. The chapter on the Iranians, bringing out the principle of Dualism, has a good deal that is fresh, and all the details are very well put. Together with Canon Rawlinson's second chapter may be read Dr. Cunningham Geikie's article on the Accadian religious system in THE CHURCHMAN of February, 1880.

Short and Simple Readings on St. Matthew's Gospel. By G. H. A. RYVES. Pp. 184. Stock. 1883.

The title well describes this book. Ten or twelve verses are printed at the head of each chapter; then follows a "short and simple" *reading*. Mainly, the exposition is meditational, like the expository portions of Mr. Purton's book, "Trust in Trial." These readings, however, are not intended for seasons of affliction, but for family worship, or the closet, like Mr. Bourdillon's and Bishop Ryle's. There is about them a sweet tone of lowly-mindedness; the piety is thoroughly practical.

The Christian Ministry and its Functions. Being chiefly extracts from the Rev. C. Bridges' "Christian Ministry." By the Rev. CHARLES CLAYTON, M.A. Pp. 156. Seeley & Co. 1883.

Most heartily do we recommend this little book, especially as an aid to students for Holy Orders and a gift-book for our younger clerical brethren. The work of that shrewd, sound, and saintly man, Charles

Bridges (with whom, for a season, more than twenty years ago, we were privileged to take counsel on these subjects) is now, we hear with regret, out of print, and is not likely to be republished. Under these circumstances Canon Clayton, who by his experience as Examining Chaplain, and in other ways, is eminently well qualified for such a task, undertook the publication of Mr. Bridges' work, several of the chapters being shortened, and some omitted, while only a few footnotes have been kept. Instead of 540 pages, therefore, we have now only 106. Inasmuch, however, as in the more quiet days, when Mr. Bridges wrote his treatise, it was not necessary to lay special stress upon the Evangelical and Protestant character of our Church, Canon Clayton has thought well to add his paper (recommended in THE CHURCHMAN of June, 1882) on Evangelical Protestantism, clear, full, and forcible; he has also added an Islington Meeting paper, "The Christian Minister's Strength," and a Church Association Conference paper—Southport, 1879—"Our Lord a Pattern to the Christian Minister." In an Appendix there are 13 pages of Questions and Answers.

An Argument for the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Translated from "Le Christianisme et les Temps présents," of the Abbé BOUGAUD. By C. L. CURRIE. John Murray.

This little volume somehow escaped our notice last autumn. We have read it with interest, and can recommend it for those to whom such works may be useful. The Abbé Bougaud—to take one point—quotes Rousseau. Do you say the Apostles invented the character of Christ—His life, death, scheme, character? "The inventor would be more wonderful than the hero." But other critics say, with justice, "The inventor is an impossibility!" Every reader of Pascal's "Pensées" remembers the remark that the death of Stephen is represented by Luke as more full of strength than that of Jesus Christ; the Evangelists knew how to describe a courageous death. They believed Jesus Christ to be God; why did they describe Him as so weak? No man could have *invented* such a man as the God-man Christ Jesus, who died an atoning death. "Suppose," said Parker, "that Plato and Newton never lived—that their story is a lie: but who did their works and thought their thoughts? It takes a Newton to forge a Newton. What man could have fabricated a Jesus? None but a Jesus."

Simplicity in Preaching. A few short hints on a great subject. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. Pp. 48. W. Hunt & Co.

This is a capital little book. Every passage has something good; and one is only sorry it is so short. The subject is of the highest importance. To take a leading thought: Avoid hard words. Some twenty-five years ago we learned our first lesson about hard words, when speaking to a dying ploughboy; we found out that he did not know the meaning of the word *anxious*. The most telling words, as a rule, are very short words; but even short words, if they belong not to "market English," are not spoken at the fireside, may puzzle common folk. Again: Avoid long sentences. In extempore sermons the preacher must beware of rambling; the in and out and round about style, with involved sentences, is tedious in the extreme. But in writing sermons it is well to avoid long sentences. A congregation of even fairly educated people are more likely to profit from sentences which are not broken up with semicolons, colons, and so forth. For the agricultural class and the lowest middle class, the shorter the sentences the better. In addressing them, it is well now and then to have questions: "He did; *why* did he?" "Is it so? Yes; it is." The saying, "Mr. —— goes over it and over it again" does not necessarily

imply useless, tedious repetition. Again: Simplicity is by no means inconsistent with suggestiveness. An extempore preacher, who has really the gift for preaching "without book" (we heard of an excellent man who muddled along for years until some members of his congregation begged him to make a change), may use simple language all through his sermon; plain words, ringing sentences; yet he may be very suggestive. The divisions, announced or understood, following on one after another with ease, not artificial or forced; the leading thought, like the strain in one of Mendelssohn's "Songs without Words," giving force and beauty to the whole; never obtrusive, but never lost; the antithetical proverbial saying, the homely illustration, the brief pointed exposition: these notes of a lucid yet full discourse attract interest, make impression, and stimulate inquiry. A vast number of sermons preached in the Church of England, we fear, are not listened to with attention. The people don't know at what the preacher is aiming—"what he *is at*." When they have left the church they cannot remember anything. What was the thread of thought? There was none. Forty-five minutes long, we remember one sermon in a watering-place; the curate, evidently in earnest, was preaching on not loving the world; but what he meant to recommend or to censure it was impossible to discover. There was no *point*. It was insipid. A loud voice and an animated manner will not make up for thought: *freshness* is a good test. To hear the same sayings time after time without a particle of novelty, is for many, perhaps, not what good George Herbert quaintly hinted, an aid to patience. A simple style, as we have said, may be very suggestive. And this leads to the root of the matter; there must be pains in preparation. We have not yet, in heartily recommending Bishop Ryle's book, made any quotation from it, because we hope many of our clerical readers and lay preachers will procure it; but in regard to this matter—useful reading and application—we may quote from one who is a master of English the following bit of advice:

You will never attain simplicity in preaching without plenty of trouble. Pains and trouble, I say emphatically, pains and trouble. When Turner, the great painter, was asked by some one how it was he mixed his colours so well, and what it was that made them so different from those of other artists: "Mix them? mix them? why, with brains, sir!" I entreat my younger brethren to remember this. I beg them to make time for their composition of sermons, to take trouble, and exercise their brains by reading.

"Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges." Epistle to the Hebrews. With Notes and Introduction, by the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. Cambridge University Press, 17, Paternoster Row. 1883.

The present volume of the Dean of Peterborough's useful series will probably be regarded by many Teachers in "Schools and Colleges" as one of the very best. It is undoubtedly a strong book, full, and interesting; just what might be expected from one whose picturesque style, keen insight, and rich scholarship are admitted on all hands. Here and there, of course, peep out Canon Farrar's peculiarities; and who the theological critic is must not be forgotten. Of 196 pages, the Introduction occupies 50, and the Canon's aim in discussing the style, date, theology, etc., of the Epistle is to establish that Apollos wrote it. Either Apollos wrote the Epistle, says Dr. Farrar, or it is the work of some author who is to us entirely unknown. With this conclusion we are inclined to agree.

The Foundations of Morality. Discourses on the Ten Commandments, with special reference to their origin and authority. By the Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, D.D. Pp. 240. Hodder & Stoughton.

In these discourses, says Professor Leathes, I have tried to estimate

the kind of natural and inherent testimony that is borne by the Mosaic Decalogue to its own authority and origin. Again: The question Why is right right? says the Professor, is one which points us to the very foundation of morals. In the revelation, "I am the LORD . . ." we are told why right is right. Take away the personal authority of the law, and instead of a *law* you have a creation of your mind, and it is under your control. Take away the revelation, and there is no other standard of right than that which seems, at the moment, expedient, useful, advantageous; and this varies as the occasion varies. Destroy the reality of Revelation, and you sap the foundation of Morality.

The characteristics of Dr. Leathes's writings—vigorous, fresh, and soundly "liberal"—are well known; and in recommending the present able work—one upon a subject just now specially important—little need here be said. What we have read we have read with interest and satisfaction; it recalls that excellent book, "The Christian Creed." From the last chapter, an exposition of Rom. x. 4—*Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*—we may quote one passage:

> The Apostle does not conceal the fact—neither must we conceal it—that Christ is the end of the law to every one that believeth, *but to no one else.* He does not, indeed, express this, but it is clearly implied, because it is *for righteousness* that He is the end of the law. That is, Christ is the complete satisfaction of all that the law seeks after in the heart and nature of him who longs for righteousness and who is continually baffled in the search for it by the discovery of the continually increasing demands of the law. There is no end to these demands, looked at in their naked simplicity and severity; but Christ has put an end to them, for He is the end of the law. He has satisfied the otherwise insatiable. The righteousness of God's testimonies is everlasting, and He is their everlasting righteousness. But that He is and can be this to him only that believeth is patent from the fact that if Christ is not the end of the law there is and can be no other end to it. The law is unsatisfied and insatiable; it is infinite in its demands and everlasting in its enforcement of them, and those only can delude themselves into the belief that they have fulfilled, or can fulfil, the law who are totally ignorant of its nature and its claims. To make good this position to those who are so is perhaps a hopeless matter. We are thankful to remember that it is enough continually to proclaim and enforce the truth. Then *we* are no longer responsible for its effect. God will take care of His own word, and will see that it does not return unto Him void. Therefore it is our duty to declare and declare again, as though it had never been declared before, that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. The mere statement of that fact is certain, in God's good time, to make its own way and produce its own results, and these we are content to leave with Him.
>
> What, then, is the bearing of this fact upon the origin and authority of the moral law, and what light does it throw upon the relation between religion and morality? Surely it contains in itself the key of the whole position, the very solution of the problem, for if there is any one doctrine of the Gospel which may challenge to itself an indisputably divine origin, it is surely *the doctrine of* FAITH.

Manual of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion. By R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D., Rector of Bridlington. The Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, Strand, W.C.; John F. Shaw and Co., 48, Paternoster Row.

This Manual of forty-eight pages, clear and full, is the most valuable publication of the kind, so far as we know. From the pen of such a

master as Dr. Blakeney the Church might expect a Manual of real research—trustworthy, lucid, not diffuse; in short, suitable in every way for students; and unprejudiced Churchmen, we think, as a rule, will admit that the present pamphlet has not disappointed their expectations. The learned and laborious Canon, on whose ability and sound judgment that great lawyer Dr. Stephens had much reliance, gives in short compass the results of recent investigations. His authorities are standard ones; and we have, besides, the pith of recent decisions. Not only for theological students, but for truth-seeking laymen of fair education, this publication has a real value.

Disestablishment and Disendowment by Instalment and Piecemeal. A Charge, with Notes. By BENJAMIN HARRISON, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone. Rivingtons, 1883.

The Archdeacon of Maidstone has often done good service to the Church by publications such as the present. It is indeed of the utmost importance "that we should clearly understand and fully realize what is the question at issue in that great design of Disestablishment and Disendowment, which, however disguised, will assuredly be the one chief end in view—most dangerously then when it comes piecemeal and by instalments—in the many and various legislative propositions which we must expect to see, from year to year, in different shapes brought forward.[1] It is no question," continues the Archdeacon—

We must never forget, as it might have been two centuries ago, between antagonist religious systems, as between Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Independency. There is not any one form of belief, doctrine, or discipline, which would be chosen for national preference; and concurrent endowment has been openly and repeatedly forsworn. It is pure *Secularization* that is in view; a godless State, godless education, godless policy and law; confiscation of that which was in past ages given to God; the Cross to be wrenched from its place surmounting the Crown; and the Bible to be taken out of the hand of the Sovereign, in whose hand the Holy Book is solemnly placed at the coronation of our kings. There must henceforth, if the principles of a popular philosophy are to be followed out to their "corollaries," be no prayer to consecrate the deliberations of a national legislature, no recognition of the being of a God, no fear of guiltiness in His sight in taking His name in vain, profaning an oath, and insulting His Gospel.

In the *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivingtons) appears, as usual, a good deal of interesting information. It is an ably edited periodical, judicious, and of a sound Church (Protestant) tone. A report of a Committee of the Norwich Diocesan Conference, on "Our Relations and Duties to Foreign Churches" (Archdeacon Groome, chairman) is well worth reading. The Report mentions with sympathy and respect—

Those Protestant Churchmen in Spain and Portugal who are desirous of organizing themselves after the model of the Anglican Communion under episcopal and synodical government, making use of a liturgy compiled so far as possible from ancient national sources.

The Waldenses, who probably are the representatives of the old Church of North Italy, and whose loss of episcopal government, which they may be induced to restore, is the direct result of the persecutions that they have undergone.

The Armenian Church, whose members are suffering dire oppression at the hands of their Mohammedan masters, and whose disintegration is zealously pur-

[1] See Note A. (A very interesting note, we may observe. The quotations from evidence given by Liberationists before the Committee on the burial fees question show pretty clearly what Churchmen have to expect.)

sued by the proselytizing efforts both of Roman Catholic and American Dissenting Missionaries.

The *Foreign Church Chronicle*, in referring to M. Gambetta's funeral, gives the triumphant utterance of one who is now a Professor of the University of Oxford. In a Sunday morning lecture Mr. Harrison said:—

"For the first time in this century a great nation of Europe had buried a great citizen with the highest national honours, from which every vestige of priestly intervention was resolutely excluded. Gambetta was the first statesman of European rank formally to repudiate any kind of homage to any sort of Church. His religion was France; with the religion of Churches he refused the very semblance of adhesion. It might well be that in history he would be recorded, not only as the young lawyer who replaced the Empire by the Republic, but as the first statesman in Europe who refused to bow the knee in the Temple of Rimmon."

"To bow the knee in the Temple of Rimmon." This is how Mr. Frederic Harrison describes the recognition of Christianity; and Mr. Frederic Harrison is now a Professor at Oxford—elected as one of their own body into a College in which but a few years ago the Collect for Trinity Sunday was recited every day in the Chapel in addition to the Collect for the day.

The Report of Proceedings at the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Surrey and North Kent Clerical and Lay Association (Shaw and Sons). We are sorry that this very interesting report has by some inadvertence been mislaid. The Conference of this "Clerical and Lay" branch, of which Lord Midleton is president, was held at Blackheath, and several interesting speeches were made; while the papers read were above the average. Professor Lionel Beale, Canon Hoare, Mr. N. Bridges, Mr. Henry Morris, the Rev. C. L. Engström, and others, took part in the proceedings. From a timely and vigorous paper on "The Duty of the Evangelical Section of the Church with regard to Diocesan Organization," by the Rev. J. W. Marshall, a brief extract at the time was given in THE CHURCHMAN.

From Mr. J. E. Hawkins (36, Baker Street, W.) we have received several charming cards. In a packet, "Treasures of Wisdom," are four flower-pictures with texts of Scripture, printed in finest chromo-lithography. They are beautifully done, and merit warm praise. In "Newness of Life" packet are three Easter cards, the work, it seems, of Deaconesses, Mildmay Park. "The Risen Life" cards are cheap and choice.

The Religious Tract Society has sent out some excellent cards at a low price, very tasteful and good—"Easter Joy," and "The Love of the Spirit."

Messrs. Marcus Ward and Co.'s cards (67, Chandos Street, Strand) are always choice and well executed. Several recently sent to us are exceedingly good; prices from a penny to a shilling. The spring flowers, berries, etc., are beautifully done. *Easter Greeting*, "He is not here; He is risen"—the interior of the Sepulchre, with angels guarding the "linen clothes"—is a wonderfully attractive picture-card.

We have several times recommended some little pamphlets or tractates published by the Religious Tract Society—*The Temptation in the Wilderness*, *The Story of Easter*, and others. We are pleased to notice another,

The Week before the Crucifixion, now issued, worthy of its carefully written companions; one of the best of the series.

The New Departure. Thoughts for Loyal Churchmen. By the Rev. E. E. HOARE, Vicar of Trinity, Tunbridge Wells, and Hon. Canon of Canterbury. Reprinted from THE CHURCHMAN. E. Stock. We have copied the title-page of this pamphlet, the price of which is one penny. We need only add the expression of our hope that the esteemed author's earnest and gentle appeal may be of real service throughout the Church.

We have received from Messrs. Suttaby and Co. (Amen Corner, St. Paul's) three beautifully printed "Devotional Manuals"—Bogatzky's *Golden Treasury*, Bishop Patrick's *Heart's Ease*, and Keble's *Christian Year*. The last named is indeed a dainty volume. If other volumes are like these three, the present series will be a gem.

We gladly recommend Messrs. Nelson's Royal School Series of Arithmetic. We have examined three of the series, and are much pleased with them. A practical teacher of experience tells us the questions are admirably selected: "Nothing could be better for class-work." (The answers are supplied to teachers.) The books are well printed, and very cheap.

The Bible: How to read it. By the Rev. AUGUSTUS LYNE, Book Society, 28, Paternoster Row. Simple, earnest, and likely to *tell* with many. Over a hundred thousand have been circulated, we see.

In the *Quiver*, a very good number, appear articles by Mr. Calthrop, Dr. Maguire, and several very readable papers. In *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* we notice an ably written article (with the well-known signature "K.") on Government Education in India. The *Sunday at Home* contains a capital paper on the fishermen of the North Sea; we hope this paper may be reprinted, it would be of service, *e.g.*, as regards the Thames Church Mission Society, which is doing a noble work. *Non cuivis contingit* to see what this graphic friend of the fisherman saw: "We came up with the fleet about 300 miles from the Thames, and though I had frequently passed through numbers of herring, mackerel, and pilchard fishing craft, I was not prepared for the imposing sight of 200 fine smacks of from fifty to eighty tons burden, their tanned sails reflecting the most brilliant scarlet in the rays of the setting sun, and extending for several miles east and west of the admiral's vessel." Every reader of the *Sunday at Home*, however, can sympathize, and we cannot refrain from quoting a portion of this touching description:

A special meeting for intercession was held on the 12th of June by three who were deeply interested in the smacksmen, and each rose from his knees in the hope that God's "set time" was come. Within three days a friend had—unsolicited—provided £1,000 to purchase a suitable vessel; and within three weeks the *Ensign* was fully equipped, placed under the command of a godly captain, and had joined the Lower Short Blue fleet, then fishing off the German coast. She has since then supported herself by fishing, but for mission purposes is placed entirely and gratuitously at the service of the Thames Church Mission.

"I'm a fisherman myself, sir," a man once said to me, "and I'll allow that there are many well-mannered, sober, steady men among us, but, taking us all round, *you'll not find a coarser set of human beings in the world*; and, if you want to know the reason, you've only got to look at yonder smack heading away into the North Sea, where, maybe, she'll be heaving and tossing about for weeks, with ne'er a proper influence in the shape of books or company for the men to come at."

Here, then, was a *raison d'être* for the Mission vessel—to be not merely a rendezvous for Christian sailors, but a help in various ways to the whole fleet.

Eight months have now elapsed since the day when, with a Thames Church Mission flag at the main, she sailed in amongst the smacks, amid the boisterous greetings of the crews. Mr. Herbert Johnson, in the accompanying sketch, faithfully depicts the scene of which he was an eye-witness on the Lord's-day, when a party of five arrived out from London by the steam-cutter *Frost* to celebrate the *Ensign's* advent. The great twenty-feet flag was for that occasion transferred to the steamer, where, by the captain's kindness, both morning and afternoon services were held. The weather was very unsettled, with a threatening of more wind, so many were prevented coming in the morning; but, spite of all difficulties, a large company responded at three o'clock to the call of the steamer's whistle sounded from the bridge, and listened attentively to an address by a Christian brother. Very touching were the petitions afterwards offered by several smacksmen, very fervent their thanksgiving, and all their visitors were deeply moved by the triumphant closing hymn, so appropriate to the circumstances of these brave fellows. The "bright, beautiful home" was the burden of their song.

"Curious, is it not?" said Lord Beaconsfield, one day, in the spring of 1881, as he took up a certain Review. "Curious, is it not? Reading an article in this publication, I find it demonstrated that there is no God. Going a little further, and perusing another paper in the same number, I discover that the Pope is God's vicegerent. Well, that is a little perplexing." These words of Lord Beaconsfield are quoted by MR. ALFRED AUSTIN as a sort of keynote of the new publication, *The National Review*, in regard to Religion. At present, says the able writer, many people are building a second Tower of Babel, and the confusion of tongues grows daily, while they are no nearer the sky! For ourselves, we have always regretted the encouragement given by religious persons, whether writers or reviewers, to periodicals of such a mingle-mangle character, that on one page you find Infallibility, and on another Infidelity. Now and then, of course, appears an article by some eminent author, whose devotion to Scriptural Religion is well known; his name serves to increase the circulation of a great deal that is radically wrong. When that particular number appears on a drawing-room table, what is to be said of the effect on the younger members of the family? Canon Lefroy made some pertinent remarks on this subject on a London platform some months ago: his phrase "the domestication of Infidelity," may serve to suggest some serious thoughts to persons who place Christianity higher than "culture." In the Conservative periodical now issued we may, at the least, expect to have Christianity spoken of with reverence; but we hope for a good deal more than that, and the present number gives much promise. Even of the two great quarterly Reviews, one—the *Edinburgh Review*—contains now and then something that the devout Christian, of even high culture, reads with regret and with something more than regret. The religious articles of the *National Review*, we hope, will be written in a thoroughly conservative spirit: we may go farther, and say we hope the articles on Church of England subjects will run on sound, really loyal Church lines even if "High" Church, not of the bastard Anglican type, but liberal, tolerant, and not ashamed of a Protestant tone.

The chief contributors to the March *National Review* (W.H. Allen and Co., 13, Waterloo Place, S.W.) are Lord Carnarvon, Canon Gregory, Mr. Balfour, M.P., and Lord Midleton. All the articles which we have read are ably written, and in certain respects decidedly above the average of periodical literature. On the First of March, 1711, the first number of the *Spectator* appeared; and Lord CARNARVON writes pleasantly of the 1st of March, 1883 and the Tory venture. We wish it a very useful and honourable career. Of a Liberal review—on the same lines—we

should say the same. Canon GREGORY'S "The Work of the Church during the present century," is well worth reading. Lord MIDLETON'S "Irish Legislation and its Results," is out and out the best paper on this subject, so far as we know.

We have received from Archdeacon MOULE, Shanghai, the following letter:

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHURCHMAN.

DEAR SIR,—I have read with deep and painful interest the article in your Magazine for November, 1882, on the "Present Aspect of the Conflict with Atheism." I cannot but hope that the serious and alarming statements made by Mr. Walter Browne both as to the strength of the atheistic forces, and the confusion and division in the otherwise invincible ranks of Christians, will lead to some definite result; at any rate to the speedy republication of the works by Sir James Paget and Dr. Asa Gray, as to the subject and contents of which Mr. Browne is so provokingly silent.

My object in writing to you from the other side of the world is, however, to draw attention to two slight flaws in Mr. Browne's article. In the first place, he does, I think, but scant justice to the character and work of the Victoria Institute. Whatever may have been the special scare which led to the formation of that admirable and most useful Institute, it is certain that its investigations have gone far beyond the unproven hypothesis of evolution. If Mr. Browne will glance through the titles of the papers printed in the sixteen large volumes of the "Transactions of the Victoria Institute," he will admit, I feel sure, that his description of its character is meagre, if not unjust.

He thinks that evolution is "an hypothesis to be investigated, not a heresy to be written down." In reply, I would venture to remark that evolution, as applied to the origin of species and the order of creation, has been investigated most exhaustively, and has been found to be an hypothesis and no more. The proofs of its probable application, were creation to be originated over again, are many. The proofs of its application in the creation with which our investigations are concerned are not forthcoming. Even the discovery of a specimen or two of "missing links" would not do. They would be set down, and justly so, as freaks of nature, not as sure links in a calm chain of evolving species. What the theory wants, and must have, if it is to stand, and cannot have, for they are not, is crowds of such specimens, covering all the old world which geological excavations have disclosed; and specimens also growing and evolving under our eye on this modern earth. They should be as numerous as the flint-flakes in the "great and terrible wilderness."

But they are nowhere to be found. Since, therefore, the hypothesis is a heresy judged by Nature's book, and since it is exultingly used as contradictory to the Bible, it might, scientifically speaking, be "written down." I doubt, however, whether this will be found to be the true character of the papers on the subject published by the Victoria Institute.

I have one more complaint to urge against Mr. Browne's argument before I revert heartily to the tone of thankful appreciation with which I began. Speaking of the necessity for aggressive work in preaching the truth to the enemies of the faith, he writes thus: "It may be said that the Church does this in her missionary enterprises to heathen lands. But it is a strange way of maintaining an empire to be straining after foreign conquests while you refuse to check rebellion at home. Why are the enemies of the faith in East London less worthy of attention than those in India?" To this language I venture to offer a very strong protest. I make bold to reverse the whole picture. How can you expect to keep down rebellion at home when you show apathy and indecision about rebellion and revolt in the wider provinces of your vast Empire? Is force no remedy? then Ireland can go on murdering and terrorising over law and the officers of law. But the roar of guns at Alexandria, and the shock of battle at Tel-el-Kebir, showed rebels near home that whatever politicians may say, the policy of England is to maintain her Empire intact. Well, and are not India and China parts of the Empire of our Lord? What does Mr. Browne mean by "*foreign conquests?*" Does he mean that we are "straining after" what the Church has no prior right

to possess? Are not the five hundred millions of India and China as much part of the Empire as the four millions of London? Is not rebellion in the East as dangerous as revolt in the West? And how stands the fight? There are twice as many clergy of the Church of England working in London with its four millions as there are in all the heathen and Mohammedan world with their one thousand millions of rebels. The British Isles, that little corner, albeit the citadel of Christendom, possesses twenty-three thousand clergy of the Established Church; the vast world for which the Church's Lord lived and died only five hundred. I am convinced that more zeal for foreign missionary enterprise will react at home. Send us one thousand men to reinforce your army abroad. Strike boldly, and infidels at home will believe that we are in earnest. Unkind critics cannot help making merry over the idea of "war undertaken in the interests of peace." But surely the Church's war is such; for its sure result will be the setting up of the Kingdom of the Prince of Peace.

Apologizing to you, sir, for the length of this letter, and to Mr. Browne for the freedom of my critique on his important and timely article, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

A. E. MOULE.

We have sent a proof of this letter to MR. BROWNE, who replies as follows:

SIR,—With regard to the points raised by Archdeacon Moule in his very interesting letter (the kindly feeling of which I fully appreciate), the truth or falsehood of what is known as evolution is much too wide to be discussed on this occasion. Archdeacon Moule, seems, however, to share in the prevalent error of confounding together the doctrine of evolution (which teaches simply that existing species are developed by natural descent from pre-existing species) with the theory of natural selection, by which Mr. Darwin sought to account for that development. The evidence for the former grows daily wider and deeper, and it is now accepted, at least within wide limits, by almost every naturalist of repute, while it is only a misconception which sees in it anything contrary to Holy Writ. The doctrine of natural selection, on the other hand, is becoming daily more and more discredited; and we now hear thorough-going partisans like Dr. Romanes admitting (as Mr. Darwin himself admitted) that other principles must be likewise at work. It is a signal instance of the want of organized intercourse between religion and science that this confusion should still be prevalent.

But whether evolution is true or not, I must adhere to my statement that the Victoria Institute (in whose objects I most fully sympathize, and much of whose work I can admire) has obtained the reputation of holding a brief, so to speak, against evolution; and whatever it may have gained by assuming the functions of an advocate, it has lost that credit for impartiality which can only attach to a judge. I think it probable that this fact has had a serious effect in impairing the estimation which might have attached to papers on other subjects, read before the same Society.

With regard to the second part of the letter, I deeply regret that a passing metaphor should have led Archdeacon Moule to suppose that I fail to appreciate the noble efforts made in the cause of foreign missions by the Christian Church, or would for one moment suggest that those efforts should be relaxed. The surest mode, however, of ruining foreign missions would be to allow a spirit of secularism and infidelity to prevail in the nation at home. The duty of meeting these home heathen on their own ground has a double claim upon us; it is not only a contention for rightful supremacy; it is a struggle for existence itself.

WALTER R. BROWNE.

THE MONTH.

THE Report of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences for 1882 contains much that will interest those of our readers who are inclined to look upon this movement with regard and hope. The Executive Committee of the Council

report that there were two general meetings of the Council in 1882, following the first one held in July, 1881, which was in many respects necessarily experimental and tentative:

> Judging by the increased support which the Council has of late received, the Committee venture to hope that the plan and working of this new Church organization are on the whole approved. Full reports of the constitution and bye-laws, and of the doings of the three past meetings, have been widely circulated. They have been embodied also in the history of the Council, to be found in the Official Year-Book of the Church of England, recently published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The papers read at the London Diocesan Conference, and the speeches made, were in some respects rather disappointing.

Dr. Benson has been "confirmed" at Bow Church, and as Archbishop has done homage at Windsor Castle. He will be enthroned in Canterbury Cathedral on the 29th.

Mr. Enraght, deprived (and inhibited by his Bishop), gave way to the Vicar duly appointed by the Trustees. A mob of Ritualists caused scandal on the first Sunday (March 11th).

Great portion of the time in the House of Commons has been absorbed, as usual, in debates on Irish affairs. Much precious time has been wasted. The most noteworthy event was the demonstration by Mr. Forster of Mr. Parnell's position as regards the deplorable agitation in Ireland during the last year or two. The right hon. gentleman made a most vigorous and effective speech.

One of those charged in Dublin with complicity in the Phœnix Park murders has become a Crown witness, and his information is important.

On his reappearance in the House on the 5th, the Prime Minister, whose health seems now restored, was warmly welcomed. In the absence of Mr. Gladstone, the Government introduced an Affirmation Bill; it will be strongly, and we hope successfully, opposed.

Three men have been convicted at the Old Bailey of the publication of blasphemy; in the Christmas number of the *Freethinker* Scriptural scenes were grossly caricatured by woodcuts and comments.[1]

[1] In the first trial the jury were unable to agree. The sentence on Foote, the editor, was imprisonment for a year with hard labour, on Ramsey for nine months, and on Kemp for three; a newsagent of Fleet Street, who had sold the periodical, being liberated on his recognisances. The definition given to blasphemy by Mr. Justice North, was that of "any contumelious reproach or profane scoffing against the Christian religion or the Holy Scriptures, or any act exposing the Holy Scriptures and the Christian religion to ridicule, contempt, or derision."