Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1883.

ART. I.—EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND; ITS PRESENT ASPECT AND FUTURE PROSPECTS.

IT is an easy thing to cause a schism in the Church of Christ, but an extremely difficult thing to heal one. That is a lesson taught us by the history of all Churches. A narrow intolerance on the part of the dominant party, or an undue attempt to exercise authority over men's consciences in matters not essential to the faith, first produces resistance, and then separation. This is at first viewed as a necessary evil which the circumstances which caused it could alone justify; and there is a willingness to return if these difficulties are removed. Then men become habituated to a state of separation if their spiritual needs are met by a separate organization; and when the feelings and views of the dominant party become softened and enlarged so that they regret the original action which caused the schism and would willingly remove the difficulties which prevent a reunion, the latter party, inheriting the principles without the feelings and wishes of the originators, become hardened to the state of separation, and what began in a narrow intolerance in the dominant party, or in a difference to be deplored, ends in an intolerance equally narrow in the separated, and in a sect to be maintained in a narrow and sectarian spirit.

There is, in fact, no lesson more difficult to learn than the nature of true Christian tolerance, its legitimate province and its proper limits. It was taught us by our Saviour when He rebuked two of His Apostles who forbade one who was casting out devils in His name, "because he followeth not with us," and warned them against putting a stumbling-block or rock of offence in their brother's way. It was practised in the primitive Church when, probably, a High Churchman and an Evangelical are not more apart in spirit than were St. Jerome and St.

Augustine, and yet both remained in one united Church. It was the failure to recognise this truth in the subsequent history of the Church which has given rise to most of the separations which afterwards took place.

These views are well illustrated in the movement which is now taking place among the Episcopalians in Scotland, the object and meaning of which will, however, be better understood by a short sketch of the previous position of this body.

At the Revolution in 1688, when some of the English Bishops refused to take the oath of allegiance to King William III. and were ejected from their sees, the entire Episcopal Church of Scotland followed the same course and was in consequence disestablished, and the Presbyterian Church established in its place. The former was placed under penal disabilities; but when the Act of Toleration was passed in 1712, which authorized those of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland to meet for divine worship under pastors ordained by a Protestant Bishop, provided they subscribed the oath to Government and prayed for the Queen and Royal Family, various Episcopal congregations were formed who were not in connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church. There were thus at the same time two Episcopal communions in both countries. In England the Established Church and the non-jurors; in Scotland the disestablished non-juring Church and the tolerated English congregations: these latter were in communion with the Established Church of England and Ireland, whose Bishops freely ordained their clergy and exercised episcopal functions among them, while the two non-juring Churches were in close communion with each other.

The English congregations in Scotland, as they may be called, used the English Book of Common Prayer. The non-juring Church had at first no liturgy, but adopted, for the celebration of the Eucharist, the Communion Office in the Service Book of 1637, which had been framed on the model of the Prayer Book of 1604, and was sanctioned by the proclamation of the Privy Council of Scotland dated 20th of December, 1636, enjoining the use of the Service Book which had been compiled "for the use of the National Church of Scotland" by command of Charles I., but the attempt to force the use of which upon the Scotch people led to the abolition of Episcopacy in 1638.

The non-juring Church in Scotland, however, like the English non-jurors, soon became divided into two parties—those who wished to introduce what were called the *usages*, and those who opposed them. The former party had framed a liturgy derived from that of the ancient Greek Church, which contained forms and usages entirely opposed to the modern

liturgies, and attempted to introduce it into Scotland; but in 1731, when a concordat called "Articles of Agreement amongst the Bishops of the Church of Scotland," was entered into, the first article prescribed that "they should only make use of the Scottish or English Liturgy in the public divine service, and not disturb the Church by introducing the usages." Thus the two Offices were placed on a par; and the Communion Office of 1637 continued in use till the middle of the century, the last edition of it being printed in 1743. The usagers soon after obtained a majority in the Episcopal Synod, and the non-juring Communion Office was introduced in 1755 and finally adopted in 1764. The main distinction between the two offices was that the latter introduced from the early Eastern liturgies a form entirely contrary to that adopted in all the editions of the English Prayer Book, including the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI. This consisted in the Prayer of Consecration being followed by an Oblation in which the consecrated elements were offered to God, and an Invocation praying Him "to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son." Thus, while the Communion Office of 1637 contained no features which were really objectionable, the other expressed doctrines inconsistent with the formularies of the Church of England. This is the office now known and in use as the Scotch Communion Office, and a more unfortunate step on the part of the Bishops than to supplant the Office of 1637 by it could not be taken, for it was an element of discord at the time it was introduced, it has been an element of discord ever since, and it will be an element of discord as long as its use is permitted. It has no claim whatever to be called the National Office of Scotland. That character more truly belongs to the Office of 1637 authorized by King Charles I. What the precise doctrinal significance of the peculiar features in the Scotch Communion Office really may be is matter of controversy. There is no doubt that in the Eastern Church, from which this form was derived, the invocation is understood to express the doctrine of a material change in the elements, but the supporters of this Office have always maintained that the expression can only mean "become by way of efficacious representation."

In 1792 the penal statutes which affected the Scotch Episcopal Church were repealed on condition that her Bishops subscribed the Articles of the Church of England, which was fulfilled in the year 1804, and then only under reservation that they were to be interpreted in unison with a work which had been published some years before, containing the doctrines of

the non-juring party, a reservation not communicated to the Government or by which their subscription was qualified.

At this time the head of the Scotch Episcopal Church, as *Primus*, was Bishop Skinner, a man of much sagacity and judgment; and the leading layman among the English Episcopalians was the Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo,[1] a man not only of great influence but of enlarged views and much benevolence of character. Under their auspices a union was formed between the two communions, under Articles of Union by which the exclusive use of the liturgy of the Church of England was reserved to the clergymen of the English congregations, "as well in the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as in all the other offices of the Church." The English congregations all joined, with the exception of those at Aberdeen, Perth, and Montrose; the two former, however, ultimately joining.

The exclusive use of the English Communion Office was confirmed to these congregations by the Code of Canons enacted in 1811, "in order to promote an union among all those who profess to be of the Episcopal persuasion in Scotland, while the Scotch Communion Office was to be used in all consecrations of Bishops, and every Bishop when consecrated was to give his full assent to it, as being sound in itself and of primary authority in Scotland." This was a qualified recognition of it as a standard of doctrine which did not affect the English congregations, and there being at this time no Evangelical congregation among them, it escaped much notice. The first, strictly speaking, Evangelical congregation was that of St. James's in Edinburgh, formed in 1822; and its principles soon spread to most of the other English congregations. As might be expected, it excited some opposition among the Bishops, who then belonged either to the old non-juring party or to the High Church party in the Church of England. But when they met in 1826 to consider how these congregations should be dealt with, they came unanimously to the resolution that "the time was past when they could with safety refuse to tolerate anything that was tolerated in the English Church." This was a wise resolution, and it would have been well for the unity of the Church if it had been adhered to.

From this time all was peace and harmony in the Scotch Episcopal Church till the Tractarian movement began in 1833 in the English Church. These views were largely adopted in the former Church, and its spirit soon manifested itself in a revision of the Canons, which took place in 1838. The term

[1] The grandfather of the present writer.

"Protestant" was carefully eliminated from them. The Scotch Communion Office was declared to be not only an authorized service, but also of primary authority—that is, it was elevated into a standard of doctrine for the Church, and a clause was added to one of the Canons for the purpose of suppressing the prayer-meetings commonly used by Evangelical congregations. Soon after it pleased the then Bishops in an evil hour to undo the work which had been accomplished in 1804 and subsequent years, and to force the Evangelical clergy out of the Church.

An Evangelical chapel had been established in Edinburgh, called Trinity Church, and the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, who had been previously officiating in a small chapel in the Old Town of Edinburgh, was appointed joint incumbent with the Rev. Andrew Coventry. Mr. Drummond was the recognised head of the Evangelical party in the Scotch Episcopal Church; and he established a weekly prayer-meeting, which was largely attended and highly appreciated by his congregation. This meeting the Bishop of Edinburgh was urged by his High Church clergy to suppress, and unfortunately, yielding to their importunity, he in 1842 enforced against Mr. Drummond the Canon which prohibited a clergyman from officiating without using the Liturgy, which had hitherto been a dead letter. Mr. Drummond offered every concession which could be reasonably asked from him, but in vain, and he was placed in the position of having either to abandon all practical Evangelical work, or to leave the Church. He chose the latter alternative, and a separate congregation of English Episcopalians was formed of those who adhered to him, which became St. Thomas's English Episcopal Church.

In forming this separate Church, its founders announced that if the interference with the weekly prayer-meeting were the sole ground of secession, "Mr. Drummond and the congregation connected with him would suspend communion with the Scotch Episcopal Church until their Christian privileges are secured to them, and when this is done they will return;" but "a new and more serious ground of difference was brought under the notice of Mr. Drummond by an English clergyman. A Communion Office exists in the Scottish Episcopal Church—little known in the South of Scotland (where the use of an English Communion Office is permitted)—which contains doctrines repugnant to Scripture and closely allied to superstition."

Mr. Drummond held that this Office clearly expressed the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Eucharist, and a doctrine of transubstantiation; though it is fair to add that the

justice of this view has been uniformly denied by its supporters.[1]

This ground of separation, however, was soon to show its reality, for the action taken by the Bishop of Edinburgh against the Evangelical clergy was followed by the Bishop of Aberdeen, who endeavoured to compel Sir William Dunbar, the Incumbent of St. Paul's, Aberdeen, one of those English chapels which had joined the Scotch Episcopal Church, to join in the celebration of the Scotch Communion Office. This was a direct breach of the Articles of Union, and he and his congregation again dissolved their union. They were followed by Mr. Miles, the Incumbent of St. Jude's, Glasgow, who was assailed by his Bishop for sympathizing with Sir William Dunbar. The church of St. Peter's, Montrose, had never joined the Scotch Episcopal Church, and other new Evangelical congregations were formed in connection with them, the principal of which were St. Vincent, Edinburgh; St. Silas's, Glasgow; and St. John's, Dundee. And thus the congregations of English Episcopalians again formed a separate communion not in connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church; the grounds of separation being first, the refusal of the Evangelical congregations in Scotland of those Christian privileges enjoyed by their brethren in England; and second, the recognition of the Scotch Communion Office as a standard of doctrine which they could not accept.

The alienation between the two Episcopal Communions was further increased when the judgment of the Privy Council in the Gorham case, in 1850, drew forth from the High Church party in England numerous protests against it, in which the then Scotch Bishops unanimously joined, and declared it not to be binding on their Church.

This was the last step taken in this direction by the rulers of that Church, and soon after a better spirit began to prevail. It was felt that the Bishops had been led to adopt a very mistaken course in alienating the Evangelical congregations, and there was a very general regret that it had led to a schism in the Church. It was not long before they were startled by the Primary Charge of the late Bishop of Brechin, which was delivered in 1857 and published. In this Charge the Bishop maintained that there was a material presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements, and that therefore they ought to be adored. His views, however, were not sanctioned by the rest of the Bishops. They severally protested against them; and finally, in 1858, issued in

[1] The present writer, who was a member of the Evangelical congregation of St. James's, which did not secede, thought it his duty to support Mr. Drummond, and was one of the original members of St. Thomas's.

Synod a Pastoral letter in which they were repudiated, and a moderate view of Eucharistic doctrine, in accordance with that generally held in the Church of England, was maintained to be the doctrine of the Church.[1]

It was soon seen that the position of the Scotch Communion Office in the Canons, as of primary authority and as a standard of doctrine, was inconsistent with this declaration, and a petition was presented to them by a large body in the Church, urging its abolition. It was therefore resolved to summon a general Synod of the Church, for the purpose of revising the Canons. This issued in the revised Canons of 1863, in which a great change was made in the standards of the Church, and in the position of the two Communion Offices. In the introduction to the Canons the Church is described as "being in full communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, and adopting as a standard of her faith the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion *as received in that Church.*" The Church thus explicitly receives them as they are interpreted by the Church of England, and accepts them without qualification. The Canon declaring the Scotch Communion Office to be of primary authority, and thus a standard of doctrine, is repealed. The relative position of the two Offices as services is simply inverted. The Book of Common Prayer is now declared to be the service book of the Church for all the purposes to which it is applicable, and no clergyman is to be at liberty to depart from it in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments. In all new congregations, and at all consecrations, ordinations, and Synods, the Communion Office of the Book of Common Prayer is to be exclusively used, while the use of the Scotch Communion Office is now only permitted to those congregations which have hitherto used it, and to new congregations where the incumbent and a majority of the congregation apply for it, but the Bishop may refuse the application if it appears to him that undue influence has been used. The change, therefore, with regard to the position of the Scotch Office is very great. Its position in 1842, when the separation commenced, was this:

[1] The following passage will show this; "You will remember that, as our Church has repudiated the doctrine of Transubstantiation, so she has given us no authority whereby we can require it to be believed that the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, still less his entire person as God and Man, now glorified in the heavens, is made to exist *with*, *in*, or *under* the material substances of Bread and Wine. You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross."

1. The Scotch Communion Office was used in the old non-juring congregations in the North.
2. It was declared to be of primary authority.
3. Every Presbyter must acknowledge this.
4. The use of the English Office in the other congregations was merely permitted.
5. The Scotch Office must be used not only at the consecration of Bishops, but at the opening of every general Synod, and every Presbyter was thus liable to take part in it.

Of these facts, which abundantly justified the separation, not one was left in existence after the revision of the Canons in 1863 except the first, and the Scottish Communion Office was in all the rest replaced by the Common Prayer Book. The Canon which restricted the freedom of service, and might be enforced to prohibit prayer-meetings, was unfortunately retained.

This great change was differently viewed by the English Episcopalians, so far as the Scotch Communion Office was concerned. By some the obstacle created by it was considered to be substantially removed; but Mr. Drummond himself held that it was still incumbent upon the English Episcopalians to continue apart as a standing protest against the use of it to any extent whatever, and the great weight of his personal character and influence swayed the greater part of the body. Both parties, however, were agreed that the retention of the Canon restricting the freedom of the services still presented an obstacle to union, unless the same liberty in this respect was guaranteed to them as is enjoyed by Evangelical congregations in England. Mr. Drummond, however, showed his willingness to terminate the schism if this were done, and if the Scotch Communion Office were replaced by the Communion Office in the Service Book of 1637, which he offered to accept.

During the next ten years the Scotch Episcopal Church drew gradually nearer to the Church of England, and assimilated herself more and more to it in her doctrinal aspect and comprehensive spirit. There was more spiritual life and less narrow formalism in her teaching and services, the communion with the Church of England became closer, and she was more fully recognised by the latter as her true representative in Scotland The Scotch Bishops were invited to the Pan-Anglican Synod, and took part in many of the Conferences, and English Bishops freely officiated in the Scotch Episcopal Churches; at length in 1875 a series of Mission Services took place in the Edinburgh churches, which were conducted by the Rev. W. D. Maclagan, now Bishop of Lichfield, and the Rev. Mr. Pigou, now Vicar of Halifax. These services attracted to them many

of the English Episcopalians, and their effect was to leave behind them an enlarged spirit of Christian love and charity, and greater breadth in her practical work and services, so that the same prayer-meetings were then and since generally held which had been suppressed in 1842.

In the end of this year Mr. Drummond resigned his position as Incumbent of St. Thomas's, after a ministry of upwards of thirty years, which had been characterized by great faithfulness and had been largely blessed to his people, his health rendering absolute rest and quiet essential to him, and soon after his retirement an unexpected difficulty arose to the English Episcopalians. The confirmation of the children of the English congregations had hitherto been provided for by sending them at first to Carlisle, where they were confirmed by the late Bishop of Carlisle (Waldegrave), and after his death to Berwick, where the same good office was rendered to them by the late good and excellent Bishop of Durham (Baring). This Bishop had, however, for some time, as the result of mature consideration, come to the conclusion that the Scotch Canons of 1863 conceded quite as much as the English Episcopalians required, and only resolved, out of consideration for Mr. Drummond, to accept candidates for confirmation at Berwick as long as he was minister of St. Thomas's, but upon his voidance of the charge he meant no longer to do so.[1] Accordingly, when an application was made to him in August, 1876, to confirm the children of one of the English congregations as usual, he replied in the following terms: "I am very sorry that I must decline receiving candidates for confirmation from Edinburgh. The resignation of Mr. Drummond seemed to me an admirable opportunity for arranging a Concordat between the so-called English Episcopal congregations and Bishop Coterill. Mr. Drummond had consistently fought a most important battle with reference to the Communion Service, and to all intent had gained the victory. It is, I believe, entirely due to him that the Canons, with reference to the Scotch Communion Service, were altered. It could be hardly expected that after all he had undergone for the cause of the truth he should be willing to accept the authority in any way of a Scotch Bishop. But on his resignation an opportunity has occurred, in my judgment, which ought not to be lost, of a satisfactory arrangement." Mr. Drummond's influence, however, was too much felt for this excellent advice to be followed, while the restrictive

[1] Communicated by the clergyman to whom he made the statement, and whom he told that whenever his advice had been sought by Evangelical clergymen about taking charges offered them in the Scotch Episcopal Church, he always told them that there was nothing whatever to prevent Evangelical clergymen from accepting such preferment.

Canon, with regard to the services, still presented in their minds an obstacle.

In order to meet the difficulty, an association was formed in March, 1877, of English Episcopalians in Scotland for the object of promoting their interests generally, and specially to secure the continuance of the services of a Bishop of the Church of England to exercise Episcopal functions among these congregations. Mr. Drummond was a member of this association, and the chapels represented were St. Thomas's and St. Vincent, Edinburgh; St. Silas's and St. Jude's, Glasgow; St. Peter's, Montrose; St. John's, Dundee; St. James's, Aberdeen; those at Nairn, Cally, Wemyss Bay and Dunoen.

The sudden death of Mr. Drummond on the 9th of June, 1877, soon after deprived the party of their able and excellent leader, by whom they were held together, not only by the force of his Christian and Evangelical character, but by the bond of strong personal attachment, a feeling in which the present writer fully joined.

Bishop Beckles, an ex-colonial Bishop settled in London, undertook the duty of exercising Episcopal functions among them, and in the following year proceeded to Scotland and confirmed the children in the English chapels. There was nothing absolutely contrary to ecclesiastical law or usage in this, for the Scotch Bishops did not possess territorial jurisdiction in the same sense as belonged to the Diocesan Bishops of the Church of England. By the Statute of 1840 (3 & 4 Vict., c. 33), a Scotch Bishop is defined as "any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland residing and exercising Episcopal functions within any district or place in Scotland," in contradistinction to the English Bishop, who is referred to as "the Bishop of any Diocese in England and Ireland;" and Bishop Beckles was merely to exercise Episcopal functions without any right of superintendence or jurisdiction being conferred upon him. But notwithstanding there being no technical objection to his exercising these functions in Scotland, it soon became apparent to many of the English Episcopalians that this had been an ill-advised step; and so far from strengthening their position materially weakened it. At the first meeting of the Convocations of Canterbury and York which followed, this step was condemned by both Convocations, in consequence of which the Incumbent of St. James's Chapel, Aberdeen, refused to allow Bishop Beckles to confirm their children, and formally joined the Scotch Episcopal Church, and there was no doubt that it was almost universally viewed with disapprobation in England. They could not, too, but recognise the altered aspect of the Scotch Episcopal Church —that the use of the Scotch Office was in the main confined

to congregations in the north, who had inherited a relish for it from the old non-juring Church; that one half, if not a majority, of the existing Bishops, and the great body of the Clergy in the southern dioceses, had no greater liking for it than had the English Episcopalians, and that its use among them was extremely rare; that among them perfect freedom of service and a close approximation to the Church of England now existed. There actually were in the Diocese of Edinburgh two Evangelical congregations—those of Trinity Church and St. Andrew's Church; and they could not but feel that a united Evangelical party within the Church would be more powerful for good than when they were divided—part within the Church, and part in an isolated position without it—that, as the ties between the Scotch Episcopal Church and the Church of England were drawn closer, their position, as the grounds of separation became narrower, would be less tenable, and they would meet with less support and sympathy from their brethren in England. They felt, too, that with the changed spirit of the Scotch Episcopal Church there would be every disposition to remove the difficulties which impeded union; and it appeared to them that the time had now come when it would be desirable, if it could be done without sacrifice of principles, to terminate the separation.

The keynote was struck in a pamphlet published in 1882, under the title of "A Plea for Union among Episcopalians in Scotland, by a Member of the Church of England;" it was followed by "A further Plea for Union among Episcopalians in Scotland, by a Presbyter of the Church of England."[1] In the former pamphlet the difficulties which impeded the union were plainly stated and discussed. The view taken with regard to the Scotch Communion Office is as follows. After stating that the revised Canon of 1863 remained, so far as its position was concerned, unaltered in the last revision of the Canon in 1876, and that this is now the law of the Church, the author proceeds:

> The question of the position of the Scotch Communion Office in the Church has, therefore, ceased to be a question of doctrine, and has now become one merely of toleration; and it is a matter of serious consideration for the English Episcopalians whether, in the face of this explicit declaration of doctrine, and adoption of the English Communion Office as the Service Book of the Church, and the only one that these congregations would be called upon to use or sanction, while the Scotch Communion Office is obviously merely permitted to certain congregations as an article of peace, and to avoid disunion, they are now justified in remaining separate on a ground as narrow as this, should all other obstacles to union be removed. Such a view would make it equally impossible for them to consider themselves connected with the Church of England. In that

[1] It is no secret now that the present writer was the author of the former, and the Rev. E. C. Dawson, of St. Thomas's, of the latter.

Church there are forms and ceremonies adopted by extreme High Churchmen in the administration of the Sacrament, which symbolize a doctrine not very diverse from that expressed by the Scotch Communion Office; and yet the Evangelical party have no thought of leaving the Church on that account. They take the true view that they are of more service to the cause of Christ by maintaining their position within it, and preserving within its fold a party bearing witness to Evangelic truth. As there are diversities in the human mind and tendencies, so there must be differences in their mode of viewing the doctrines of the Church they all accept, and in each of her forms as they find most conducive to their advancement in spiritual life. Toleration of such differences does not necessarily imply their sanction or approval, and without it there can be no comprehension in any Church. Such is the character of the Church of England, which unites within her fold parties who attach different meanings to her formularies, and are quite as apart from each other as the supporters of the Scotch Communion Office are from the Evangelical congregation. In no other sense could the English congregations, if they again united themselves with the Scotch Episcopal Church, be held to sanction the Scotch Communion Office.

The "further Plea" takes very much the same view:

"Let us then endeavour to state clearly what it is that the Evangelical congregations should seek to obtain. In the first place, with regard to the Scotch Communion Office, if they are wise they will not fail to recognise the difficulty with which the Church in Scotland has to contend. They will perceive that it may be impossible to remove from the Church's services an Office which has so long been used, and which expresses the opinions of an influential section, without causing serious disturbance or even widespread defection. They will not, therefore, ask for what it is impossible should be granted, but they will consider whether there are not terms which may be safely and honourably offered by the one and accepted by the other, without a compromise of doctrine on either side.

With regard to the other difficulties connected with the restrictions imposed by the Canons upon the services, which would unfairly hamper the position and practical work of an Evangelical clergyman, both pamphlets urge that these should be at once removed. The former pamphlet thus concludes:

Such then being in the main the obstacles which apparently prevent the union of the English Episcopalians with the Scotch Episcopal Church, if they can be removed, ought it not to be done? Would not the gain to both parties by reunion be incomparably greater than it would be to the former to remain in a position of isolation, hardly recognised by the Church of England as belonging to her, and to the latter to maintain narrow rules, adopted at a time when a narrower spirit prevailed than is the case at present? Let the Scotch Episcopal Church quietly remove or invalidate those narrow features that impede reunion. Let the English congregations be satisfied with obtaining freedom for Evangelical teaching and Evangelical practices, without seeking to impose their views on others who differ from them: and let both parties join in one Christian brotherhood, and go forward into the warfare against evil, and unite as Christian brothers in one common effort to win souls to Christ.

The same tone is taken in the conclusion of the second pamphlet:

> The English Episcopal Churches, too, will, if they are filled with the spirit of wisdom, let bygones be bygones; they will lay aside all feelings of prejudice, and regard such concessions as may be offered them from the broad standpoint of Christian charity. And if both parties meet as brethren, earnestly and sincerely desirous to find a method by which both may work hand in hand for their common Master, it will be hard indeed if such a way cannot be found.

The views expressed in these pamphlets were at once cordially responded to by the Scotch Episcopal Church. A meeting of the whole Clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh, under the presidency of their Bishop, was held, when a resolution was unanimously adopted in favour of removing all obstacles to a union of the two Communions, and not long after the Bishops met and agreed to issue a Declaration obviating the difficulties connected with the points of difference.

At a meeting of the Representative Council of the Scottish Episcopal Church, held at Glasgow on the 10th October, 1882, the present Bishop of Durham preached before them a sermon, in which he urged the union between the two Communions in the following terms:

> Episcopal communities in Scotland outside the organization of the Scottish Episcopal Church—this is a spectacle which no one, I imagine, would view with satisfaction in itself, and which only a very urgent necessity could justify. Can such a necessity be pleaded? "One body" as well as "one Spirit;" this is the Apostolic rule. No natural interpretation can be put on these words which does not recognise the obligation of external corporate union. Circumstances may prevent the realization of the Apostle's conception, but the ideal must be ever present to our aspirations and our prayers. I have reason to believe that this matter lies very near to the hearts of all Scottish Episcopalians. May God grant you a speedy accomplishment of your desire! You have the same doctrinal formularies; you acknowledge the same Episcopal polity; you respect the same liturgical forms. "Sirs, ye are brethren." Do not strain the conditions of reunion too tightly. I cannot say, for I do not know, what faults or what misunderstandings there may have been on either side in the past. If there have been any faults, forget them. If there exist misunderstandings, clear them up. "Let the dead past bury its dead." The darkest chapters in the history of the Church are the records of schisms—hopeless schisms which centuries have done nothing to heal—arising out of the over-scrupulous accentuation of minute differences on the one hand, and the over-rigorous enforcement of an absolute uniformity on the other—sad tragedies of spiritual frailty and disorder, over which angels have wept as they beheld the Son of God crucified afresh. God forbid that another such painful chapter should be added to these dark records of the past. Learn to bear and to forbear. Meet one another in a spirit of mutual truthfulness and brotherly love.

Rest not day or night till this union be effected. Do this, and the crown of crowns shall rest upon your brows. "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God."

The Declaration, which was adjusted at this and a subsequent meeting, was issued on the 28th November, 1882, and communicated by the *Primus* to the Association of English Episcopalians, along with an address presented to the Bishop of Edinburgh by the Clergy of his diocese. It is unnecessary to quote this Declaration at length. Suffice it to say that so far as concerns doctrine, the Bishops explicitly declare that "the standards of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Church of England are now the same," and the English Book of Common Prayer "the service book of the Church, not only for the performance of morning and evening service, but for the Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church." That the use of the Scotch Communion Office is permitted, because it "has been in use in certain congregations for upwards of a century," and "that it would be at variance with those principles of comprehension and toleration which ought to regulate the government of every Christian Church, and are essential to the preservation of unity, to deprive the foresaid congregations of the liberty granted to them," but "that there is obviously no possibility of this Office being imposed on any congregation contrary to their wishes;" and they declare "that those who by their subscription promise obedience to the Canons do not thereby commit themselves either to an approval of the distinctive features of the said Communion Office, or to any acceptance of doctrine which can be supposed to be inconsistent with the Book of Common Prayer." With regard to discipline, it states that the purpose of the Canon is, in their judgment, "on the one hand, to secure regularity in the stated and ordinary worship of the Church, and, on the other, to prevent the introduction of ritual and doctrine inconsistent with the Church's formularies and standards; but that the Bishops would not use the power given them under that Canon to interfere with other services for devotion and instruction by any of the Clergy, such as are now of frequent occurrence amongst us, over and above the stated services both on Sundays and other days." This Declaration is signed by all the Bishops; and the address signed by the Dean and all the Clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh, which was adopted by them, and communicated with it, explicitly declares "that the liberty of worship now possessed in England by those of the Clergy commonly designated 'Evangelical,' has, as a matter of fact, been enjoyed to the full in our own Communion without hindrance and without reproach."

The present writer is permitted to state that the terms of the Declaration were submitted by him to the Archbishop of York, and that his Grace expressed a decided opinion that it ought to be accepted by the English Episcopalians as satisfactory, and strongly advised that the separation between the two Communions should now be brought to an end.

When these documents were formally communicated, the result was that the Vestry of St. Vincent Church and the Incumbent, Mr. Talon, were unanimously of opinion that "This Declaration substantially removes the causes of the separation of the English Episcopal Chapels;" and the Incumbent, with the full concurrence of the congregation, subscribed the Canons.

The Vestry of St. Thomas's came to the same conclusion; but there were circumstances connected with that congregation which rendered it difficult for them to take the same course, and they adopted the plan suggested by the late Bishop of Durham of a Concordat. An arrangement has therefore been made by which the Bishop of Edinburgh executes Episcopal functions in the congregation, sanctions Mr. Dawson, the Incumbent, officiating in the diocese, and an exchange of pulpits with the Clergy of the Scotch Episcopal Church.

Since then the Bishop has preached in both churches, and performed the rite of Confirmation. The constitution of the Church of Montrose prevents their coming to a resolution till the lapse of six months. The two Glasgow congregations have peremptorily refused to join their brethren in either uniting themselves to the Church or in entering into a similar Concordat. Their grounds of objection are stated in a published letter addressed by a leading layman to the secretary of the Association of English Episcopalians. Space prevents us quoting it at length, but they may be stated shortly that: 1st. The Church "not only recognises and sanctions, but will continue to recognise and sanction, the use of our Office which expressly teaches and proclaims the erroneous and pernicious Papal doctrine of transubstantiation;" 2nd. The power conferred upon its Bishops of preventing a clergyman from conducting "in any unlicensed place any religious service." It is obvious that such objections derive their force solely from regarding the Scotch Episcopal Church in the aspect she presented prior to the revision of the Canons in 1863, and practically ignoring the change affecting them and its results in the altered spirit of the Church. That the first objection is now untenable, we have the weighty authority of the late Evangelical Bishop of Durham; and it is enough to assure them of the groundlessness of their fear as to the second, that the Bishop of Glasgow (Dr. Wilson) signs the Declaration.

It is probably due to this being apparent to themselves that two other grounds have since been urged; viz., that the Scotch Episcopal Church protested against the Gorham judgment in 1850, and that the Declaration is merely the opinion of individual Bishops, and has no authoritative or permanent character. But these, too, are equally untenable, for the first was before the revision of the Canons in 1863, and the Bishops now explicitly declare that their standards are the same with those of the Church of England; while the address which declares that the liberty accorded to the Evangelical Clergy in England is enjoyed to the full in the Scotch Episcopal Church is signed, among others, by two Evangelical clergymen. As to the second objection, they have the remedy in their own hands, for they can give to the Declaration the force of contract by making it a condition of the Concordat or an article in the Constitution of the Church, to be approved by the Bishop in terms of the Canons, as has been done in the case of St. Vincent Church.

It is obvious that if each party in a Church insisted upon enforcing their views upon other parties, and refused to tolerate any deviation in doctrine or ritual in the others, to which they were not required themselves to submit, a united and comprehensive Church would be impossible, and it would become a mere group of separate sects, viewing each other with dislike and suspicion, and refusing to co-operate in the great contest with evil. This is the position which the Glasgow congregations of English Episcopalians must inevitably assume if they continue to maintain a separation not only from the Scotch Episcopal Church, but from their Evangelical brethren, upon grounds too narrow and ill-founded to bear examination. Our Saviour's exhortation to His disciples to love one another is best interpreted in our days by a large-hearted and generous mutual toleration in matters of difference in the same Church, which do not involve a real sacrifice of principle on either side.

It is to be hoped that when time has mitigated the angry feelings which accompany controversy, and calm reflection has shown the superiority of union and co-operation over division and isolation, and the relative unimportance of the points of difference when viewed in a candid spirit, the result may be a united and comprehensive Episcopal Church in Scotland, in which the Evangelical element may have its legitimate freedom and influence, and every obstacle to the union of all those who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth, in one combined effort against evil, be once and for ever removed.

WILLIAM F. SKENE.

ART. II.—THOUGHTS ON NATIONAL RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

"THE MODES IN WHICH CHILDREN MAY BE ESTABLISHED IN SOUND RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES, AND THE CAUSES OF THEIR FREQUENT DEFECTION THEREFROM."

THIS subject is of vast importance at the present time. We and our children are surrounded by great dangers. Those professing Christians who have embraced the strange, not to say monstrous idea—an idea such as neither their forefathers nor the Christian Church in any previous age entertained—that religion and politics must be divorced, find themselves on the same platform with secularists and unbelievers in an unbecoming and unholy effort to banish the Bible from National Schools. A secular system of education would not only be dishonouring to us as a Christian nation, but it would also undoubtedly be a grievous wrong, fraught with terrible consequences, to our children. It is easy to relegate religious instruction to parents, pastors, and Sunday-school teachers theoretically; the broad, unmistakable fact remains that with many good influences at work, and with much excellent machinery in motion, we are not able to keep pace with the religious requirements of our children, nor to retain them, to any adequate extent, in the paths of virtue, rectitude, and piety. Dangerous times are the times for increasing, not diminishing, sound, Scriptural instruction, and for retaining, not destroying or decreasing, the fortresses which the wisdom of our fathers and the principles of our faith erected for the moral and spiritual welfare of the children of our Church and of our land.

The members of the Church of Rome, and the agents of a conspiracy within the walls of our beloved Zion, are wise in their generation. No effort do they spare to obtain a firm hold of the young by careful instruction in their peculiar tenets, and by the formation of numerous guilds and sisterhoods, the members of which act upon each other, and as far as possible prevent unfaithfulness or defection. They are one with us in opposition to a purely secular system of education. It would be as fatal to their purposes in propagating what, in certain aspects, we are persuaded is downright heresy, as it would be to us in endeavouring to disseminate the pure gospel of the grace of God. While we abhor many of their principles and practices, we may learn some lessons from their organizations, their zeal and their unwearied vigilance. Certain it is that as there is defection from sound religious principles too pain-

fully and clearly manifested, in various quarters, in the direction of infidelity, worldliness, immorality, or heresy, no pains should be spared to establish our children in the faith, and to watch over and help them in their Christian walk and conversation. As so many of the working-classes neglect places of worship; as immense political power is now placed in their hands which may seriously affect the National Church; as every effort is put forth to influence them in the direction of secularism, it is beyond all question a solemn duty to store their minds with religious truth and to adopt such measures as are conducive to retain them as consistent and loyal members of our Church, and as steadfast upholders of sound Protestant and Evangelical religion.

This subject, as has been said, is most important, but it is not new; and for my part, I have nothing fresh to advance in connection with it. Yet it is well, from time to time, to be reminded of our duty towards the children of our Church and country, and to seek to realize afresh the dangers which beset them.

At the outset, then, it may be observed that, on this as on all other religious questions, any cause of failure arises from a neglect of the principles laid down in the Word of God. The inculcation of sound religious principles ought to begin at home and in the nursery. God Himself marks out as a distinctive characteristic of the father of the faithful and the friend of God that he would teach his children the way of the Lord. In the Old Testament, parents are instructed to train up their children for God, to tell them of God's judgments and miraculous works, to teach them the Scriptures, to pity, correct, bless, and pray for them. In the time of our Lord, if these duties were not fully carried out, great care was undoubtedly taken to teach children the traditions of the elders and portions of the Scriptures, though the interpretation of the same was of a defective and legal, rather than of a spiritual character. We should expect that He who came to fulfil all righteousness would have something to say about children, illustrating and expanding the principles laid down in the existing Scriptures; nor are we disappointed. Little children gathered around Him. He held them in His arms and blessed them, and He taught that those members of His kingdom were the greatest who were childlike in their characteristics. And after His resurrection from the dead, in those apparently brief interviews He had with His Apostles, there is one incident and one conversation of vast importance in relation to children. Simon Peter, after his fall and repentance, is of a very lowly spirit. He is now, as he never was before, in a frame of mind to feed and tend the flock of Christ, the sheep and the lambs. The

flock would ever have, to a greater or less extent, the silly and wayward characteristics of sheep. The lambs would require greater tenderness and care. Peter has been foolish and self-willed himself, but in the school of suffering he has become tender-hearted and childlike. Our Lord knows this, but before He gives him his commission He requires the development of another characteristic, viz., personal, devoted, whole-hearted love for Himself. "Simon, son of Jonas, hast thou some regard for Me?" "Regard, Lord—I have the deepest personal love for Thee." "Simon, hast thou really some regard for Me?" "Regard, Lord—ah! much more than that; I have the deepest personal love for Thee." "Is it so, Simon? hast thou the deepest personal love for Me?" Peter was grieved that Jesus asked him this question the third time. He ought not to have been grieved. Love delights in a response of love. The tale can never be too often told. Jesus wanted to hear the voice of Peter breathing out the affection of his heart. It is when there is the expression of personal love for Himself that the Good Shepherd entrusts His sheep and His lambs to the tender care of Peter—then, and not till then. "Lead My lambs to the pasture where good food is to be found. Shepherdize the full-grown sheep, and lead the full-grown sheep that are lamb-like and require tender treatment to the good and rich pastures. Remember, Simon, that the lambs and the full-grown sheep, and the sheep that are lamb-like, are *Mine*—the objects of My love: because of thy love for Me, love and care for them."

Principles similar to those already cited are to be found in the New Testament; and, whatever may have been the conduct of parents, it is evident that the early Church, by its deacons and catechists, did not neglect the younger members of Christ's flock. "The Lord's Day meetings of the Apostolic Church were not simply gatherings of men and women; the young were there as well, and the very young were not forgotten in the ministrations of the holy day."

In the darkest days of Church History the monks and nuns had charge of the instruction of children and young persons. The glorious Reformers recognised the importance of this duty, and not only composed the much-abused but most valuable Church Catechism, but also required that "the curate of every parish should diligently, upon Sundays and holy days, after the second lesson at evening prayer, openly in the church, instruct and examine so many children of his parish sent unto him as he should think convenient, in some part of their Catechism." For a time this injunction was generally observed. The vast increase of the population, however, and the consequent demands for services of various kinds, made it impossible to obey this injunction adequately;

and when real spiritual life was at a low ebb, if observed at all, it was in a cold, formal, perfunctory way.

One of the natural results of a real spiritual revival ever should be sincere interest in and care for the young; and such a result came from the blessed revival in our own Church and land. God put it into the heart of Robert Raikes to found Sunday-schools—which really were a return to primitive custom, having their counterpart in the synagogue and the assemblies of early Christians. Such schools some sacerdotalists would disparage or destroy, for they want all spiritual instruction to be in their own hands; but the people of England, inside and outside of the Church, know their value too well to allow them to be abolished. They are a grand institution, which must be maintained, and if possible increased and improved to the fullest extent. Because many parents neglect duties distinctly specified in the Word of God; because others who have the will, and make their best effort, which, though unpretentious, is most valuable, feel that more time than they can give, and greater ability than they possess, are required in these days of advanced education and of many dangers; because the Clergy in many parishes are overburdened with both secular and religious work, Sunday-schools and day-schools, in which the Bible is not only read, but definite instruction taken therefrom is given, are an absolute necessity.

Before specifying "the modes in which children may be established in sound religious principles," or "the causes of their frequent defection therefrom," it is essential to make a distinction between classes. The upper classes have advantages and disadvantages. They have the advantage of excellent books and of superior education, and, as a rule, they are early taught the habit of attending church, and are at the time of confirmation—a rite which they seldom neglect—under the direct influence and personal instruction of the Clergy. In some cases, pious governesses give the religious instruction, to which the parents, strange to say, are absolutely indifferent. But they have their disadvantages. In some of their schools there is no religious education whatever; in others it is merely nominal, and has rather to do with sacred historical events and criticism than with doctrine and the soul's requirements in its relationship to God; while in not a few it is of an heretical and injurious character.

Special and peculiar temptations assail the wealthy, and it is evident from some defections to the apostate Church of Rome that the subtle influences of Jesuitism are at work to captivate the heirs to great properties and the children of those who possess titles or are in high and important posi-

tions. It must be boldly stated that in too many quarters sound religious principles have not been adequately instilled into the minds of the upper and middle classes, and it is a reproach to the Evangelical section of the Church that they have not established more generally and on a greater scale, middle-class schools.[1] It is, however, pleasing to notice that special efforts are being made for the benefit of the children of the upper classes, that Bible-classes and religious meetings are held in drawing-rooms, that services are conducted not only in churches, but also in the open air, on lawns, or on the seashore at fashionable bathing-places.

As regards the children of the working-classes, taken as a whole, little can be expected from parents, whose time is fully occupied with household duties and daily toils, in the way of religious education. They are now divided into two sections—one attending board-schools, where sound religious principles are not instilled at all except by the formal reading of the Scriptures, or instilled according to the ideas of a teacher who may happen to hold them, or may have none at all. Of many of this section it may be said, that except in church, chapel, or Sunday-school, they have no chance whatever of knowing anything of religious principles. The other section is in denominational schools, the major part of course being in Church schools. For a time, at least, those young persons who compose this section are under the influence of the Clergy, both on week-days and Sundays, in our schools and in our churches.

From what has already been advanced it will be obvious—and it is important that this fact should be remembered—that, with reference to vast numbers of the children of our land, there is no defection from sound religious principles, simply because there have been no sound religious principles inculcated from which defection could take place.[2]

Amongst the causes of defection from sound religious

---

[1] I have watched with much interest the progress of the South Eastern College, Ramsgate, an excellent school in connection with the South Eastern Lay and Clerical Society, of which the Dean of Canterbury is the President. Such an institution ought to have much more financial support than, so far as I know, it has yet received.

[2] Amongst the children who come under the influence of the Clergy and Church teachers, there are, alas! only too many who are established in religious principles which I cannot in honesty designate "sound religious principles." Thank God the leaven of Evangelical truth penetrates often into unexpected quarters; and persons sound in the faith are found teaching in parishes and schools which are under the management of those whose doctrines are neither loyal to the Church of these realms nor to the Scriptures of truth. Men and women holding Evangelical principles quietly do their work in the old places and on the lines of the old paths.

principles there must stand in the forefront, and as the basis of all other causes, the natural enmity of the human heart. Until the heart is really changed by the Holy Spirit of God, defection from sound religious principles ought to cause no surprise. Even when the mind has grasped a considerable portion of truth, and can detect mistaken views of the Gospel, it does not follow that there is any real love for the same.

My readers are all aware how careful some of those who have adopted unscriptural views are to inform the public that they were brought up in the strictest Evangelical school; and it has been insinuated that the complement of Evangelicalism is the special ism they have embraced. But Evangelicalism has no complement, it deals in extremes—on the one hand, with the utter ruin of man; and on the other, with a perfect Saviour, a perfect justification, a perfect salvation. "Ye are complete in Him." If there has been defection from sound religious principles it is, as St. Paul teaches us, because the truth was not loved.

Considering, then, what the natural disposition is, the following causes are calculated to produce defection from sound religious principles—the influence of worldly and wicked companions; the prevailing scepticism; the spirit of disobedience and lawless independence, which is a feature of the times; the increasing opposition to clearly marked and definite doctrinal truth; divided opinion in the Church, and the citation of great names in favour of lax and erroneous views; the tone of certain novels, periodicals, reviews, newspapers, etc. Let it not be said that these are dangers which scarcely affect children; the air is so full of them that they reach, to a greater or less extent, every class of the community. The discussions of the playground are a proof that the conversations relating to the political and religious events of the day, whether held in overcrowded and poor dwelling-houses, or in gilded saloons, are not always listened to carelessly or inattentively; and there can be no question that these dangers have their influence at the most critical period of life, when the school bonds are unfastened, and the first step is taken in the path of personal freedom and independence.

There are, however, some special causes of defection from sound religious principles, which it may be well to mention. In our large towns there is a considerable amount of proselytizing on the part of (1) Secularists, (2) Ritualists, and (3) Dissenters.

1. Secularists have their organizations throughout the country. Even where they fail to win over open or secret disciples, they sometimes instil principles of pure worldliness. There came into my hands the other day a copy of the Rules

and Principles of the National Secular Society. I give one extract:

> The members are either active or passive. The active list consists of those who do not object to the publication of their names as members of the National Secular Society. An active member's duty is to send as often as possible reliable reports to the president or the secretary of *the doings of the local Clergy*, of special events, sermons, lectures, or publications affecting Secular progress. He should also aid in the circulation of Secular literature, and generally in the freethought propaganda of his neighbourhood. . . . . The passive list consists of those whose position does not permit the publication of their names, except at risk of serious injury. The knowledge of these names is confined to the executive, and the members are only referred to by initials.

Here, then, are a set of men acting as spies upon the doings of the Clergy and reporting to a superior officer, "special events, sermons, lectures, or publications affecting secular progress." This superior officer, if so disposed, can send the information he receives on to the President, Mr. Bradlaugh, who may thus be in possession of the characters, doings, speeches of the Clergy in each and every centre.

"Extremes meet," and we have a Secularist propaganda on a thoroughly Jesuitical model. Secularism, like Jesuitism, is working hard to get hold, in this grand England of ours, of men, women, and children.

2. Ritualists directly aim at the subversion of what we hold to be "sound religious principles." They have secrets, mysteries, services, books, guilds, which are not without special attractions for the young. The members of their guilds might almost be called "professional proselytizers," and they leave no stone unturned to act on each other and to prevent defection. By promises, resolutions, or vows, the young are bound and enslaved to particular opinions, practices, and priests. The Ritualists are well organized and act together as a party. By sneers at what they call Puritanism; by vulgar and unscrupulous attacks upon the great leaders of the Reformation; by directing attention to what they designate "Church" or "Catholic" teaching rather than to the Scriptures; by excessive laudation of their partizans for preaching, work, or self-denial; by trying to make out, especially in their tracts relating to confession, that English divines in past ages agreed with their sentiments and practices, they seek to trade on a too widely-spread ignorance upon theological subjects, and to win to their side the young and unsuspecting. "They seek," says Mr. Askwith, "by every means to throw discredit on the Thirty-nine Articles. They induce publishers to issue Prayer Books which do not contain them. They teach that the Articles are to be explained by the Prayer Book and not the Prayer Book by the Articles. . . .

They throw every obstacle in the way of elucidating the Thirty-nine Articles by publishing manuals on the Prayer Book which do not treat of the Articles, and calling the study of them dry and unprofitable." At the time of Confirmation—that time of vast importance and when vital issues are often at stake—they spare no pains to stamp their influence on the inmost soul of those who come under their charge.

3. Dissenters by bitter attacks on the Church, by political action, and by proselytizing members of their chapels, not unfrequently influence our young people at the age when they leave the day and Sunday schools. In these days such an influence is to be most seriously deprecated, for there is a widespread opinion that amongst special sections there is a marked absence of the spirituality of the fathers of nonconformity, as there is an undoubted change of front with reference to an established religion and the public recognition of God; and, it must be added, that only too frequently very vague and unsatisfactory doctrines are taking the place of the old, well-defined, Evangelical system of religion, which was at once the strength and the glory of the greatest and best of Dissenting leaders and teachers.

Amongst the best means of establishing children in sound religious principles, I would specify the following:—

1. Distinctive teaching in the pulpit and in the schools.—There never was a time when such teaching was more essential. The very soul and life of sacerdotalism depend upon sharply defined dogma. Vague, general, Broad Church ideas will never, in my judgment, stand against it. Imperious, sacerdotal dogmatism demands implicit acceptance and submission. Too frequently the recoil from the demand, as it is in Italy and in France, is infidelity. The dogma of human invention must be met by the dogma of the Scriptures. The sneer of Broad Churchmen against systems of doctrine must be unheeded. I have had, as some of my readers may be aware, a certain measure of experience as regards Missions and Mission Preachers, and I venture to affirm that those Missions have been the most successful and permanent in which the Person of Christ and the doctrines which are connected with His history, character, and work have been most clearly defined.[1]

2. The careful training of day and Sunday-school teachers.—In some of our large parishes the Clergy must be to a great

[1] The Church recognises a system of doctrine in her Articles; and though some may esteem them the forty stripes save one, it will be our wisdom to make use of them in our pulpits and in our schools. Of the value of the Articles and of the Homilies I have a high sense.

extent dependent upon their teachers for the proper training of the young, but the teachers should impart that instruction which they themselves have received from their Clergy. Teachers and pupil-teachers should be helped in the preparation of the diocesan examination in religious knowledge; and the Sunday-school lesson should be carefully given to the teachers before the teachers give it to the scholars.

3. The importance of pressing upon parents the care they should take as to the churches and schools to which they allow their children to go.—Parents are often to blame for the defection of their children; and when it is too late, when their children have been to confession and have joined a guild, when they have become entangled in meshes from which it is almost impossible to get them free, they discover, to their bitter sorrow, the mistake they have made.[1]

4. The organization of associations.—No pains should be spared to bring and weld together the younger members of our Church. Isolation is disastrous; union is strength. No church and no parish in populous districts should be without Bible-classes and associations for young men and for young women. To make such classes and associations successful, the members must be personally known to the Clergy, and they must be conscious of their loving sympathy and interest. If they are under the impression that they are brought together merely to be taught or to be enchained in cold, hard, fast laws, the result will undoubtedly be failure. The instruction of a spiritual character must partake of the nature of a joint search into the truths of revelation, and they must be convinced that they are themselves of importance and of use; and that they are really wanted to work and to help forward God's cause in the parish and in the world. A spirit of friendship ought to be cultivated in each class and association, and that friendship should occasionally find expression and a cementing bond in a special attendance at the Supper of the Lord.

5. Instruction in the principles of the Church of England. —The principles of our Church are sound, religious principles because they are agreeable to the Word of God. If our young people do not know why we have an Established Church, forms of prayer, recurring seasons, special offices—in other words, if they are not taught to love and value the Church and the Prayer Book, defection from sound religious principles, defection to Dissent or even Romanism, is not to be a

[1] Often is the home made miserable because a stranger has pushed himself into it—a priestly confessor has wormed out family secrets, and has come between the parents and their children, with a presumptuous and unlawful authority.

cause of wonder. At as early an age as possible children should be taught to use the Prayer Book readily and intelligently. It has been truly said, "The use of it does not come by the light of nature: it must be taught."

6. Letters of introduction.—Too great stress cannot be placed upon this point. It frequently happens that just when a boy or girl is leaving school a situation is obtained in a new parish. A letter of introduction may then be of inestimable value. Such letters, I rejoice to believe, are greatly on the increase.

7. I place last of all the personal holiness of all who have young children under their care. It cannot be too often repeated that "children may not understand the sermon of the lip, but they will always understand the sermon of the life." Let them have the impression that their teachers are not manly, straightforward, honest; that an effort is being secretly made, under the plea of private consultation, to discover their secrets, and so to exercise over them a despotic influence; that there is any doubting or unbelief, any hypocrisy or unreality, any inconsistency of life, and there will speedily be defection from Sunday-school, from Bible-class, from church, from principle. The late Bishop of Cork, who had great influence over the young, said: "Truth on the tongue, and holiness in the life, are mighty engines with which to work. 'Take heed unto thyself and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.' You should know the truth, that you may teach it; you should be taught it, that you may know it; you should teach it, that others may know it; and walk in it, that they may receive it."

It is much easier to write a paper on this subject than to carry out the suggestions made. The Clergy have so many important duties to perform, which cannot be neglected; we have to deal with so many classes, each requiring special care; we have such huge populations, in some places rapidly increasing, which must be influenced, that there seems little likelihood of our fully discharging our duty to the young in any adequate sense. But we have a Throne of Grace at which we can obtain heavenly wisdom. What we can do personally or through others must be done. And it is no slight honour to be the means of establishing in the faith, and of guarding and shepherdizing the precious lambs of the flock of our beloved Lord.

JOSEPH MCCORMICK.

ART. III.—ANTS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

CHILDREN of the sun, the ant tribes cluster between the tropics, and are there largest in size and greatest in numbers. Receding northward and southward, the ants gradually diminish, according to the temperature of the locality. In England, thanks to the all-important Gulf Stream, although situated far northward of the tropics, the climate remains warm enough to sustain several species of ants. None of them are of any very great size, by far the largest being the common Wood Ant, or Horse Ant, as it is sometimes called. Even this is quite a small insect, while the pale yellow House Ant—an importation, as I believe—is so tiny that it is scarcely perceptible, as it glides on swift limbs about our rooms.

What are the ants? They belong to that wonderful order of insects called the Hymenoptera, which includes the bees, the wasps, the ichneumon-flies, and the gall-flies, as well as the ants. The reader must bear in mind that the Termites, often called "white ants," are no more ants than they are butterflies, and do not even belong to the Hymenoptera, but are allied to the dragon-flies. Many of the Hymenoptera are social insects, living in communities, and working in concert. Chief among them are the various hive bees, the social wasps, and the ants. All are wonderful beings, carrying out the principle of division of labour to a degree that is only equalled by civilized man; but the ants are pre-eminent among them for the singularly intellectual powers they exhibit. In all cases, however, these intellectual powers belong only to the workers, which are females with arrested development. In point of fact, all these social Hymenoptera are insect amazons, the few males and females only existing for the purpose of perpetuating the race.

We will first take the common Wood Ant (*Formica rufa*) as an example of ant-life as manifested in England, and then proceed to the larger and, if possible, more interesting species which inhabit hotter climates.

There are few woods where the nest of the ant may not be found. It is divided into two distinct portions, *i.e.* the part which is above ground, and that which is below. The former is of limited size. It is a mound composed of leaves, bits of stick, straw, and similar materials. Fir-woods are favourite habitations of this ant, as the long needle-like leaves are admirably adapted for the rude building which the ant makes. It must be remembered that the ant tribe, though admirable burrowers, are very poor builders, their structures being

exceedingly loose and fragile. A very large specimen of the ant mound will be about eleven feet in diameter, and three feet or so high in the centre. If one of these mounds be opened in summer-time, a remarkable sight presents itself. At first, all is turmoil, but after a few minutes three distinct kinds of ants are visible. First, there are multitudes of wingless ants, about the fifth of an inch in length. These are running fussily about, and many of them are bearing in their jaws some object of which they are taking the greatest care. Most of them are carrying oval objects of different sizes, but all grey or white in colour. Then there are a number of ants which are furnished with long, milky-white wings. Some of these winged ants are very nearly half an inch in length, while others are about one-third of an inch long.

The large winged ants are the perfect females, who are intended to be the founders of fresh colonies. The lesser ants with wings are the males, while the workers have no wings, nor ever will have them, because wings would be very much in the way of their work. Even those which possess wings only use them once in their lives, and then for a very short time. These wings, by the way, are marvellously beautiful. To the unassisted eye they present a milky appearance, because the eye does not possess sufficient magnifying power to separate the colours which adorn them. But the microscope shows that they are highly iridescent, different shades of azure, crimson, and green flitting over their surface as the light falls on them. As a rule, the males and females remain within the nest for a long period, and it is very difficult to detect them in the act of leaving the nest. There seems to be some sort of common understanding among the nests of a considerable district, that they should all take to wing simultaneously, as otherwise it is not easy to account for the vast swarms which are occasionally seen. They have been repeatedly mistaken for actual clouds, and one instance is mentioned where they had surrounded the spire of a church. The spectators thought that the church was on fire, the effect of the sun-rays upon the innumerable translucent wings being exactly that of flame, the dark bodies representing the smoke.

The late Mr. Frederick Smith, of the British Museum, who knew more about ants than any living man, wrote of the Garden Ant (*Formica nigra*) thus: "In the month of September, 1855, I observed at Dover immense clouds of this ant pass over the town towards the sea. Subsequently, on passing along the beach, I observed a line of their floating bodies extending from the town at least a mile towards St. Margaret's Bay; the line consisted of males and females, and was about a yard broad." The wings of both sexes, though ample in point

of size, and capable of buoying their owner in the air, are very feeble, and incapable of a long flight, or of making their way against the wind. Consequently, like the locusts, which are equally feeble of flight, they can only drift with the wind, and if they come upon the sea or a broad river, they are sure to fall into it and be drowned. Their numbers are also greatly thinned by the swallow tribe and other insect-eating birds, as well as dragon-flies, each of which can eat nearly as much as a swallow. It is very fortunate that all the females do not survive their aërial journey, for if they did so, the country would be entirly overrun with ants.

There are two points of structure in the wing which ought not to be passed over, as they are examples of the beautiful adaptation of means to end, and of instinct to structure, which we find throughout the whole animal kingdom. All the Hymenoptera have four transparent wings, which, though separated when at rest, are joined during flight, so that they look and act like two wings instead of four. This junction is obtained by means of a row of little hooks arranged along part of the upper edge of the hind wings. Exactly opposite them the lower edge of the front wings is turned up so as to make a fold or flap. As soon as the insect spreads its wings for flight, and presses them downwards, the points of the hooks glide over the surface of the front wings, and catch in the flap.

Now, though the Creator of the material universe, with its countless suns and their attendant planets, God permits no waste, and takes as much pains to avoid wasted power in an ant's wing as in all the stellar and solar systems which the telescope can only indicate.

I have mentioned that the ant only flies once in its life, and that the duration of flight is very short. Bees and wasps are perpetually on the wing, and are obliged, not only to fly to considerable distances, but to carry food to the nest. Therefore, the hooks of the bees and wasps are very strong, and shaped very much like pickaxes, with one point being greatly thickened just where the strain is greatest. But the hooks of the ant are very slight and feeble, and somewhat resemble the "pot-hooks," which, in the days of my childhood, used to be the introduction to the art of writing.

Now comes another point. I have already mentioned that the worker ants have no wings, because these organs would be very much in the way when the insect traversed the multitudinous galleries of its subterranean nest. But the female possesses four ample wings, and yet, in the course of her future life, the whole of her time is passed underground. What, then, is she to do with her wings? She is forced to rid herself of them, and to remove them before she begins to form

a new colony. But how does she do it? Until quite lately, it was thought that the ant bit them off. As this periodical does not permit illustration, I can only say that the structure of the insect renders such a feat impossible.

Suppose that any of my readers had wings growing out of their shoulder-blades, such as sculptors and painters give to conventional angels, would it be possible to bite off these wings? It would be quite as possible to bite off one's own ears. More than thirty years ago, I determined to watch the ant for myself, and take nothing on hearsay.

Towards the end of autumn, occasional winged females might be seen, having completed their solitary flight, and returned safely to earth. Their first care was to rid themselves of their wings; the ant always did so in the same manner. First, she forced her wings forward as much as possible, and in so doing turned them partially sideways. She then ran forward, and suddenly stooped, so as to bring the tips of the wings against the ground. As a rule, both pairs of wings snapped off close to the body, but now and then those of one side would persist in adhering, and several attempts had to be made before they were cast off.

So much for the mode—now for the means. If the reader will examine the wings of an ant—the Wood Ant is the best, as being largest—he will see that the strong nervures which connect the wing with the thorax are deeply scooped on the inside, the scoop looking as if it had been made with a gouge. When the wing is used for flight, and the pressure is directly downwards, the scoop scarcely weakens it at all, but when the insect reverses its wings and presses them sharply against the ground, the strain is thrown on the weakened portion, which immediately gives way. We all know the great strength of a girder when set on edge, and force applied downwards. But if that same girder be laid flat, a comparatively small force will break it. These future queens are still helpless, and can do nothing until they are met by a worker. She knows instinctively what to do, and guides her mistress to a hole in the ground, where they disappear. How the new nest is formed, and what system is adopted for constructing the extremely elaborate series of galleries and chambers, is at present unknown.

Nor is it at all an easy matter to investigate the interior of a nest, for the ant is no builder, and the partition walls are so fragile that the whole structure crumbles to pieces at the touch of spade or trowel. It is not difficult to make a "formicary" with glass sides, so that the ant can be seen at work. But ant-life in so confined a space is necessarily artificial, and can give but little idea of the real nest.

I have, however, been fortunate enough to examine, though

for a short time only, the interior of a large Wood Ant's nest in full working order. It was done in this wise. One of my friends, a good practical naturalist, held many consultations with me, until we elaborated a plan which we really thought a very clever one; and perhaps it was, as far as it went. Only, as events turned out, it went a very little way. The nests of the Wood Ant are greatly cherished by gamekeepers, as the insects, in all their stages, afford excellent food for pheasants. So my friend obtained leave for us to try our experiments in a very strictly kept preserve, where a number of ant-hills were to be found. We then procured a large piece of thick plate-glass, so large indeed, that both of us together had some trouble in carrying it from the vehicle into the preserve. Having previously chosen a fine specimen of an ant-hill, with an open space round it, we stood one on either side of it, set the glass edgewise on the top of the hill, and then drew it backwards and forwards, just as masons saw stone. We continued our work until we had not only cut completely through the ant-hill, but had sunk the glass deeply into the ground. When we had cut our way so deeply that the upper edge of the glass was beneath the top of the nest we went away, so as to give the insects plenty of time for repairing damages.

I may here mention that when an observer wishes to make practical experiments upon an ant's nest, several precautions are necessary. He should wear boots—Wellingtons are the best—and either tie the trousers firmly round the ankles with a string, or confine them with a strong india-rubber band. The hands must be also protected by gauntleted gloves, which are secured in similar fashion at the wrists.

In a few weeks' time we returned to the preserve, armed with spades, trowels, and note-books. Then we cut away the whole of the nest on one side of the glass, carrying our excavations downwards as far as the glass reached. Thus, we were enabled to look into the interior of the nest through the glass, and a most wonderful sight it was. There were galleries, shafts, connecting passages, and chambers, all filled with ants. There were the winged ants, which scarcely stirred a foot when the light shone in upon them. There were quantities of "ants' eggs" in some of the chambers, and larvæ in others. And, hurrying through the passages were thousands of workers evidently discomposed and alarmed at the intrusion of light into their dwellings, and most of them carrying off the "ants' eggs" into the recesses of the nest.

Then I began to make a sketch of the busy scene, but found myself checked by an event which neither of us had foreseen, though we ought to have done so.

The interior of the Wood Ant's nest is always moist and

warm. Ants, or at all events some species of ant, have the power of keeping their nests not only moist, but wet, though all the surroundings are hot and dry. Dr. Livingstone has drawn attention to this curious faculty. He mentions that in tropical Africa there were certain black, long-legged ants, which ran about upon the rocks with perfect impunity, and in the noontide sun. The stone was so hot that if touched the skin of the hand would be blistered. Beetles and other insects placed upon it could only run a few steps, and then fell dead. This might be expected, as insects in general succumb at a temperature of 120° Fahr., or thereabouts. Yet, not only were the ants uninjured, but the nest, which was only a few inches below the level of the soil, and far from any water, was full of moisture. Dr. Livingstone, who, although not a naturalist, was apt at generalizing, suggests that there might be something in common between the ants of Southern Africa and certain antelopes of the same country, both creatures being able to sustain life in that arid climate, and yet without the possibility of having access to water. Everyone knows that water is simply a combination of hydrogen and oxygen, and Dr. Livingstone offered the suggestion that both the antelopes and the ants might be able to combine the hydrogen which exists in the food which they eat, with the oxygen which is the life-preserving element in the air which they breathe, and so to secure sufficient moisture for the purposes of life.

To return to our Wood Ant's nest. In a very short time, the comparatively cool air which impinged upon the outer surface of the glass caused the moisture to condense in the inner surface, and accordingly the view was effectually cut off. However, I had just time to secure a rough sketch of the plan on which the interior of the nest was formed. There was a series of nearly horizontal galleries, some quite close to the surface of the ground, and others at a considerable depth. Although these galleries extended far beyond the limits of the "hill," there were no entrances except from the hill itself.[1] I have mentioned that when the nest was broken open, the majority of the workers busied themselves about the so-called eggs.

Now, when I was a very little, and a very inquisitive boy, I found myself greatly perplexed. I knew that the eggs which I had at breakfast were very much smaller than the hen which laid them, and I could not at all understand why the ant's eggs should be larger than the ants themselves. On examining

[1] Shortly after making the sketch, I came across a diagram illustrating the section of a coal-mine, and was quite startled at the almost exact resemblance of the diagram to the sketch. In fact, the mining engineer might have made his plans from the domicile of the Wood Ant.

these "eggs" with a magnifying-glass, I discovered that they were not eggs at all, but silken cocoons, similar in every respect to those of the silkworm.

The life-history of the ant, whether male, female, or worker, may be briefly given as follows: The queen ant lays her eggs, which are immediately taken in charge by the nurses. Being carried to the upper or lower portions of the nest, according to the temperature, they are hatched, and then appear as little grubs, without the least resemblance to the highly developed form which they will soon assume. They have no legs, so that they cannot move about, and in fact, an ant larva bears no small resemblance to a sausage. Dissection shows an internal structure of equal simplicity. First, there is a thin, but exceedingly tough skin; under the skin is a layer of fat, and under the fat a very thin layer of muscular fibres, just strong enough to enable the larva to bend its body. The rest of the creature is comprised of a vast stomach, so that it is really little more than a stomach furnished with a mouth. For its food, it is wholly dependent on the nurses, and I must say to their credit, that out of the hundreds of ant larvæ which I have dissected, I never found one in which the stomach was not full. When it is full fed, it proceeds to envelop itself in a silken cocoon, the slight muscular layer which I have already mentioned just sufficing to enable the creature to bend its body and direct the course of the silken threads of which the cocoon is formed. Considering the small size of the cocoon, the thread is wonderfully strong, and with a little care can be wound off like that of the silkworm itself. There are always three sizes of these cocoons, the largest being those of the queens, or perfect females, the next in size being those which contain the males, and the smallest those of the workers. When the enclosed insects have reached maturity, the nurse ants tear the cocoons open, so as to permit the inmates to escape. The males and females remain within the nest, as has already been mentioned, but the workers are very soon able to undertake their lifelong labours.

When a Wood Ant's nest is once fairly established, it retains its place for many years. Not only this, but the ants travel in the same path, which extend to wonderful distances, and can be clearly recognised, even in winter, because the ants are in the habit of removing every object which would affect their traffic. The late William Howitt told me of ant-roads which he had watched for more than fifty years, and which in his old age were as clearly defined as when he was a boy.

It has long been known that the ants possess many characteristics which are not only shared by man, but which distinguish civilized man from the savage. First and foremost comes

the capability of laying up food for the future. No savage ever provides for the future. He lives not only for the present day, but for the present hour, and as long as he can satisfy the immediate cravings of hunger and thirst, he cares for nothing more. Such races we find in the native Australians and the Bosjesmans of Southern Africa. Such were the Tasmanians, who are now totally extinct, a fate which is slowly but surely overtaking all savages. With regard to the storage of solid food as practised by the ant tribes, we must wait until we can treat of the ants of other countries. But even our own ants possess the power of storing liquid food, and do so in a very remarkable manner. With man, as with all mammalia, milk is the sole food in early childhood; with civilized man, milk remaining the principal, though not the only food for several years. The parents, therefore, must provide a store of milk for their young. They cannot do so directly, because milk cannot be kept for more than a few hours. So they store it indirectly in the form of money, which buys the milk of the dairyman. He again stores his milk indirectly by keeping cows, which afford a supply twice daily. Though I suppose that not one dairyman in a thousand has the least idea of the fact, and probably would not believe it if it were told him—the ants were beforehand with him, and kept their cows not only long before the business of a dairyman could have been invented, but many ages before man took his place on the earth. The creatures which are to the ants what cows are to us are known by the name of Aphis, popularly called the "green blight." They crowd upon young plants and tender leaves, and suck the sap by means of a sharp-pointed proboscis. If an aphis be carefully examined, two little horn-like projections will be seen on the upper part of the abdomen. They differ in shape and size according to the species, but serve the same office. Scientifically, they are termed "cornicles." If these cornicles be submitted to the microscope, or even to a tolerably powerful magnifying-glass, they will be seen to be tubes, having an aperture at the extremity. From the aperture there exudes almost perpetually a translucent, viscid liquid, which falls in tiny drops, and is mostly received upon the leaves of the plant on which the aphis is feeding. Popularly it is known as "honey-dew." To the touch, this liquid much resembles sugar and water, and to the taste the resemblance is quite as remarkable. In point of fact, just as the cow, by the wondrous chemistry of Nature, converts her food into the saccharine milk, so does the aphis convert the sap of the plant into the sweet honey-dew. There are very many species of aphis found in England, and most of them secrete this honey-dew in abundance. Some of them possess a proboscis which seems almost

absurdly large when compared with the size of the insect. It measures from base to tip very nearly three times the length of the body, and at the base is enormously thick, so that a side view of the aphis is really ludicrous, the proboscis passing underneath the body and extending far beyond it. Most persons, when these aphides are first pointed out to them, think that the proboscis is a tail, and a very long one.

Honey-dew is to the ants what milk is to us, and not only do they lick up the sweet juice from the leaves, but they drink it as it exudes from the cornicles. Sometimes they come upon an aphis which is not producing honey-dew. In that case, with their antennæ, which are evidently the conversational organ of the ant tribes, they gently tap the extremity of the cornicle. These little taps are quite understood by the aphis, which soon pours out a modicum of the needed liquid.

Not only do the ants supply themselves in this manner, but they actually carry the aphides into their nests and scoop out chambers for them, just as the dairyman keeps his cows in stalls. They even go further in their storage of liquid food. Towards the end of autumn they ransack the trees in order to search for the eggs of the aphides, which produce honey-dew. They then carry off the eggs, and place them in the recesses of the nest. In the following spring, when the young leaves are beginning to show themselves, the ants carry the eggs back again to the tree, and place them on the tender leaves, which will afford them abundance of sap, convertible into honey-dew.

In the summer of last year (1882) a vast swarm of the Hop Aphis passed over Kent and Surrey. The swarm was estimated at some three miles in length, and looked like a variegated cloud as it passed through the rays of the sun. Part of this swarm settled upon an aspen-tree in my garden, covering the leaves so completely that the whole of the under surface of each leaf was one mass of aphides. The ants, however, found them out almost as soon as they arrived. So did the ladybirds and the lace-wing flies; and in three days or so there was not an aphis to be seen. This was rather a misfortune as far as I was concerned, for I was trying to rear some newly hatched Mantidæ, and the only food which the little creatures could take consisted of the aphis.

There is at least one species of ant which lays up liquid food in a still more remarkable manner. This ant is a native of Mexico and Colorado, but must necessarily be mentioned here. It is the Honey Ant, and is scientifically termed *Myrmecocystus Mexicanus*. It is naturally a slender, long-bodied, and long-legged insect; but there are a number of individuals

which are set apart as living honey-pots. The ants have no power of secreting wax, like the bees; neither can they, like some of the wasps of the same climate, form cells of clay, which are baked as hard as earthenware under the tropical sun, and therefore able to contain honey. So, a certain number of the workers are told off, and then wounded in some curious fashion which totally stops the process of digestion. They are then perpetually fed with honey, so that the abdomen becomes enormously swollen, and looks much like a very large white currant. When honey is required for the purpose of feeding the young, these living honey-pots give out the sweet liquid from their mouths as it is needed.

The honey-ants are actually used as articles of commerce, and sold by measure. They are brought to table with the dessert. The abdomen being so weighty, the insects cannot crawl away, and are eaten by the simple process of putting the abdomen between the lips and nipping it off with the teeth. Only the largest and best-looking ants are used for this purpose, the others being pressed, and a sort of mead produced by the fermentation of the sweet juice.

We turn now to Ants Abroad.

It is a remarkable fact that many admirable entomologists, including Hüber, Latreille, and Kirby, have repudiated the statements in the Book of Proverbs, that the ant "provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest." Now, the Holy Scriptures were never intended to be handbooks of physical science, so that even if Solomon or Agur (who lived several centuries after Solomon) had written of the ants according to popular opinion—like the rising and setting of the sun—no slur could have been cast upon either Solomon or Agur. But they were right, and Gould, Latreille, Hüber, Kirby, and others were altogether wrong. For an Englishman it might be excusable to doubt the storage of grain, and to think that the cocoons had been mistaken for seeds. But that such acute observers as Latreille and Hüber should commit themselves to such a denial is really astonishing, inasmuch as the Harvesting Ant (*Atta barbara*) is a native of France.

Now I must ask the reader to call to mind the description of the parallel galleries which was given in the history of the Wood Ant.

The Harvesting Ant gathers in the autumn the seeds of various grasses, stinging-nettle, shepherd's-purse, speedwell, and other plants, and carries them down to the lowermost part of the nest, which, as has already been mentioned, is always warm and wet. Consequently, the seeds begin to germinate. As soon as they do so, the ants bite off the young

shoot, and then transfer the seeds to the upper chambers, which are hot and dry. Most of my readers are probably aware that the greater part of a seed consists of starch, which is intended for the nourishment of the young plant. The germ, however, being destroyed, a chemical process takes place, and the starch is converted into sugar. In point of fact, the ant has made malt, and has anticipated John Barleycorn by countless centuries. Malt is made by steeping barley in water until it begins to shoot. It is then transferred to a chamber which is so hot as to kill the young plant, and is kept there until the dry heat has converted the starch into sugar.

There is another species, called the Agricultural Ant, which lives in Texas. This creature goes far beyond the Harvesting Ant, inasmuch as it actually cultivates its food-plant.[1] The ants prepare the soil by making a mound of finely-pulverized earth, on which they permit no other plant to grow except the "ant-rice," a species of Aristida. It is believed that they not only watch and tend the plant, but that they sow it besides, as it is difficult on any other supposition to account for the invariable presence of the ant-rice in the artificially prepared mounds. These mounds are variously shaped, but are usually about ten feet in diameter, and perhaps a foot high in the centre. The labour of weeding these mounds must be very great, owing to the rapid growth of vegetation in that country. Dr. McCork remarks that it is very curious to see these mounds established amid the wild sage and other vigorously growing plants. "The weeds had crowded up as closely as they dared, and in imaginative moments I could almost fancy that the bulky things were looking down with covetous eyes upon the forbidden grounds, from which they were held back only by a wholesome fence of the little insects, whose energy was continually saying to them, 'Hitherto shalt thou go, and no further.'"

There is another characteristic of civilized man which is shared by ants; *i.e.*, the keeping of domestic servants.

These servants, or slaves, as they are often called, are very seldom of the same species as their mistresses, and almost invariably are of much less size. One species of slave-makers, the Rufescent Ant (*Polyergus rufescens*), has been waited upon for so many generations, that it can do nothing useful for itself. In point of fact, it is much in the condition of the nobles in the middle ages, who prided themselves on their inability to use a tool or even a pen, leaving the former to the working-classes and the latter to the clergy. They would only condescend to the lance, sword, and battleaxe, and thought

[1] The scientific name of this ant is *Pogonomyrmex barbatus*.

that their only business was fighting. Such is the case with the Amazon, or Rufescent Ant, which, however, go still further. The nobles in question could at all events feed themselves, while the ants cannot do so. Their jaws are only constructed as weapons, and if they be placed amid plenty of food, and without servants to feed them, they die of hunger. Sir John Lubbock kept a nest of these Amazons for four years, and never once saw the ants feed themselves.

Hüber found, however, that a single slave was sufficient to wait upon fifteen of its mistresses. He had put about thirty of them in a box, together with earth, honey, larvæ, and pupæ. They did nothing, and in two days half of them were dead. He then introduced a single slave. She at once reduced the place to order, fed her mistresses, scooped out one chamber for the larvæ and another for the pupæ, extricated some young ants that were matured within the pupæ, fed them, and kept the whole colony in health.

If a new nest be formed, the Amazons cannot find their way to it, and have to be carried by the slaves. Strangely enough, they can find their way when they want to attack a nest for the purpose of procuring fresh slaves. Hüber once watched a small party of these ants on a marauding expedition. The party occupied a space some ten inches in length by four in width. After going for some distance along the road, they went through a hedge into a pasture-field, keeping their ranks unbroken in spite of the grass and other obstacles, and made for the nest which contained their prey. Some of them fought with the defenders, while others broke through the sides of the nest. The whole of them then poured through the breach, and they presently emerged, each carrying in her jaws a larva or pupa. Sometimes one of these marauding parties will consist of two thousand individuals or more, though a small body of a hundred or so will take the field.

Some of our British ants are slave-makers, the most conspicuous in this respect being the Red Ant (*Formica sanguinea*). This insect somewhat resembles the Wood Ant but may be readily distinguished by its blood-red colour. It is tolerably common in the New Forest, where its habits may be watched. Several nests have been found at Shirley Common, near Croydon, and the Rev. W. F. White gives some interesting accounts of them in his "Ants and their Ways."

It is known to take as slaves no less than four distinct species of other ants, and it is really a wonderful fact that these diverse creatures should all know how to do the work of their captor's nest. There are with this ant, as with most species, large and small workers, the former acting as soldiers, while the latter perform domestic tasks. The large workers of the

Red Ant are exceedingly fierce, and if the nest be disturbed will attack the intruder with great fury. The nest is made in banks, especially where it can be backed by a gorse stump. Mr. White, who watched a raid upon the nest of another species, the Ashy Ant (*Formica fusca*), states that the assail-ants confined themselves exclusively to the larvæ and pupæ, without meddling with the perfect insects. The Fuscas did their best to carry the pupæ into a place of safety; but they were so afraid of their foes, that when one of them approached, the intending rescuer dropped its burden and abandoned it to the enemy. The Red Ants would push the Fuscas out of the way, but never hurt them.

The common Wood Ant is also a slave-maker. Mr. Bignell of Plymouth, who is well known for his acquaintance of ant-life, was witness to a raid by the Wood Ant upon the common Garden Ant (*Myrmica scabrinodes*). One of them had captured a winged female of the Garden Ant, and was trying to drag it towards the nest.

Although so much less than the Wood Ant, the Garden Ant is a fierce and active fighter, and the Wood Ant had the greatest difficulty in overpowering her. They were so fiercely engaged that when Mr. Bignell picked them up and put them into a box they did not cease fighting. When he opened the box at home, they were still fighting. Then he put some chloroform into the box and they died fighting. He then set them on a piece of cardboard, and I had the pleasure of making a careful sketch of the curious group.

One of my brothers saw a combat between three Wood Ants and a single Garden Ant. The latter had disabled one of her foes by seizing an antenna in her jaws, and resisted all attempts on the part of her assailants for twenty minutes. What the ultimate result of the fight was I do not know. Thinking that three to one was rather unfair, my brother drove off one of the assailants. He is a schoolmaster, and as the bell rang at that moment, he was unwillingly obliged to leave the combatants.

Perhaps the fiercest fighter among the British ants is the brilliantly coloured and delicately formed little *Formica exsecta*. "They advance in serried masses," writes Sir J. Lubbock, "but in close quarters they bite right and left, dancing about to avoid being bitten themselves. When fighting with larger species they spring on to their backs and then seize them by the neck or by an antenna." They also have the instinct of acting together, four seizing an enemy at once, and then pulling her different ways, so that she on her part cannot get at any of her foes. One of them then jumps on her back, and cuts, or rather saws off her head. In battles between this ant and the much larger *F. pratensis*, many of the *F. exsectas* may

be seen on the backs of the *F. pratensis*, sawing off their heads from behind."

This interesting species seems to be confined almost exclusively to the neighbourhood of Bournemouth. It may be known from the Wood Ant by its smaller size, and the bright red head and thorax of the workers and queens. The male is black. The nest is somewhat similar to that of the Wood Ant, but is smaller and mostly formed of dry grass.

The most formidable of the ant tribes are the Ecitons of tropical America and the Drivers of Africa. But fortunately for the human inhabitants of the country, they render invaluable services to man. Indeed, were it not for the Ecitons, it would be difficult for civilized man to retain his position there. The original inhabitants of the country are snakes, rats, scorpions, gigantic cockroaches and venomous centipedes a foot long, spiders, and the hated chigoe fleas which burrow under the toe-nails, and which unless they are carefully taken out will even occasion the loss of the toes. No one in that country thinks of going to bed until the feet have undergone a rigid examination. As man persists on thrusting himself and his dwellings among all these creatures, they take up their abode in his houses, where their presence is always annoying and often dangerous. Fortunately, the Ecitons, or Foragers as they are sometimes called, act as scavengers, making their appearance just before the rainy season. As soon as they are observed approaching the house, every box is opened and every drawer pulled out so as give the ants a free access. The human inhabitants then leave the house, and do not return until the ants have disappeared from it. After they have gone not a living creature can be seen in it, and from snakes to chigoes, the vermin have been eaten by the ants. One of my brothers determined on seeing how the ants made their attack, and for this purpose left the door open and took his stand on a chair. The first sign of their approach was given by a slight rustling sound, like that of fallen leaves stirred by the wind. Presently a gigantic cockroach was seen to scuttle over the floor, and about a foot behind it was one ant not a quarter of an inch in length. Behind that ant came two, behind them several more, and so on, the number perpetually increasing. Presently the cockroach turned and tried to fly in another direction. He had been met by another pioneer ant, which was backed up by others just as the former had been. Presently, whole streams of ants poured in a similar manner into the house from every hole and crevice, so that it was incumbent on the observer to seek his own safety. Had he remained in the house, he would assuredly have shared the same fate which befell the cockroach and its companions.

These roving ant-masses are always accompanied by their officers, who can be at once recognised by their enormous heads. The officers walk on the outside of the column, and do not permit the soldiers to straggle out of the ranks. They also evidently act as guides. It is remarkable that some of these Ecitons are blind, or at all events possess no eyes, so that the mode of their guidance is a mystery.

What an astonishing performance this clearance of a house is! Who informs them of the house, and who guides them to it? Who tells off the single pioneers, gives the order to surround the house, and gives the signal to concentrate simultaneously upon it? Here, in fact, is a complicated military movement executed with a precision of which our best generals might be proud. That orders are given from the rear, just as in modern warfare, is evident, but of what nature those orders are, and how they seem to be transmitted and instantaneously obeyed, is one of the great mysteries of ant-life. Sir J. Lubbock had a microphone of special sensitiveness attached to one of his nests, but nothing could be heard except the tramp of the ants' feet as they ran about. It may be possible that the insects can produce and hear sounds which not even the microphone can make audible to man. Or, it may be that ants possess some mode of communication which is not developed in man, he possessing the gift of language.

Africa possesses foraging ants which in many of their habits resemble the Ecitons. They are popularly known as Drivers, because they drive away every living creature that comes in their way.[1] The workers differ greatly in size, the largest equalling an earwig in length, while the smallest are no larger than the common Garden Ant of this country. I believe that at present the males and queens are unknown. It is said that even the great python snakes have no chance against the Drivers, and that when a python has crushed an animal to death it dares not swallow its prey until it has made a large circle, a mile or so in diameter, in order to make sure that no Drivers are near. This may be true or not, but it shows the terror in which the insects are held. They have been known to enter a pigsty and eat the pigs, whose tough skins cannot resist the sharp jaws of the insect, while, as to poultry, they will clear a henhouse in a night. It is curious that when they devour poultry they remove all the feathers, beginning at the base of the beak and working backwards over the body. They are forced to dig out each feather separately, but their numbers

[1] The scientific name is *Anomma arcens*. The Greek word *anomma* signifies "eyeless," while the Latin word *arcens* signifies "compeller," *i.e.*, Driver.

are so great that they achieve their task in a wonderfully short time.

Sometimes it happens that when still out on these foraging expeditions the Drivers are overtaken by the sudden floods which prevail in the rainy season, and would be drowned but for a singular mode of meeting the danger. They form themselves into globular masses, each about as large as a cricket-ball, holding each other tightly by means of their entwined legs. Much air is entangled among the limbs, and the balls are rendered so light that they not only float, but when there is a wind, roll over the surface of the water. The ants wait patiently until the ball is washed or blown to land, and then untwist themselves, little or none the worse for the voyage. The largest ants always occupy the outside of the ball, the "women and children," as the natives call the smaller specimens, being in the middle.

They can even cross rivers by another ingenious device. They select a tree-branch which projects well over the water. They then let themselves down in a sort of chain until the lowermost ants can touch the water. Others crawl down this chain, attach themselves to the lowest ants, and spread their long limbs as far as possible on the surface of the water. Others rapidly follow, and pursue the same plan, until they have formed a bridge, over which the main body can pass. They are in the habit of forming similar festoons on other occasions. Once a nest was discovered, and the natives tried to burn the Drivers out by covering the nest with dry palm-leaves, and setting them on fire. Quickly as such fuel burns, the ants were quicker still, and the greater part contrived to escape up trees, from the branches of which they hung in festoons that quite blackened the trunk with their numbers.

Like the blind Ecitons, which have been already mentioned, the Drivers possess no eyes. Yet they hate light, and always travel after dark, if possible. There is another reason for travelling after sunset. They cannot endure heat, and if they be exposed to the rays of the tropical sun they die almost immediately. They therefore travel under cover as much as possible, and when they are forced to come out into the light and heat they build a continuous arch of particles of earth, agglutinated together by some liquid, which they pour from their mouths. The arch is a very flimsy one, but it is quite sufficient for the purpose of protection.

I have casually mentioned the power of the jaws. On one occasion the head of one of the large workers had been cut off. More than twenty-six hours after decapitation the head seized one of Dr. Savage's fingers with its jaws, and immediately began to bite. Though it was rather a painful experiment, he

allowed the jaws to continue their work. The jaws did not pinch simultaneously, as might have been supposed, but each jaw was thrust alternately into the finger, cutting its way like a scissor-blade and drawing blood at every stroke. Ten hours afterwards the head showed signs of life, while the severed body lived for more than forty-eight hours. So, it is no wonder that the hides of the pigs could not protect them, or that the ants were able to dig out the feathers of the fowls by the roots. The jaws are so long that when closed their points cross each other. It is therefore impossible, when once the Driver has taken hold of its prey, to remove it without destroying the insect; and, as we have seen, even if the body be torn away, the jaws continue to bite just as fiercely as before.

The description of the jaws is taken from some specimens kindly given to me by the late Mr. F. Smith, to whom allusion has already been made. The specimens had formed part of an ant-ball, which was cleverly captured as it floated, and sent to Mr. Smith. Two of my specimens still grasped each other firmly by the legs.

Even with our little British ants, possessing comparatively feeble jaws, it is not uncommon to find the severed head of a slain foe still clinging to the legs, the ant not having been able to loosen the grasp of the jaws.

The reader will remember that the males and queens of the Drivers have not yet been discovered. Exactly the converse takes place with an ant appropriately called *Anergatis, i.e.* workerless. With this curious insect no workers have as yet been discovered. There are the males and females — the former, by the way, being wingless—but the workers who undertake all the labours of the nest belong to not only a different species, but a different genus, known as *Tetramorium.*

The natives of Brazil are in the habit of using the large-headed Ecitons instead of sutures to a wound. They press the edges of the wound together, and then hold an Eciton to it. The insect immediately bites, driving the sickle-shaped jaws through the edge of the wound, and making the points cross. The body is then twisted off, the head being left adherent to the wound. Sometimes a row of six or eight ants' heads may be seen upon a native's wounded limb.

There is another large ant inhabiting Brazil, which is sometimes mistaken for the Forager ants. Its popular name is Saüba (pronounced Sah-oo-báh), and its scientific title is *Œcodoma cephalotes,* the two words signifying "big-headed house-maker." It is not personally to be dreaded, like the Drivers and Ecitons, though indirectly it is often exceedingly mischievous to civilized man. Despite their scientific name

they are not good builders, but they are marvellous burrowers. Some entomologists, therefore, substitute the name Atta for Œcodoma, as less misleading.

There are, with these ants, the usual winged kings and queens, and a multitude of wingless workers. These latter are, like those of the Driver, of several sizes. There are the ordinary workers, which are comparatively small, and the large-headed workers, which are popularly, but wrongly, called soldiers. The heads of these ants are of enormous size, and are divided into two large lobes, looking much like two eggs placed side by side.

There is a further subdivision of these large-headed workers. Most of them have smooth and shining heads, and are continually walking about, though they do not seem to direct the small workers. The second set has the head covered with hair, and in the centre is a double ocellus, or simple eye, quite unlike that of any other known ant. These individuals seem to be stay-at-homes, but can be made to show themselves by pushing a stick into the nest. Two or three of them will then slowly emerge, look about them, and descend again into the darkness. In spite of their formidable appearance, they do not seem to bite, and Mr. Bates was able to take them in his fingers without being injured. They are about as large as ordinary wasps.

The nest is constructed on much the same principle as that of our Wood Ant, namely, a dome with tunnels beneath it. But the Saüba nest is of gigantic proportions, the dome being, on an average, forty feet in diameter and about two feet in height. It is made of pieces of leaf covered with layers of earth, and the mode of procuring the leaves is very curious. Unfortunately for the settlers, the Saüba prefers the leaves of cultivated trees, such as the coffee and the orange, and often kills the tree by the incessant stripping of its leaves. Mostly, the workers ascend the trees and cut off nearly circular pieces, each about as large as a sixpence, and drop them on the ground. Smaller leaves are simply cut off and thrown down entire. The fallen leaves are picked up by relays of workers who carry them to the nest. As these green leaves overshadow the insect, it was once thought that they were employed as shelter from the sun, and the Saüba was consequently termed the Parasol Ant. When the labourers have brought the leaves to the nest, they transfer them to the artisan ants, which lay them in their places. So here we have a division of labour, and even a sort of trades unionism, fully developed in the ants long before man discovered their utility. From the centre of the dome a large perpendicular shaft is sunk to a considerable depth, and from this shaft tunnels of wonderful extent radiate

in all directions. These ants often do very great mischief. It is impossible to calculate upon them or guard against them. One of them which was driven into the shaft of a goldmine, conducted a torrent of water into it in the rainy season so that the water washed away the timber which supported the roof, and laid the whole mine in ruins. In another case, the Saüba burrow passed through the bank of a large reservoir, and so let out the contents and flooded the surrounding country.

There is but one way of destroying these insects, and that is by procuring the services of a professional ant-killer. He brings with him a large gang of negro labourers, as also building material and other apparatus. He then builds a large dome over the nest, filling it as he goes on with charcoal, dry wood, and plenty of sulphur and capsicums. Next, he makes a series of holes near the base of the dome, and having divided the negroes into gangs, he places one negro in charge of each hole. At a given signal the negroes thrust a piece of burning charcoal into each hole, insert the nozzle of a large bellows, and begin to blow. The master takes up some elevated position and watches for smoke coming out of the ground, this denoting an entrance to a tunnel. These holes are stopped with wet clay, and after about four days and nights' incessant work, the whole of the ants are presumed to be dead. The galleries are then laid open and filled in with wet clay well stamped down. The tropical sun soon bakes the clay as hard as brick, and then the place is considered safe from the ants.

There is much more to be narrated of these marvellous insects, but our limited space prohibits mention of more than one species, a native of Sydney, N. S. Wales. It had been long known that some of our British ants buried their dead, but that the insects could employ funeral ceremonies as elaborate as those of man, was not known until 1861, when the funeral rites were for the first time witnessed by a lady, Mrs. Lewis Hutton. She was walking with her little boy when the child suddenly screamed. On running to his help she found that he was covered with soldier ants. She tore them off, killing many and throwing them on the ground. When the child was quieted, she returned to the spot and saw a number of soldier ants surrounding the dead bodies. Presently, four of them ran off and entered a hole leading to the nest. In a few minutes a number of soldiers emerged; they marched two and two with a space between each four. Following them was a body of the workers about two hundred in number. Each group of four went at once to the body of a dead soldier, the two front ants picking up the corpse and the other two falling in behind like mourners; they then started off in procession to a sandy hill at some distance. When the bearers were tired they laid

down their burden, which was taken up by the second pair, the former bearers falling in behind. When the hill was reached, the bodies were laid down, and half the labourers divided into gangs which dug a grave for each dead warrior. The soldiers laid the bodies of their companions in the graves, and the other half of the labourers then filled in the earth. About six of them had refused to obey orders; they were at once killed, a hole was dug at some distance, and they were thrown ignominiously into a common grave.

The most astonishing point in this account is that the ants must have possessed some mode of counting, as they told off exactly the necessary number of soldiers for bearers, and of workers for grave-digging.

It is no wonder that Sir J. Lubbock should state his belief that although the anthropoid apes, *i.e.* the gorilla, chimpanzee, and orang-outan, approach nearer to man than do any other animals, the ants have a fair claim to rank next to man in point of intelligence.

J. G. Wood.

Art. IV.—ENGLISH AGRICULTURE, 1876-1883.

It has needed a series of years of agricultural depression to recall to our minds the full importance of agriculture as a trade to England. Gradually the impression had gained general acceptance that the country owed most of its prosperity and much of its greatness to its commercial progress. "Seed-time and harvest" were supposed to be, by degrees, losing their importance. A nation which was fast becoming the workshop of the world did not need to trouble itself much about products which could be imported at small cost, if required, from America or elsewhere. As it happened, too, the years of "inflation," which commenced with 1869 and lasted until 1876, were also years of large agricultural yield. Rent and wages both rose steadily. The harvests were abundant, the seasons good, and the prices of stock of all kinds showed a steady upward tendency. With the disappearance of the rinderpest, and a series of fairly dry summers, cattle did well. The prosperity of the manufacturing interest caused a brisk demand, at increased prices, for all kinds of farming produce. As usual, we began to forget that things could not always be so. Every farm, as it fell vacant, was the subject of eager competition. The price of land rose with an exceptional rapidity. Land agents and land surveyors took a sanguine view of a situation, of which they found them-

selves the masters. A large breadth of soil was brought under tillage which had been previously either down or rough pasture. Local banks were only too ready to grant liberal assistance to any tenant who wanted money to venture upon a new farm, or to stock an old one. Farmers, in short, were supposed, and in many instances supposed themselves, to be doing a roaring trade. And so all went well for a time.

Four short years were sufficient effectively to dispel the illusion. Between 1876 and 1880 the capital of British farmers was diminished by millions. The price of land fell from 10 to 25 per cent. Hundreds of thousands of acres were thrown upon the hands of their owners. A "great fear" came upon all the classes connected with land. As is usually the case, presumption was succeeded by panic. An almost speculative mania for the ownership or occupation of land gave place to the most gloomy forebodings as to the future. In short, history repeated itself for about the hundredth time. The change, too, was felt most heavily by those who could least afford it. Land-owners of small means, or in embarrassed circumstances, were the first sufferers. Unable to stock and crop their own fields, they had to submit to ruinous reductions, especially in those cases in which rents had been recently increased. It is needless to say that among the heaviest sufferers of all were the ecclesiastical corporations and the parochial clergy. In neither case were they in a position to turn farmers themselves. Some of the Chapter surveyors had been the most grievous offenders in the way of over-estimating the value of land. The properties under their control were often, therefore, to say the least, fully rented. The consequent collapse was proportionate. There have been instances in which, at the quarterly audit, owners have had rather to give than to receive. There have also been cases in which livings of considerable value have been resigned because incumbents, drawing most of their income from glebes, were unable either to let or till them. The weakest of course went to the wall. The hardest bargains were driven with those who were obviously least in a position to fight their own battles.

We have learned, then, by a bitter experience that all the resources of modern science do not avail to ward off misfortune. But the causes to which agricultural depression is to be traced are not far to seek. The first of these, as Mr. Bright once truly stated, is the absence of sun; a second is an over-copious rainfall; a third is foreign competition. All of these have been in active operation for several years past, and they have affected all the classes connected either directly or indirectly with agriculture. The crops have ripened badly; the "ingathering" has not been auspicious. And the conso-

lations for the farmer which once mitigated the effects of crops deficient in quantity or inferior in quality no longer exist. Bad harvests do not in the present day mean high prices, although good ones are far less remunerative than of yore. Grain is no longer stored on speculation. Large reserves of it are always available abroad, and a very trifling rise in the value of corn brings in foreign competition. Bread-stuffs and flour of all kinds are also now largely imported. The virgin soils of Colorado and Nebraska, of Manitoba and the "far West," need no manure and little cultivation. The cost of transport is diminishing every day, and the area of production is extending. There is no reasonable prospect, at all events for a generation to come, that these conditions will be materially altered. Unless we can stimulate production by higher farming, and unless the seasons be more propitious, it cannot pay to grow wheat much longer upon any of the poorer soils in England, and it will be difficult even to grow barley so as to make the undertaking a fairly remunerative one. Of course the prescription immediately suggested will be the laying down of land in grass, and the indefinite multiplication of our flocks and herds. This must however be, under the best of circumstances, a work of time. It involves not only a considerable outlay, but a temporary sacrifice of rent in all, and a permanent one in most cases. Down-land which has been broken up for tillage, and which has in that state fetched from twelve to twenty shillings an acre, will take years to make a decent sward again, and may then be worth about half its former value. The fertile "skin" which nature in the course of ages had supplied, when once broken by the plough cannot be replaced at will. Nothing short of a heavy money fine can ever repay the owner of land of this class for permitting it to be broken up. The yield of a few years may repay the tenant for his labour, but at the end of that period, if he be a wise man, he will have realized the mistake which has been made, and will have served a notice to quit. The imprudent owner will then receive back his land rendered little better for another generation than a barren waste. There is, at the present moment, in a southern county, an estate of seven thousand acres without a single tenant, farmed by a local firm of surveyors on the unremunerative footing of keeping it in cultivation, and of paying the necessary outgoings, but no more. Rent is a word not named in this arrangement for the present, and only a whispered possibility for the future. The case is no doubt an extreme one. But it is typical of many more in which the loss has been less serious, but in which there is no apparent prospect of the soil ever again attaining its former value.

Nor have the losses on tillage farms been adequately recouped by the profits made upon stock. The last five years have witnessed the most serious diminution of cattle and sheep alike ever known in this country. Since the importation of cattle from abroad, England has never been entirely free from one or other of those epidemic diseases to which stock are liable. The cattle plague, it is true, was stayed by slaughter and judicious isolation, but pleuro-pneumonia still raged fiercely, and has only been overcome by a vigorous system of repression, due, as Lord Carlingford admitted the other day, to the energy of the Duke of Richmond, when President of the Council. For the foot-and-mouth disease no adequate specific has yet been found. This malady, although rarely fatal, causes a serious temporary depreciation in the value of the animal affected, and is specially ruinous to dairy farmers. Very heavy losses have accrued from each of these causes. To these must be added that the excessive rainfall has often weakened the grass, preventing stock from thriving, and that there has been an occasional heavy and unexpected drop in prices. Sheep have suffered still more seriously. The ravages of "the fluke" among our flocks have been on a scale hitherto almost unprecedented. Whole pastures have been swept clean where they have been liable to flooding. Nor, although we now recognise the precise character of the pest which is the terror of the flock-master, have we discovered any means of extirpating it. So long as rivers continue to flood the adjacent meadows, they must remain either deserted or sources of danger. It is true that the "scare" which prevailed some time ago, with regard to foreign importations, has proved exaggerated. Under the worst of circumstances the cost of transit should always give the British farmer an advantage of at least a penny a pound. It is more than doubtful, also, whether America was not in too great a hurry to drive a flourishing trade, and whether in consequence she did not exhaust the supply of prime animals too rapidly. Inferior beef will never pay for exportation—a fact which our Yankee cousins are just beginning to discover. Having no means of stall-feeding, they can only secure weight by sending us animals at a later age than that at which they would find their way here to the butcher. But the supply of such beasts even in western America has a limit; and there are unmistakable signs that—for the present, at all events—that limit has nearly been reached. For the past nine months the price for home-raised stock of all kinds has been remunerative. The tantalizing part of the business is that there are now comparatively few to be sold. Two years at least will be needed to bring the supply of sheep at all abreast of the

demand, and even then it will be a difficult matter to do so, consistently with keeping up an adequate supply of breeding ewes. If prices keep up, too, the foreign supply is sure to increase in quantity, and ultimately to improve in quality. Home-raised stock may be able to hold its own against the foreigner, but can never again expect to enjoy a monopoly of the market.

Whether, therefore, the staple product of a farm be corn or cattle, the owners have a hard time of it. The rise in agricultural wages, amounting on an average to about 15 per cent., which was established in 1873, has not been sensibly diminished since. The whole credit of this advance was claimed by the orators of the Labourers' Union: it was in reality due to a combination of forces, all operating in the same direction. There is no denying the fact that it has eaten seriously into the profits of farming. The most unsatisfactory aspect of the question has been that while the price of labour has risen, the amount and character of the work done has diminished. The labourers do not seem to take the same pride in their work, or to render the hearty service which they did in the good old times for a far smaller remuneration. More supervision is required, and more tact is needed in their management. We are not among those who grudge a fair day's wage for a fair day's work; but the difficulties which he has had with his men have not been among the least of those which stared the farmer of late so unpleasantly in the face. On the other hand, it is fair to admit that the development of machinery, as applied to agriculture, has enabled him to dispense with some surplus labour, and has rendered him far more independent of the weather. The most serious, however, of all his embarrassments has arisen from the loss of capital, which successive bad years have occasioned. It is to be doubted whether more than one in ten of the existing members of the class were fully provided with the means of meeting the exigencies of modern cultivation at the outset of these troublous times. It is quite certain that a very small percentage indeed now possess the funds requisite to develop adequately the productive capacity of their farms. Some of those, too, who have the means, have lost heart, and have retired from the field altogether, rather than risk further losses.

The picture is not an encouraging one. Nothing, however, is to be gained by under-estimating the character of the situation. The really important point is obviously not so much the past as the future of agriculture. The year 1883 commenced unfavourably; there was again an excessive rainfall in the first two months, and large tracts of country were apparently hopelessly water-logged. But March and April did much to retrieve

the chances of the harvest. The dry, cutting wind pulverized the soil and gave the farmers a chance of thoroughly cleaning the land. We very much doubt whether for the last four years there has been a single clean farm in the country. If, therefore, Providence should favour us with genial weather, we may expect a good, although not an overflowing harvest. The price of stock, again, has ruled high for many months past. In the end this must be for the advantage of the farmer, though he will have had to pay dearly for his store cattle this spring. Matters are, however, on the mend all round, and we may expect to see from this time forward a steady, though not a rapid, improvement. It will be no small benefit for the future, if we have learnt from the lessons of the past, that agriculture, if it is to be carried on profitably, must be so, like all other trades, on strictly business principles, and with a due regard to thrift. It has been too much the fashion hitherto to consider it a pleasant occupation, which can be carried on without monopolizing the whole time and attention of those engaged in it. Now that that illusion has been effectually dispelled, others are beginning to take its place. One of these is, that great things may be done for farming by legislative interference in the dealings between landlord and tenant. Another is that substantial relief might be afforded by the reduction of local burdens. We doubt the efficacy of either specific. The English farmer is so essentially the child of contract, and, as a rule, so thoroughly capable of taking care of himself, that he has little to expect from an attempt on the part of the legislature to define under what conditions his business shall be carried on. At the present moment he commands the market, and can practically choose his farm and his landlord. He can insist, if he so pleases, upon the conditions of the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1875, or of those imported into the new Government Bill, without any fear of the consequences. Nor is it for his interest that the out-going tenant should obtain more than that to which he is strictly entitled, inasmuch as the burden of an exorbitant valuation is certain ultimately to fall on the incoming man. He is perfectly competent to make his own bargain, and will probably do so for himself far better, and with less chance of incessant wrangling, than the law can do it for him. Farms will probably change hands more frequently in the future than in the past, and it is not desirable to hamper this process by any unnecessary restrictions. If Parliament is content to define generally the principles upon which such contracts are made, it will be wiser to leave all details to be filled in by the individuals themselves. That the local burdens have of late shown a tendency to increase, and are in many cases exceptionally

heavy, is perfectly true. The School Board rate, the Sanitary rate, and the Highway rate have been distinct additions to the burdens imposed upon land. Some relief may and ought to be given in this direction by a more equitable distribution of taxation; but the increase of his public liabilities has been a mere flea-bite in comparison with the effects upon the outgoings of the British farmer from the increased cost of labour and from bad seasons. The conditions under which his business has been carried on have been changed, and he must take up a new base of operations. The old restrictive covenants as to the management and cropping of land are obsolete and must be obliterated. More capital is now required, and he must therefore be contented to farm higher on a smaller number of acres. It may be that the rearing of stock will in the future be the main source of profit, and that the breadth of arable land will be reduced to the minimum necessary for the rotation of crops and for the growth of litter.

Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.

The time is essentially one for mutual forbearance among all the classes dependent upon agriculture. As we have already pointed out, the Clergy have been among the most serious losers. Low prices have diminished the value of the tithe-rent-charge. Glebes have gone out of cultivation or been worked at a loss. In many instances they might be disposed of with advantage by those who have neither the time, the skill, nor the capital to turn farmers themselves. But we believe the worst to be now over and better times to be at hand, if the necessity of a change of front is fully and fairly recognised. The war-prices and war-profits of the early years of this century are never likely to return. Nor is it probable that agriculture will ever be a pursuit in which exceptionally large returns can be earned by the capital invested in it. But there is no reason to suppose that there will not be a fair field open to scientific farming on a large scale with adequate capital, as well as to what may be called "petite culture," if it be carried on by men of industry, energy, and skill. Which of these conditions will be the most profitable, will be determined mainly by local circumstances. In the vicinity of towns and in populous neighbourhoods, farms of the latter class will probably succeed best from their proximity to their markets. In other districts, we are disposed to think that there will be ample room for farming upon a more extensive scale, provided always that those engaged in the business are quick to recognise the changes of the times and prepared to adapt themselves to them. It would, indeed, be an evil day for England if a permanent blight were to fall upon what is still the most important

of all her industries. All classes now recognise a fact which they had been inclined to forget, namely, that there can be no real national prosperity while agriculture languishes. The depression, which we trust is now passing away, will not have been altogether a misfortune if it has led us to a truer and juster appreciation of the conditions under which future success must be achieved.

MIDLETON.

ART. V.—DR. CHARLES WRIGHT'S "ECCLESIASTES."

The Book of Koheleth, commonly called Ecclesiastes. Considered in relation to Modern Criticism and to the Doctrines of Modern Pessimism, with a critical and grammatical Commentary and a revised Translation. The Donnellan Lectures for 1880-1881. By the Rev. CHARLES HENRY HAMILTON WRIGHT, D.D., Incumbent of St. Mary's, Belfast. Pp. 516. Hodder and Stoughton. 1883.

THE present generation has witnessed a rapid and prolific growth in England of critical treatises upon the various books of the Bible, so that this is a class of literature that has been very greatly developed within the last few years. Nor has the mysterious treatise of Koheleth, or Ecclesiastes, proved other than a fruitful field for speculations of this kind. The latest work on the subject is that by Dr. Wright, of Belfast, very favourably known by his recent Bampton Lectures on Zechariah. It may be said generally that there is one feature characteristic of all this class of literature, and that is an inability in the writers to appreciate the meaning of the word *therefore*. In the great majority of cases the conclusions confidently arrived at are in inverse ratio to the cogency and solidity of the reasons advanced in support of them. The number of facts relating to the formation of the Canon of the Old Testament and the composition of the several books of it, is singularly small; but for that very reason the multitude of theories put forth about it, and the variety of speculations advanced, is proportionately large. We have only to open Dr. Wright's book to discover an illustration of the truth of this remark.

"The men of Hezekiah," we are told on p. 4—who are only once mentioned in Scripture, at Prov. xxv. 1—"an important company, or College of Scribes, continued to exist as a Jewish institution for several centuries. It may have lasted, under some form or other, down to and during the period of the exile." Now, this is an apt specimen of the way in which conjecture is substituted and mistaken for historic fact. What is the *evidence*, we should like to ask, properly so called, for the unqualified statement that "the men of Hezekiah" con-

tinued to exist as a Jewish institution for several centuries? Hezekiah died about B.C. 698; Judah was carried away captive B.C. 588, or 110 years afterwards. Where, then, shall we place the "several centuries" during which the men of Hezekiah flourished as a Jewish institution? unless, indeed, we even expand the further conjecture immediately added with a timid condition, "It *may* have lasted, under some form or other, down to and during the period of the exile." Nay, rather, it surely *must* have done so, if it "continued to exist as a Jewish institution for *several centuries*." The fact is, we *know* nothing of these men of Hezekiah except what we are told in Prov. xxv. All the rest is conjecture, based upon the scantiest possible and least trustworthy tradition. But, then, where is the wisdom of representing this conjecture as an unquestionable historic fact, rescued from oblivion by the learning and investigation of the writer, who simply has the boldness to make the assertion?

As a further illustration of the unsatisfactory nature of reasoning which does not clearly distinguish between speculation and ascertainable fact, and of the eminently subjective character of all such reasoning, we may quote p. 6. Dr. Wright says:

> Kuenen has indeed ably maintained that the whole story of "the men of the great synagogue," and of their work in reference to the Canon of the Old Testament, is a legend entirely devoid of any real historic truth. Professor Robertson Smith has adopted the same view, and regards Kuenen's arguments as conclusive. It has, in his opinion, "been proved in the clearest manner that the origin of the legend of the great synagogue is derived from the account given in Nehemiah viii., ix. of the great convocation which met at Jerusalem, and subscribed the covenant to observe the Law. It was, therefore, a meeting, and not a permanent authority. It met once for all; and everything that is told about it, except what we read in Nehemiah, is pure fable of the later Jews."

"Such a conclusion is, however," continues Dr. Wright, "not justified by the facts of the case," and so on. The fact is, that the principles of reasoning are vitiated on both sides by the tacit admission of assumptions that are mutually destructive. In the one case (which is Dr. Wright's), the statement of Rashi about the men of the great synagogue and their work is accepted as more or less historical; in the other (that of Kuenen and R. Smith), it is ruthlessly rejected, and resolved into a garbled version of what is related by Nehemiah. But who does not see that in this manner volumes may be written on either side, with a great parade of learning and ingenuity, and yet the net result be equally worthless as regards the amount of ascertainable fact. There is, however, reason to believe that many persons are imposed upon by this pomp and

circumstance of literary discussion, from which a certain amount of glory may accrue to the disputants, but very little real profit to the reader.

Dr. Wright has undoubtedly produced a very readable and learned book, though, for the reasons assigned, we are not sure that he has greatly added to what we know about Ecclesiastes. He rejects the traditional view of the Solomonic authorship,[1] and believes it to have been the work of the last of the prophets, not of course understanding Malachi by this phrase, somewhere between 444 and 196 B.C. He thus assigns a date for this treatise at least five hundred years later than the true one, supposing the book to have been the work of Solomon. Here, then, it would seem that we must have a crucial instance of the true value of much of the so-called modern criticism. The criticism, that is so boastful in the present day, must be unworthy of the name, which cannot decide within five centuries upon the date of a given work; and yet this is undeniably the case with Ecclesiastes. There are not wanting scholars of eminent learning, *e.g.* Pusey and others, who accept Ecclesiastes as the work of Solomon; and yet there are many more who assert emphatically that for linguistic and critical reasons the theory is absurd. Now surely if this were the case absolutely, it would be impossible for those scholars who do so to maintain the contrary. Some have placed Ecclesiastes as late as 150 B.C., while others regard it as at least eight centuries earlier. They cannot both be right. But the point to which we would draw attention is the questionable character of the criticism which would pronounce so confidently on the lateness of the date; for if this criticism were valid, there then would be no room for the opposite supposition to be maintained for one moment, whereas the contrary is an obvious fact. By all means let the lateness of Ecclesiastes be proved if it can, but let us be quite sure of the grounds on which it is proved, which are more subjective than those of mere grammar and language.

Dr. Wright has spoken slightingly of a work[2] which has dealt in a very exhaustive manner with the evidence from language, viz. the anonymous "Treatise on the Authorship of

---

[1] In his introduction Dr. Wright says: "It is not, I confess, without some feelings of regret that I have felt myself constrained, by the evidence adduced by modern critics, to abandon the traditional view of the Solomonic authorship of the Book of Ecclesiastes. But I do not consider the canonical character of the book, or its Divine inspiration, to be at all affected by the abandonment of a theory at variance with the linguistic features of the book, as well as with internal evidence, and with the statements of its epilogue, when rightly understood."

[2] Published by Messrs. Macmillan and Co., and known to be written by the Rev. David Johnston, of Herray, Scotland.

Ecclesiastes," and has said that Professor Stanley Leathes has "incautiously" observed that "the force of this evidence, *so far as it goes*, seems to be irresistible." "These critics," the writer continues, "seem to forget that the argument on which they rely proves too much. By the same line of argument the Book of Wisdom and the Book of Ecclesiasticus may with equal reason be ascribed to Solomon." But the fact is this is too summary a way of dealing with an argument that has been worked out with great fulness of detail by Mr. Johnston, and the force of which arises from its cumulative evidence and gradually increasing cogency. Before deciding on this question —as to which we ourselves agree with Dr. Leathes—we would counsel all students to peruse the work of Mr. Johnston. It is, moreover, one thing to note indications that appear to confirm a traditional conclusion, and quite another to press these indications into a proof of something for which there not only is no evidence, but for which there is evidence to the contrary. No amount of correspondence between Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, if it existed, could prove the latter book to be by Solomon, seeing that it is ostensibly written by the son of Sirach; while with regard to the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, the points of contrast are no less striking than those of similarity between it and the traditional works of Solomon, and the existence of the "results" assumed by Dr. Wright has first to be shown, in this case as they have been shown in the other by the Scottish critic.

The book of Dr. Wright is not so much a commentary upon Ecclesiastes as a commentary upon its commentators, and the meagreness of positive results at which the author arrives is altogether in keeping with its generally discursive and discussional character. The only part of Ecclesiastes which is treated at large is the last chapter, in a thesis which appears to have been delivered at Cambridge. Then follows a new translation of the whole book, with a critical and grammatical commentary on the text. It is a hazardous thing to attempt a new translation of Ecclesiastes, as the following passage selected casually may serve to show (ch. vi. 10):

> That which has been, long ago has its name been pronounced, and known is that which a man shall become; and he cannot contend with Him who is stronger than he. For there are many words which increase vanity; what profit (are they) to man? For who knoweth what is good for man in life, during the number of the days of the life of his vanity, for he spends them as the shadow? For who can point out to man what shall be after him under the sun?

We question whether the English reader will find this a rendering preferable to the Authorised Version, or discover so much additional light in it as will induce him to substitute the one for the other.

There is a great deal of learning in this book, and it is carefully got up. Dr. Wright has ably contrasted the Pessimism of "the sacred Jewish philosopher" with that of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, pessimists whose conclusions are destructive not only of faith, but of morality. The author of Ecclesiastes is vainly claimed as a precursor by this school, whose writings, beginning to be read in England, are one of the saddest phenomena of the present time.

Art. VI.—ODD CORNERS OF THE MASTER'S VINEYARD.

LORD, what wilt Thou have me to do? is a question which everyone must ask, if they really feel that they are not their own. But the answer to the question is not always evident, for the various circumstances of varied lives make it impossible to lay down any fixed laws as to what can or ought to be done by each individual. The object of the present paper is to suggest some "odd corners" in which opportunities of usefulness may have passed unnoticed.

Take first the case of the Christian man of business. His time is very fully occupied, his hours are late, and, except on Sunday, it seems impossible for him to undertake any real Christian work, and possibly on Sunday his own need of rest may render it more than ordinarily difficult for him to teach or visit, while it may well be that he feels the hours of that day are all too little to be devoted to his family. Is there any "odd corner" for him? It may be taken as an ascertained fact that those who have most to do are those who may most thoroughly be trusted to undertake any work of real importance, for they know both how to value and to economise time; and not unfrequently they have a machinery in their hands which enables them to carry out business other than their own with far less trouble than it would cost a private individual. May we not look to our Christian men of business to relieve the clergy of much of their finance business and account keeping? The writer of this paper has the honour of the acquaintance of a man of business whose time seems to be completely filled up, and yet he has managed to utilise the machinery at his command in such a way as to enable him to undertake, and admirably to carry out, the duties of treasurer to a large Church Missionary Association. Such men also are

invaluable on Committees, and a little mutual consideration will generally make it possible so to arrange the dates, hours, and number of committees to minimise the inconvenience of attending, to those who are much occupied.

Then there is the case of the man who has begun a well-earned rest from official or business life, who would gladly turn away from figures and statistics of every sort, and to whom the very making of an appointment is irksome, from its likeness to the drudgery which has occupied so many years of his life. Might not such men give a tithe of their leisure to God? Have we not here the very persons for Secretaries to small institutions, treasurers to schools, and similar posts. This work will involve self-denial, but it will bring a blessing with it. And it is by no means clear that such men may not be gifted with power to do direct spiritual work. The knowledge acquired in their more active life, of men and things, will make their work infinitely more definite, and, therefore, far more valuable, than that of those who have had no such training.

Some, however, are laid aside by shattered health. Is there an "odd corner" for them? It seems such a large one that it may be almost called a field of itself. Such persons have pre-eminently the power of setting others to work. They have usually the time which others lack, to enable them to follow closely the progress of the great agencies for good which are needing support; they can follow one or more with their interest; and then they can speak burning words to their friends and acquaintances, who have not the leisure or the inclination for such a study, which shall stir them up to take some real and active part where it is needed. Many a missionary has first been led to think of the mission-field by words spoken to him by one who is thus laid aside. Many a great scheme has been thought out, and prayed out, and set in motion, from a sick room, for there is an indescribable power in words spoken and suggestions made by those who cannot themselves "go forth to battle." And these remarks apply with equal force to the toilsome but necessary work of collecting subscriptions for special objects. This work, from the nature of things, generally falls on those who have already a great deal too much to do in the merely keeping pace with their spiritual work; and they are oftentimes sadly hampered in this, by the need for the other work too. But wherever personal influence is not required, the letter stating the nature of the work to be done, and its claims for support, may often be written by an invalid, or one precluded from active exertion, with even greater force than if it came from the pen of an ordinary worker.

It is not necessary here to touch upon the power that many such people have of influencing the world and the Church, through the press. It has often been well and wisely said that the Evangelical members of the Church of England, make less use of the press than any other people; and yet surely the power of the press is so great that it ought to be used to the utmost. But the subject of correspondence is one which needs more than a passing word. It has been brought forward before now in the pages of THE CHURCHMAN; and too much importance cannot be attached to the work of the Christian letter-writer. The work remains long after the spoken word is forgotten; and it may spring up and bear fruit, under circumstances the most unlikely. The busiest people have time to write some letters; and if every letter written is looked upon as a real work for the Master, none will go forth unblessed. Each letter is an opportunity, and is an opportunity used or wasted.

There is a kind of letter-writing, which has already been most beneficial, and which seems to open an opportunity to many who perhaps do not feel prepared to write for the Press, and yet want to do some good with their pens, and this is the writing occasional letters for particular classes. The letters of Miss Weston for the Navy, and of Mrs. Best for the Merchant Service are now well known. They have been the means of much blessing, and the same idea may be worked out on a smaller scale, with great opportunity for good. For instance, some ladies who are not able to engage in active work, write monthly a certain number of letters for governesses who have not many friends or correspondents, and these monthly letters are looked forward to with the greatest interest, although the sender of the letter and the recipient are utterly unknown to each other. The letter which bears on the trials and difficulties of a particular life, and contains thoughts of encouragement and sound advice, is a most precious help, and one which many are specially qualified to give, who from their health or circumstances are not able to do anything else. The same idea might be, and perhaps is, already applied to servants. A monthly letter from an unknown correspondent may be of the greatest service, and is free from the grave objection which sometimes is felt to an occasional interview with an Associate of a Society, which has been known to lead to a certain amount of gossip.

But there is a work which at the present moment is being much pressed, and deservedly so, by the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, and which is essentially the work of the invalid, or the person whose health and occupations preclude the undertaking of more active business. This is

what is called the Publication Agency, in other words the undertaking to keep a list of those members of an Association who take in the Periodicals, the bringing them before the notice of those who have not previously known them, and the undertaking their regular supply. This work, unpretending as it sounds, is one that touches the very root of the question as to how we are to increase the funds of the Society, for all must feel that with increased interest will come increased funds, and the creation and maintenance of interest is not only to be accomplished by sermons and meetings, but by a more thorough use of the information which the Society prepares for all who are willing to read their most interesting Publications.

The great principle of gathering up the fragments comes into our subject. Our readers may remember the saying of John Wesley, that the reason of his never wanting was his never wasting, that he never even threw away a piece of paper or a piece of string; and this principle may find many applications in matters of Christian work. Children may be taught to utilize for the poor what would be otherwise thrown away. Scrap books for hospitals, or for the children of the poor, especially the "Text Scrap Book" now becoming so common, afford really interesting and useful work; even making "paper pillows" for the sick is a work by no means to be despised, especially if care is taken in the manufacture. At any rate we may be certain that if we adopt the principle of consecrating even our odds and ends to the Master's use, we shall not lack teaching as to how to do it best. "Lord what wilt Thou *have* me to do?" implies that He *has* something for each, and if we are coming to Him to know what it is we shall not be left in doubt.

JOHN H. ROGERS.

Reviews.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Ninth series of the Cunningham Lectures. By GEORGE SMEATON, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

IN these lectures Dr. Smeaton handles a theme the importance of which cannot be exaggerated, and, on the whole, in an edifying and instructive manner. There is no doubt that in modern times the office of the second Person of the Holy Trinity in the work of redemption has thrown

that of the third into the background—practically, if not theoretically. The tendency has been inherited from the period of the Reformation, when the great question was, How can man be justified before God? and the doctrine of St. Paul was asserted against the Pelagianism of the dominant Church. The Evangelical movement of the present century in England occupied itself chiefly with the same question. In proportion as it did so, it left other portions of the field comparatively uncultivated; so difficult is it for one age, or one school of thought, or one author, to assign its due proportion to every aspect of divine truth. Even in the volume of inspiration, it is only by combining and comparing its several portions that we arrive at a comprehensive view of the revelation which it contains. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is an example in point. Acknowledged in general terms by all Christians, it has by no means occupied the place in our theology, and in our preaching, which is its due; and while the title of the Gospel has specially attached itself to the atoning work of the Redeemer, the application thereof to individuals, the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit, has received comparatively little attention. Since the great work of Owen, we are aware of but few, besides the one before us, which has professed to give a systematic view of the subject.

Dr. Smeaton writes, for the most part, in an easy and perspicuous style. His pages are free from that terrible process of "word-painting," which is a feature of some modern popular productions, and which seems not unlikely seriously to affect the standard of literary taste. The true imaginative faculty is a precious gift, but a perpetual striving after effect palls upon the wearied reader. The multiplication of images, not remarkable for novelty, and the triteness of which is only disguised by unusual devices of style, is a very different thing from coruscations spontaneously thrown off in the heat of composition, or the steady glow which diffuses itself through the productions of a Milton or a Jeremy Taylor. The gorgeous clothing is too evidently a *purpureus pannus*, manufactured and applied from without, not emanating from a native impulse. It is refreshing, in these days, to meet with a writer on theological subjects who remembers that the perfection of style is to attract no notice to itself, and is content to express his thoughts in the language of Tillotson, Addison, and Berkeley.

We cannot, indeed, pronounce Dr. Smeaton a faultless model of composition. He occasionally employs words that jar upon an English ear, such as "exegete," "dubiety," "errorists," "deleted," "premial," "sopited," "deliverances" (in the sense of statements); some of which are perhaps owing to the author's nationality, and all of which might be exchanged with advantage for others. We are sorry to observe him endorsing the word "reliable," which, though contrary to grammatical analogy (for, as Dean Alford remarks, it ought to be reli-upon-able), seems to have established itself amongst us. Why should it usurp the place of the genuine English term "trustworthy"? It is probably to America that we are indebted for some of these importations. There is another class of words coming into vogue, against which we cannot but protest, even though Dr. Smeaton seems not indisposed to employ them, viz., those which are formed in imitation of the German, or indeed directly derived therefrom. We are becoming familiar with such terms as "output," "outcome," "outlook," and "standpoint;" and Dr. Smeaton adds "view-point" and "ground-thought." We venture to think that no such compounds can be found in our classic writers, and that their use indicates a growing indifference to purity of English idiom. Next to the Greek language the German is distinguished by its facility of forming compound words, and on its native soil the process is natural, and adds greatly to the copious-

ness of the vocabulary. Transplanted to some other European languages, at least those most commonly known, it proves itself an exotic which cannot be acclimatized. The French language utterly repudiates all such compounds; and although, from its remote affinity with the German, ours admits them to a limited extent, there is no occasion needlessly to multiply them. It may be affirmed that for every one of those mentioned a genuine English term, of the same import, may be substituted. But enough on questions of style; we pass on to the substance of the work.

Its title is "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit," which hardly conveys a distinct notion of the contents. For it may mean either the Biblical testimony on the subject, or the form which the doctrine assumed under the influence of controversy, and which appears in the Creeds of the Church; this latter being its properly dogmatical form. Or again, it may mean what the Germans call *Dogmengeschichte;* that is, a history of the stages through which, in the lapse of centuries, the doctrine has passed, and the modifications it has assumed under prevalent theological tendencies. In fact, the volume comprises all three branches of the subject, the first division being concerned with the Biblical evidence for the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and by inference of the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost; the second, with its dogmatical expression in the Creeds of the Church; and the third, with its history since the Apostolic age. On the third division our remarks will be comparatively brief. The reader will find in the earlier part of it a succinct and lucid statement of the points respecting the doctrine of the Holy Spirit on which controversy arose in the early Church; which properly are only two, the equality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son as a distinct Person in the Trinity, and His procession; the point in debate, as regards the procession, being whether it is from the Father alone, as the Greek Church holds, or from the Father and the Son, according to the doctrine of the West. On this account it may be doubted whether the latter part of this division, which is chiefly occupied with an examination of Pelagian theories, properly belongs to the subject. For the Pelagian controversy under its various aspects, such as its successor the semi-Pelagian, the synergistic of the Lutheran Church, the Arminian of the Dutch and English Churches, and the rationalistic theories of modern Germany on this subject, is but indirectly connected with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Holy Trinity: it belongs rather to the general question concerning the relation of divine and human agency in the work of redemption. The "grace" for which Augustine, and Luther, and Calvin, and the Divines of Dort so earnestly contended against the advocates of a Pelagian doctrine of free-will, was simply *divine* grace without special reference to the Holy Spirit as the agent of its communication; though, no doubt, if the debate had proceeded to the further question, viz., To which Divine Person is this internal operation on the heart to be, according to the usage of Scripture, specially ascribed? they would all have replied, To the Holy Spirit. This was assumed in all these controversies; and the real history of the dogma concerning the Holy Spirit may be said to have terminated with the separation of the East and the West on the point of the Procession.

The first division demands a more extended notice than the third. We are bound to confess that the author's treatment of the Biblical testimony on his subject, particularly as regards the Old Testament, seems to us occasionally liable to exception. If the doctrine of the Holy Trinity expresses, as the Church has ever believed, not merely œconomical relations towards fallen man, the Father electing, the Son redeeming, and the Spirit sanctifying, the Church; but eternal and ontological relations in

the Godhead itself, Father, Son, and Spirit being modes of Divine subsistence from all eternity; the Spirit must, of course, have existed under the old dispensation as essentially as He does under the new. Every good and perfect spiritual gift, every case of genuine saintship, from the beginning of the world, must be ascribed to His presence and divine operation; but this is a different thing from the further position that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost was so *revealed* before the coming of Christ, as that it may be plainly gathered from the notices of the Old Testament. We do not think that the evidence adduced by the Professor on this point is decisive. There is an antecedent probability that the revelation of the nature of the Godhead would keep pace with that of the Christian redemption, in which the three Divine Persons appear actively co-operating to a common result; and therefore would be incomplete as long as redemption was a matter of prophecy rather than of fulfilment; and such seems to be the fact. It is hardly safe, in the present state of Biblical criticism, to argue from the plural form Elohim (Gen. i. 26);[1] nor do we think that the Professor's interpretation of Gen. ii. 7 will commend itself to scholars. The "breath of life," which is said to have been breathed by God into its material receptacle, is not, in our judgment, the Holy Spirit in His hypostatical character, but that prerogative of man himself which distinguishes him from the brute creation; the πνεῦμα of the New Testament, the religious faculty or aspect of his soul, which otherwise would not differ specifically from the mere sensitive soul of an animal. Combining the "breath of lives," an emanation from God Himself—the expression is never used of the brute creation—with the "living soul"—which is often thus used—we arrive at the twofold aspect of the soul of man, the ψυχή-πνεῦμα, "the spirit-soul," as it is described in the New Testament—one and the same substance, but bearing a twofold relation—the term ψυχή indicating its relation to the lower sphere of visible things, the term πνεῦμα its relation to God. It is the human psychology, not the gift of the Holy Spirit, to which the inspired writer is here directing our thoughts. We must, in fact, take exception to the whole of our author's reasoning concerning the gift of the Holy Spirit to the first Adam (pp. 10-16). We know that man was formed in the image of God; that God pronounced this portion of His work, as well as the others, to be "very good;" that beings of perfect innocence, and qualified for divine fellowship, must have enjoyed the highest measure of that fellowship of which their nature was capable; but to maintain that our first parents formally received the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, apparently in the same sense and to the same extent in which He now dwells in the Church, seems to introduce into the sacred record more than it spontaneously delivers. But this is only an example of the tendency which appears throughout the volume, and which indeed is characteristic of the Calvinistic divines, viz., to introduce the religion of redemption into Paradise, and to identify the state of man unfallen with that of man restored in Christ. The truth is, we can form no clear conception of Adam's unfallen state, because we have nothing to compare it with—not, of course, with that of fallen man, but also not with that of regenerate man; for, *pace* the Professor, we must hold that regeneration is a higher gift than man's original righteousness, and the heavenly Paradise, purchased by a Saviour's death, a state superior to its predecessor of Eden. All we can say of Adam's original state is that it was, in its measure, a perfect one, but that it needed for its full confirmation a successful resistance to temptation; hence, in our opinion, the transfer of the terms "grace," "sacraments," and the like, to describe the religion of man's primeval state

[1] See Gesenius, *sub voc.*

is a mistake, and one which may lead to serious error. The term "grace" belongs to man's fallen condition. The formal gift of the Holy Spirit is always in Scripture connected with the ascension of Christ, not with the creation of man; and to argue that the Christian life is a mere restoration of the Paradisaical, and therefore that this divine gift belonged as fully, and in the same sense, to the first Adam as it does to those who bear the image of the second is, to say the least, to be wise above what is written. We fully agree with Martensen's remarks: "The first Adam stands in the background of the human race as an undefined shape enveloped in mist; as a dim recollection resembling that which we ourselves have of the first awakening from the unconsciousness of infancy; yet we are compelled to suppose that such a being and such a state existed, but we behold them with the eye of faith, as in a mirror and a dark word."[1]

Our author quotes 1 Peter iii. 19, according to his interpretation, as a proof that the passage in Gen. vi. 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," etc, refers to the Spirit of Christ—that is, the Third Person of the Trinity. We are by no means concerned to deny that the Spirit of God did strive with the antediluvians; but we doubt whether the famous passage of St. Peter throws light upon that of Genesis. To say nothing of "the Gospel's being preached" to the antediluvians by Noah (Dr. S., p. 18), which to us appears an anachronism, the author must be aware that by most modern commentators the application of the passage to the preaching of Noah at all is, not without reason, disputed; and that the rendering "quickened by the Spirit," *i.e.* the Holy Spirit, is both critically and grammatically inadmissible. The best MSS. omit the article τῷ before πνεύματι; and, moreover, it is not the usage of Scripture to ascribe the resurrection of Christ to the Holy Spirit, but occasionally to Himself (John ii. 19), most commonly to the Father. Grammatically, too, the exposition is more than doubtful.[2]

The author treads on firmer ground when he passes on to the later books of the Old Testament. "The Spirit of the Lord" occupies a very prominent place in the Psalms and the Prophets, both as inspiring them for their office, and as the subject of prophecy. There can be no question as to the meaning of David's words: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue" (2 Sam. xxiii. 2), or of such prophecies as that of Joel ii. 28. He who is sent, or poured out, cannot be formally the same as the sender, however one in essence. But more than this can hardly be inferred from these expressions. The result of the whole seems to be: the Holy Spirit was operative before the coming of Christ, whether to qualify artificers of the tabernacle (Exod. xxxi.), or to inspire psalmists and prophets, or to carry on His ordinary work of sanctification. There were intimations, too, of His personality which, *read with the light of the New Testament on them*, convey a meaning; but the full revelation of His Trinitarian personality was reserved for the completion of redemption by the death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. And with this accords the difficult passage in St. John's Gospel (vii. 39), to which Dr. Smeaton devotes some remarks: "The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." St. John does not

---

[1] Dog. § 78.

[2] "There is no indisputable instance," says Bishop Middleton on the passage, "in which anything is said to have been done or suffered by the Holy Spirit, where πνεῦμα, whether in the genitive or the dative case, is not governed by some preposition. But not only is the preposition here wanting, but even the article has so little authority that it is rejected by Wetstein, Griesbach, and Matthäi."—*Greek Art*, p. 430.

mean that the Spirit did not exist, or was not operative, previously to the event mentioned; but that He was not given as a matter of covenant until the Saviour had earned a right to dispense His gracious influences. Neither the promise to Abraham, the precursor of the Gospel method of justification; nor the covenant of Sinai, which was only a national one, and only connected with temporal promises; contained a stipulated gift of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was given to the ancient believers in consideration of the future work of Christ, certain in the counsels of God, though not as yet accomplished; but He was given in a sporadic manner, not as the characteristic agent of a whole dispensation, as the Gospel era is called specifically "the ministration of the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 8). It was Christ alone who earned the right and the power to confer the spiritual blessing in all its fulness, in the multiplicity of the gifts as well as the extent of the effusion. In this sense it may be truly said that the Spirit was not yet given as long as Christ was not yet glorified. And the full revelation of His Trinitarian relation to the Father and the Son corresponded to the full outpouring of His influence; which revelation, therefore, can hardly be looked for in the earlier records of inspiration. It is unnecessary to follow Dr. Smeaton in his examination of the New Testament evidence; his task here was comparatively easy, and he has performed it, on the whole, in a very satisfactory manner.

The second division of the book, as has been intimated, contains the properly dogmatical aspect of the subject. It is arranged under the following heads: The personality and procession of the Holy Spirit; His work in the anointing of Christ; revelation and inspiration; His regenerating work on the individual; His sanctifying work, also on the individual; and His work in the Church. The first of these divisions may be considered as virtually discussed in the examination of the Biblical testimony, for it is impossible to explain the expressions of the New Testament otherwise than on the supposition that the Holy Spirit is God, that He is a distinct Person in the same sense in which the Father and the Son are, and that He proceeds from both. The author has probably studied Anselm's masterly treatise, *De processione Spiritus S.;* we could have wished that he had presented to his readers some of the points on which that great theologian insists. The other topics may, we think, be reduced to two: the work of the Spirit in reference to Christ, and His work, extraordinary and ordinary, in the Church.

The work of the Holy Spirit *in reference to Christ*, or, as Dr. Smeaton calls it, "the anointing of Christ," is regarded by him as commencing with the incarnation. In this we are compelled not only to differ from him, but even to doubt whether his theory is not of suspicious tendency. We are not surprised at its appearance in his pages, for in fact the introduction of the Holy Spirit at this stage of the Saviour's history is characteristic of the Reformed divines as distinguished from the Lutheran, and, we may add, the general current of ecclesiastical tradition. The question briefly stated is this: Is the Logos Himself, as the Second Person of the Trinity, to be considered the active principle of the incarnation, or did the Holy Spirit, as the Third Person, intervene between the Logos and the humanity and produce the result? The point may seem a subtle one, and of little practical import; for it may be argued, as it may in all the external operations of the Trinity, that where the Holy Spirit acts, there the Father also and the Son must act; according to the Canon, "*Opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt.*" But it is never safe to deviate from the established usage of Scripture on these points. The result of Dr. Smeaton's theory seems to be to depose the Logos from active agency in the miracle of the incarnation, and to reduce Him to a state of unconscious inactivity. The

orthodox doctrine is that although the whole Trinity co-operates in works *ad extra*, yet special works "terminate" in special Persons, which must not be interchanged one with another, as if it were a matter of indifference to which the works are ascribed. Hence the ancient Canon above mentioned adds: "*Salvo tamen earum (Personarum) ordine et discrimine.*" Thus creation is a work of the whole Trinity, but it "terminates" in (is specifically ascribed to) the Father; sanctification is a work of the whole Trinity, but it "terminates in" the Holy Spirit; and in like manner, the incarnation was a work of the whole Trinity, but it "terminates in" the Son. That is, the Logos Himself is the active principle in the assumption of the humanity. Not the Holy Spirit, but the Logos, prepared (*terminative*) the body which He assumed.

Dr. Smeaton has reproduced Owen's theory on this subject, and it may be well to understand whither it tends. That able divine expresses himself thus (Book ii. c. 3): "The only singular immediate act of the Son on the human nature was the *assumption* of it into subsistence with Himself," as indeed it would be directly opposed to Scripture to say that either the Father or the Holy Spirit *assumed* the humanity. "All other actings of God in the person of the Son," he continues, "towards the human nature were *voluntary*;" whence it seems to follow that the assumption itself was an *involuntary* act. In order to vivify it, Owen, like Professor Smeaton, is compelled to introduce the Holy Spirit, in his Trinitarian personality, as "creating" the body of Christ in the womb of the Virgin. "The framing, forming, and miraculous conception of the body of Christ in the womb of the blessed Virgin was the peculiar work of the Holy Ghost." What relation, then, in point of time, did the assumption bear to the creation? If we make this latter to have had the precedence we approach the confines of Nestorianism; for on this hypothesis the Logos would have assumed a human nature already in existence, even though it may, in one sense, be said to have been created by Himself, since He and the Holy Spirit are one in essence. The only method of escape is to make the creation and the assumption not successive acts, but effected in one and the same instant, which, in fact, is Owen's explanation. The assumption was an "ineffable act of love and wisdom, taking the nature so formed by the Holy Ghost, so prepared for Him, to be His own in the instant of its formation, and thereby preventing the singular and individual subsistence of that nature in and by itself." But a creation and an assumption which are effected in the same instant seem to differ only in name. We say nothing as to the apparent inversion which the theory introduces into the "order of subsistence" of the Three Persons, or, at least, into the Scriptural usage, according to which Christ does not proceed from the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit from Christ.

We are not induced to retract our opinion by the passages which Dr. Smeaton has adduced in support of his own. The capital one is, of course, Luke i. 35, which is rendered in the authorized version, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee," as if it was the Third Person of the Holy Trinity who is especially alluded to. But the accuracy of the translation is doubtful. It is true that πνεῦμα ἅγιον does not require the article to constitute it a proper name; but the following words, "power of the Highest," without the article, and which are evidently explanatory of "Holy Ghost," impress an impersonal character on this latter term, which seems to signify the Godhead or the Divine essence in general. We agree with Olshausen on the passage: "πνεῦμα denotes the divine Being without reference to Trinitarian distinctions, which divine Being is ἅγιον, or holy" (Comm.); and, notwithstanding our author's reclamation (p. 72), we refer to Rom. i. 3, 4 as confirmatory of this exposition. The "Spirit of holiness," St. Paul's

expression, can, in our opinion, be understood only of the divine nature of Christ as contrasted with His human, not of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. "The contrast with *κατὰ σάρκα*," observes the commentator above quoted, "demands a reference to the Saviour's own person, consequently it is not the Third Person of the Trinity, but the deity of Christ that is spoken of" (Olshausen *in loc.*). And so another commentator, to whom probably Dr. Smeaton will pay more deference, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton: "According to the Spirit of holiness—that is, His divine nature" (Comm.). Dr. Smeaton asks (p. 118), "Are we to refer the unction to the humanity of Christ or to the Person?" meaning, we presume, by "the Person," not the whole compound person of Christ, but His Trinitarian relation, for otherwise how can the "humanity" be distinguished from the Person? If the whole Christ is meant, the humanity is part of the Person. Now it is obvious that the "unction of the Holy Spirit" is an idea as inapplicable to the Second Trinitarian Person, before the incarnation, as it would be to the First Person, that of the Father. The term can apply only to the incarnate Son, as, indeed, Dr. Smeaton seems to admit. "The unction is competent to Him only as God-man—that is, in both natures" (p. 119). Precisely so; and, therefore, it is not competent to Him as the *Λόγος ἄσαρκος*, or the Second Divine Person, from which it seems to follow that it is inapplicable to the act of the incarnation. With Dr. Smeaton's exposition of the "anointing," subsequently to that event, we can fully concur. The God-man, Christ Jesus, *i.e. after* the incarnation was, no doubt, anointed, in a special manner, by the Holy Ghost: the excellent gifts of the Holy Ghost were poured out on Him without measure; of which the visible sign was the descent of the Holy Spirit at His baptism, and the fruits, His miraculous powers (Acts x. 38), His superhuman wisdom—not the abstract attribute of omniscience, see Mark xiii. 32—and the human graces which were combined in Him as in no other partaker of our nature. These gifts, however, were different in kind from the mysterious operation of the Logos in the incarnation; they were such as might be, and in fact were, exhibited *in measure* by the Apostles and others, who were indeed temples of the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. iii. 16), but could make no pretensions to a hypostatical union.

We are compelled to leave him again when he comes to the "third degree of Christ's unction," that which the Saviour is supposed to have received when He ascended to heaven. That Christ then "received gifts for men"—that is, the right to send the Holy Spirit to be His vicar upon earth, is unquestionable; but it does not follow from this that He Himself received any such credentials—He needed none such. Ascended to heaven, He was acknowledged Head of the Church, and Lord of this dispensation, to whom all power in heaven and earth, for mediatorial purposes, is committed (Matt. xxviii. 18).

The work of the Holy Spirit *in the Church* is, as we have said, either extraordinary or ordinary. Under the former head come the miraculous gifts of the Apostolic age—as described, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xii.—and the gift of inspiration. The former were needed as a visible sign of the fulfilment of Christ's promise; but having discharged this office, they are not, as Dr. Smeaton well argues, to be expected to reappear in the Church. They fulfil to us in the page of Scripture the same evidential function which they did, before Scripture was written, to the eye-witnesses. The gift of inspiration, for the formation of the Canon of Scripture, is the other extraordinary gift, of which we likewise expect no repetition. On this important subject we are glad to find ourselves in substantial agreement with the author. Under the term of inspiration he understands that "the Holy Spirit supplied prophets and apostles, as chosen organs, with gifts which must be distinguished from ordinary grace, to give forth

in human forms of speech a revelation which must be accepted as the Word of God in its whole contents, and as the authoritative guide for doctrine and duty" (p. 142); to which description no addition requires to be made. The author naturally contends against such modifications of it as that the Bible is not but contains the Word of God, and its insidious counterpart that "the men were inspired, the books were the result of their inspiration." Either theory tends to sever the divine superintendence from the act of writing, with which, according to our judgment, the gift of inspiration is to be specially connected. And thus not only would the writers have enjoyed no divine guidance as to what subjects they were to take in hand for the benefit of the Church, but we should have had no certainty that in the handling of the subjects selected the form of expression was a perfectly suitable vehicle of the thought. And we know that so closely are thought and language connected, that a slight inaccuracy in the latter may give a different turn to the former. In a word, the gift of inspiration, to be of any practical value to us, must include both the thoughts and their expression. Nor is this by any means inconsistent with the admission that the Holy Spirit, in this effective superintendence, made use of natural temperament and talents, and allowed each inspired agent to write from his own experience and in his own style.

Some of Dr. Smeaton's statements on this subject he will probably reconsider in another edition. He seems, as is not uncommon, to make miracles and prophecy the tests of inspiration (p. 142). There is no doubt that men inspired to write were often also gifted with these powers; but they cannot be considered a formal test. Many prophets, etc., wrought miracles who were never commissioned to write; and of several inspired writers, *e.g.* St. Mark and St. Luke, it is not recorded that they either prophesied or wrought miracles. Moreover, both the *false* prophets alluded to in Deut. xiii., and the Antichrist of the New Testament (2 Thess. ii.) are supposed to work signs and wonders: certainly not by the aid of the blessed Spirit, but still so really as, in the absence of any other test, to present a severe temptation even to the elect. As to the gift of prophecy, when our author says (p. 142) that "the great test of a true prophet was that the prediction came to pass" (Deut. xviii. 22), he must have forgotten for the moment that this very test is not denied in Scripture to the false prophets: "If there arise among you a prophet, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder *come to pass* whereof he spake unto thee," etc. (Deut. xiii. 1, 2).[1]

Our limits compel us to hasten to a close, otherwise we should have drawn attention to several valuable remarks which the author makes on the ordinary work of the Spirit in the Church, such as regeneration and sanctification. It is hardly necessary to say that he insists on the true Scriptural meaning of regeneration as always signifying a moral change, and not a mere sacramental one, or the mere gift of a higher nature, in itself morally indifferent, and, as in the case of Satan, compatible with the greatest moral obliquity. This latter is actually the view presented by a distinguished convert to Romanism, previously to his change of religion. "Regeneration," he writes, "is a new birth, or the giving of a new nature. Now there is nothing impossible in the very notion of a regeneration being accorded even to impenitent sinners—regeneration in a true and sufficient sense, in its primary qualities. For the essence of regeneration is the communication of a higher and diviner nature. The devils have thus a nature higher and more divine than man."[2] We hold it to be impossible that the Holy Ghost can convey the new birth, and

[1] "It is here supposed that professed prophets would arise, and 'give signs and wonders;' that is, predict remarkable events which would come to pass."—Scott, *in loc.* [2] Newman, "Sermons."

not at the same time implant a seminal principle of holiness which will be sure to manifest itself. The idea of this divine Agent's communicating a merely higher nature, without a new bias of the affections, is in the highest degree repulsive. We have been struck with Dr. Smeaton's remarks on John iii. 3-6, as furnishing at least a plausible interpretation of a difficult passage.

We could have wished that the author had under this division devoted a lecture to the subject of the Holy Spirit's work in relation to the authority of the visible Church, as it is in some quarters asserted—one of great importance in the present day. What is the full meaning of the passages, "The law came by Moses; grace and truth by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17); or, "Who hath also made us ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. iii. 6); or, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (*ibid.* 17); or, "Thou art no more a servant, but a son" (Gal. iv. 7)? They deal with the great point so much insisted on by the Reformers, the distinction between the law and the gospel as dispensations. Romanism, whether in its fully developed or its incipient forms, rests on the assumption that the gospel is but a new law, or rather the old one with some differences; Christ the legislator instead of Moses; sacraments *ex opere operato* instead of empty signs; bishops, priests, and deacons instead of High Priest, priests, and Levites; the Mass, or "the unbloody" sacrifice, instead of the Levitical offerings. "If anyone," says the Council of Trent, "shall say that Jesus Christ was given to man as a Redeemer to trust in, but not as a Legislator to obey, let him be anathema" (Sess. vi. can. 21). Fatal words! which embody the errors of more than a thousand years. Wherever the gospel is regarded as a new ceremonial law, the work of the Holy Spirit becomes depreciated. His sanctifying influence is severed from His illuminating, and an official order, whatever its measure of holiness, is constituted the depository of divine truth. But, according to the Anglican Church, even "General Councils may err, and have erred," for the very reason that they are composed of men all of whom "are," or may be, "not governed by the Spirit of God" (Art. xxi.). The polity of the Church, instead of being the form into which the Church, under Apostolic guidance, threw itself out by an impulse from within, becomes a divinely appointed system of discipline, like the law of Moses, working from without inwards. The true, or as Protestants term it the "invisible," Church is no longer the real source of all that is valuable in the organization, or the practical fruits, of the visible Church, but a mere accident; the essence or true being of the Church residing not in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit but in visible notes, or an external succession. Christians are no longer "sons" but "servants," under the "beggarly elements" of a ritual system. The Holy Spirit is set aside in His sovereign and almighty operations, and legal prescriptions take His place.

But we must not further pursue a tempting topic. We have to thank Professor Smeaton for his valuable contribution to the subject, and to beg of him to believe that, if in some points we have been compelled to differ from him, we do not the less appreciate the general merits of his work; its high standard of orthodoxy, its edifying tone, and its freedom from the asperities which too often disfigure theological controversy.

E. A. LITTON.

James Nasmyth, Engineer. An Autobiography, edited by SAMUEL SMILES, LL.D. Author of "Lives of the Engineers." London: John Murray, 1883.

In his preface to this most interesting volume, Dr. Smiles tells us that twenty years ago, when he applied to Mr. Nasmyth for information

respecting his mechanical inventions, he received a very modest reply. "My life," said Mr. Nasmyth, "presents no striking or remarkable incidents, and would, I fear, prove but a tame narrative. The sphere to which my endeavours have been confined has been of a comparatively quiet order; but, vanity apart, I hope I have been able to leave a few marks of my existence behind me in the shape of useful contrivances, which are in many ways helping on great works of industry." On the modesty of Mr. Nasmyth's reply comment is needless. Among the "marks of his existence" which he will leave behind him is the steam-hammer, the most powerful of all modern mechanical inventions. But the general interest of his life was also underrated in his reply to the author of "Lives of the Engineers." It is justly remarked by a reviewer in the current *Quarterly* that Mr. Nasmyth's work as an engineer is indissolubly associated with his whole personal character and training, and a background of deep human interests lies behind his mechanical triumphs. "Some men's achievements seem almost accidental, due to no deliberate exercise of thought or will, and scarcely to be traced even to antecedent influences. But when it is clear that a man was born with a capacity for the special work he has fulfilled, when he has been trained to it by every influence of his childhood and youth, and when he has fought his way consciously to his end by a continuous struggle with difficulties, his life becomes a drama, and his professional achievements become secondary to his personal and family history. This is eminently the case with Mr. Nasmyth. It is the most curious part of his story," continues the *Quarterly*, "that the foundations of his career are laid deep in Scottish history, and that the accumulated influences and inheritances of four generations conspire to mould his character, his hand, and his eye. Nor is it only the influences of his own family to which he is indebted for his capacities and his success. As he tells the simple facts of his story, all the most characteristic elements of Scottish life are brought before us."

"A hundred years ago," says the *Quarterly*, "few persons would have supposed that Scottish life, in all its wildness and sternness, had been gradually nursing a breed of men who were to take the lead in some of the most important spheres of our national being, and to give a new impulse and new method to English capacities. But this is what Scottish history had been doing for several centuries, and especially since the Reformation. In modern scientific language, Scotland had been rendered a great accumulator of intellectual, moral, and muscular force; which, after the suppression of the last Stuart rebellion, was turned to practical purposes in this country and in the British Empire. 'How can it be possible,' said Wilkes to Boswell, 'to spend two thousand a year in Scotland?' 'Why,' said Johnson, 'the money may be spent in England.' It might have been asked to more purpose, what the Scotch were to do with the wonderful store of moral intensity, intellectual acuteness, and sound health which their hardy, struggling, and religious life of centuries had accumulated. But Johnson's answer would have been equally true. They could spend it in England; and to men like Mr. Nasmyth this country, with its ever-increasing demands for mechanical, commercial, and administrative ability, offered the very career for which they had been under so long a preparation."

The Autobiography opens thus:

Our history begins long before we are born. We represent the hereditary influences of our race, and our ancestors actually live in us. The sentiment of ancestry seems to be inherent in human nature, especially in the more civilized races. At all events, we cannot help having a due regard for our forefathers. Our curiosity is stimulated by their immediate or indirect influence upon ourselves. It may be a generous enthusiasm, or, as some might say, a harmless vanity, to take pride in the honour of their name. The gifts of nature, however, are more valuable than those of fortune; and no line of ancestry, however honourable, can absolve us from the duty of diligent application and perseverance, or from the practice of the virtues of self-control and self-help.

Whether the family legend given in Burke's "Peerage and Baronetage" is really "faithful" is a question which does not diminish the enjoyment of Mr. Nasmyth's narrative. The family crest is a hand holding a hammer; and the story goes that in the reign of King James III., of Scotland, an ancestor of the family, being worsted in a skirmish, had to take refuge in a smithy, where the smith disguised him as a hammerman. A party of the Douglases entered the smithy; and in his agitation, being evidently suspected, the King's man struck a false blow with the sledge-hammer, which broke the shaft in two. Upon this one of the Douglas party rushed at him, calling out, "Ye're *nae smyth!*" The hammerman snatched his assailant's dagger, and together with the smith, wielding a sledgehammer, turned on the Douglas soldiers, and some of the Royal forces happening to come up, a defeat was converted into a victory. For this service he obtained a grant of lands; and the armorial bearings consisted of a hand dexter with a dagger between two broken hammer-shafts, the motto being *Non arte sed marte*—"Not by art, but by war." These are the Naesmyth arms to this day; but the great engineer, as he relates, has reversed the motto (*Non marte sed arte*), and instead of the broken hammer-shafts he has adopted, not as his "arms," but as a device, the Steam Hammer — the most potent form of mechanical art. James Nasmyth is the great smith of his time.

To the formation of the Scottish character, as has been said, religion has most powerfully contributed. A branch of the Naesmyth family, settled at Netherton, in the reign of Charles II., being Presbyterians, held stoutly to their own faith. "To be cleft by sword and pricked by spear into a religion which they disbelieved was utterly hateful" to them. After the battle of Bothwell Brig, graphically described by Sir Walter Scott, the Covenanter Naesmyth, head of the Netherton Naesmyths, was condemned to death, and his property was confiscated. He had got away and saved his life, but the lands were gone. His descendants had to get their bread by honest labour. Michael Naesmyth, great great-grandfather of our engineer, born in 1652, was a builder and architect in Edinburgh; he was buried by the side of his ancestors in the family tomb in that ancient and memorable burying-place, Greyfriars Churchyard. His son Michael carried on the business. He was a man of much ability; but one element in his success is stated in a passage which has an interest of its own at the present time:

One of his great advantages in carrying on his business was the support of a staff of able and trustworthy foremen and workmen. The times were very different then from what they are now. Masters and men lived together in mutual harmony. There was a kind of loyal family attachment among them, which extended through many generations. Workmen had neither the desire nor the means for shifting about from place to place. On the contrary, they settled down with their wives and families in houses of their own, close to the workshops of

their employers. Work was found for them in the dull seasons when trade was slack, and in summer they sometimes removed to jobs at a distance from head-quarters. Much of this feeling of attachment and loyalty between workmen and their employers has now expired. Men rapidly remove from place to place. Character is of little consequence. The mutual feeling of goodwill and zealous attention to work seems to have passed away. Sudden change, scamping, and shoddy have taken their place.—(P. 12.)

The father of our engineer, a distinguished painter, was born in 1758, in the Grass Market, at this time a lively place—the centre, in fact, of Edinburgh traffic. Opposite the house in which he was born was the inn from which the first coach started from Edinburgh to Newcastle. The public notice stated that "The Coach would set out from the Grass Market ilka Tuesday at Twa o'clock in the day, GOD WULLIN', but *whether or no* on Wednesday." The "whether or no," it is presumed, was only meant as a warning to passengers that the coach would start, even though all the places were not taken. The painter Nasmyth, called "the father of landscape-painting in Scotland," was also a mechanic and an architect; he had "a powerful store of common-sense," and was an "all-round man," of much ability and resource. His work-room, fitted up with all kinds of mechanical tools, was our engineer's primary technical school, the very foreground of his life.

In 1817, when nine years old, James Nasmyth went to the High School, and he learned there to do his tasks, however disagreeable, with cheerfulness and punctuality. He left the High School in 1820. Among his school-fellows he had made several friends; and, through the sons of a large iron-founder, and of a practical chemist, he gained much practical experience. He not merely read about things, he "saw and handled," he made his own tools; and bit by bit, as a learning lad, with his eyes wide open, and his hands ever ready, he became initiated into all the varieties of chemical and mechanical manipulation. The following observations are timely and instructive:

I often observe (writes Mr. Nasmyth), in shop-windows, every detail of model ships and model steam-engines, supplied ready made for those who are "said to be" of an ingenious and mechanical turn. Thus the vital uses of resourcefulness are done away with, and a sham exhibition of mechanical genius is paraded before you by the young impostors—the result, for the most part, of too free a supply of pocket-money. I have known too many instances of parents being led by such false evidence of constructive skill to apprentice their sons to some engineering firm; and, after paying vast sums, finding out that the pretender comes out of the engineering shop with no other practical accomplishment than that of glove-wearing and cigar-smoking!

The truth is that the eyes and the fingers—*the bare fingers*—are the two principal inlets to sound practical instruction. They are the chief sources of trustworthy knowledge in all the materials and operations which the engineer has to deal with. No *book* knowledge can avail for that purpose. The nature and properties of the materials must come in through the finger-ends. Hence, I have no faith in young engineers who are addicted to wearing gloves. Gloves, especially kid gloves, are perfect non-conductors of technical knowledge. This has really more to do with the efficiency of young aspirants for engineering success than most people are aware of. Yet kid gloves are now considered the genteel thing.—(P. 96.)

In the year 1829 James Nasmyth went up to the metropolis; he had an introduction to Maudsley, the great London engineer. Mr. Maudsley invited him to go round his works, and the wonderful machinery made him "more tremblingly anxious than ever to obtain some employment

there, in however humble a capacity." As they passed the steam-engine which gave motion to the tools and machinery, the man in attendance on it was engaged in cleaning out the ashes from under the boiler furnace, and, on the spur of the moment, James Nasmyth exclaimed to Mr. Maudsley, "If you would only permit me to do such a job as that in your service I should consider myself most fortunate." "I shall never forget," writes Mr. Nasmyth, "the keen but kindly look that he gave me. 'So,' said he, 'you are one of that sort, are you?' I was inwardly delighted at his words." After an inspection of his examples of handiwork, including a complete working model of a high-pressure engine, every part of which his own hands had done, Mr. Maudsley introduced the young Scotchman into his own private workshop. "This," said he, "is where I wish you to work beside me as my assistant workman. From what I have seen there is no need of an apprenticeship in your case."

The character of this remarkable man is summed up in the following passage:

It was one of his favourite maxims, "First, *get a clear notion* of what you desire to accomplish, and then in all probability you will succeed in doing it." Another was, "Keep a sharp look-out upon your materials; get rid of every pound of material you can *do without;* put to yourself the question, 'What business has it to be there?' avoid complexities, and make everything as simple as possible." Mr. Maudsley was full of quaint maxims and remarks, the result of much shrewdness, keen observation, and great experience. They were well worthy of being stored up in the mind, like a set of proverbs, full of the life and experience of men. His thoughts became compressed into pithy expressions exhibiting his force of character and intellect. His quaint remarks on my first visit to his workshop, and on subsequent occasions, proved to me invaluable guides.

Mr. Nasmyth was resolved that his wages alone should maintain him in food and lodging, and he therefore directed his attention to economical living; and as a moderate dinner at an eating-house would cost him more than he could afford to spend, he bought the raw materials and cooked them in his own way and to his own taste. He set to and made a drawing of a very simple, compact, and handy cooking apparatus. This drawing he took to a tinsmith near at hand, and in two days he had it in full operation. The apparatus cost ten shillings, including the lamp. The requisite heat, it seems, was supplied by an oil lamp with three small single wicks, though he found that one wick was enough. He put the meat in the pot, with the other comestibles, at nine o'clock in the morning. It simmered away all day, until half-past six in the evening, when he came home with a healthy appetite to enjoy his dinner.

I well remember (writes Mr. Nasmyth) the first day that I set the apparatus to work. I ran to my lodging, at about four p.m., to see how it was going on. When I lifted the cover it was simmering beautifully, and such a savoury gusto came forth that I was almost tempted to fall to and discuss the contents. But the time had not yet come, and I ran back to my work.

The meat I generally cooked in it was leg of beef, with sliced potato, bits of onion chopped down, and a modicum of white pepper and salt, with just enough of water to cover "the elements." When stewed slowly the meat became very tender, and the whole yielded a capital dish, such as a very Soyer might envy. It was partaken of with a zest that, no doubt, was a very important element in its savouriness. The whole cost of this capital dinner was about 4½d. I sometimes varied the meat with rice boiled with a few raisins and a pennyworth of milk. My breakfast and tea, with bread, cost me about 4d. each. My lodgings cost 3s. 6d. a week. A little multiplication will satisfy anyone how it was that I contrived to live economically and comfortably on my ten shillings a week. In the

following year my wages were raised to fifteen shillings a week, and then I began to take butter to my bread.—(P. 143.)

This handy apparatus Mr. Nasmyth has by him still; and recently, he tells us, he set it in action after its rest of fifty years. It was in 1836, when he was twenty-six, that he removed to Patricroft, and built the Bridgewater Foundry. In 1840 he invented the Steam Hammer. When forty-eight years of age he retired from business. The story of his life is told in a kindly, genial, and winning style. A brief extract from his account of the steam pile-driver may be quoted:

There was a great deal of curiosity in the dockyard as to the action of the new machine. The pile-driving machinemen gave me a good-natured challenge to vie with them in driving down a pile. They adopted the old method, while I adopted the new one. The resident managers sought out two great pile logs of equal size and length, 70 feet long and 18 inches square. At a given signal we started together. I let in the steam, and the hammer at once began to work. The four-ton block showered down blows at the rate of 80 a minute, and in the course of *four and a half minutes* my pile was driven down to its required depth. The men working at the ordinary machine had only begun to drive. It took them upwards of *twelve hours* to complete the driving of their pile.

We hope that our readers will peruse this pleasing and most instructive Autobiography; and we therefore refrain from making further quotations. Our aim has been to whet the appetite; and in heartily recommending the book we can promise a real treat. It should be added that the volume is tastefully printed and bound.

Short Notices.

Not for Him. The Story of a Forgotten Hero. By EMILY S. HOLT, author of "Mistress Margery," etc. John F. Shaw and Co.

WE gladly welcome another of Miss Holt's charming historical stories. Every one of her stories, so far as we know, would be rated by an impartial judge as both interesting and instructive. The literary work is of no mean order, and the religious element is excellent, while the refinement of culture and good taste pervades the whole. Several volumes of the "Tales of English Life in the Olden Times" have been warmly commended in THE CHURCHMAN; and the volume before us will take a good place in this valuable series. The dialogues are bright and natural, and the graphic descriptions of life within and without the castle walls of knightly and noble families have a Scott-like impressiveness. It is evident that Miss Holt has taken great pains with her subject, and the accuracy of her word-paintings in the smallest details of social life is thoroughly to be trusted. All the characters are finely drawn; the chief of them, the "forgotten hero," is Edmund, Earl of Cornwall, the richest man in England, not excepting the King, at the close of the thirteenth century. What this Christian earl did for Protestantism, how he suffered at the hands of his bigoted wife, who became a nun, is well described in the delightful story, for which we tender thanks to the accomplished author.

A brief notice of the *Quarterly Review* was given in the last CHURCHMAN, with an extract from its review of "The Life of Lord Lawrence." A very interesting article commends Mr. Brocklehurst's book on Mexico.

From a review of Nasmyth's Autobiography some quotations appear in another column. "The French Republic in 1883" well brings out the deplorable results of full-blown Popery as regards education in France.

From Messrs. Cassell, Petter and Co. we have received three volumes of what promises to be a very attractive and useful series: "Heart Chords." *My Work for God*, by Bishop COTTERILL; *My Body*, by Dr. BLAIKIE; and *My Object in Life*, by Dr. FARRAR. Other volumes will give us an opportunity of reviewing this series.

Life and Work among the Navvies. By D. W. BARRETT, M.A., Vicar of Nassington. Third Edition. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is a very interesting little volume, and it is no matter of surprise that it has quickly reached a third edition. The author was lately "Curate-in-Charge of the Bishop of Peterborough's Railway Mission," and he tells the story of hard work among the navvies with spirit and with a simple realness. Not a page is dull. One of the appendices gives some information about the Navvy Mission Society, with a speech by the Dean of Ripon.

To the interesting series of Diocesan Histories (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge) has just been added *Worcester*, a volume, so far as we have read, quite equal to any of its predecessors. We must return to it.

In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* appear a judicious criticism of the "Resolutions and Letter of the Indian Bishops," and a pleasing review of that remarkable work, Sir W. Muir's "Annals of the Early Caliphate."——Among several interesting papers in the *Church Sunday School Magazine* appear Archdeacon BARDSLEY'S "Bible Details Verified," Part V., a very interesting and informing series. Whether Mr. APPLETON'S able and suggestive lessons on Man, with quotations from Professor Foster's *Physiology*, etc., etc., are precisely in their proper place as "lessons" for Sunday-schools, is matter of opinion.——The *Quiver*, good and interesting as usual, contains a paper on Baalbek, by Canon GORE; and *Little Folks* is excellent.——In *Light and Truth* (Partridge) the Bishop of MEATH writes on the Reformers of Spain and Portugal; his lordship's "brief statement and special appeal" will bear, we hope, good fruit.——In the *Indian Churchman*, Calcutta, April 14 (London: Leslie, 18, Henrietta Street, W.C.), apparently the organ of very High Churchmen, we read that the question of Church Disestablishment in India is postponed. The Under-Secretary for India, it seems, admitted that there was communication going on with reference to the present ecclesiastical arrangements in India. "From several hints lately given," says the *Indian Churchman*, "we may be sure that the question will soon come within the range of practical politics, and although we may agree with our Bishop that it is but one of secondary importance, yet we ought to face it not only resignedly, but with an organization prepared to meet it."——In the *Sunday at Home*, a very good number, appears this bit of news:

All last winter in the little mission on the Labrador coast, Mr. Spurgeon's sermons were read in the Mission Church Sunday by Sunday by the lady teachers, who were left by themselves for eight months through the failing health of the devoted missionary who had laboured there for many years. These simple services on the Sunday and week-day evenings, when these sermons were the staple of the teaching given, were greatly blessed by God. Many sailors came from the ships anchored off the coast, and, with the resident fishermen, eagerly listened to the Word of life; and not only were their hearts cheered and comforted, but some were brought to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

Dr. Pusey. An Historic Sketch, with some account of the Oxford Movement during the nineteenth century. By the Rev. BOURCHIER WREY

SAVILE, M.A., Rector of Shillingford, Exeter; author of "The Primitive and Catholic Faith," etc. Longmans, Green, and Co.

On the title-page of this vigorous pamphlet (the "chief portion of which was written after a prolonged correspondence with Dr. Pusey)" appear the following quotations:

"Earnestly contend for the faith which was once (for all) delivered."—*St. Jude.*

"A considerable minority of Clergy and Laity are desiring to subvert the principles of the Reformation."—*The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in reply to the Memorial of* 60,000 *Churchmen, June* 16, 1873.

The Ritualists are engaged in what I am obliged to call "A CONSPIRACY in our body against the doctrine, discipline, and practice of our Reformed Church."—*Archbishop Tait in Convocation, July* 6, 1877.

The English Church Union is "a standing menace to the legitimate government of the Church."—*The Bishop of Bath and Wells; Charge of* 1879.

Report of Proceedings of the Representative Body laid before the General Synod of the Church of Ireland at its Thirteenth Ordinary Session, 1883. Together with an alphabetical list of the contributions to the Sustentation Fund received by the Representative Body during the year 1882. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co.

In earnestly inviting the attention of our readers in England to this interesting Report, which reflects the greatest credit on our brethren across the Channel, we may quote a section that is headed "Need of attention to the Smaller Contributions." The Report says:

On the whole, therefore, the Representative Body feel that they have reason to acknowledge with thankfulness the spirit of loyal zeal which Irish Churchmen have shown in thus liberally supporting their Church, in these times when so many among them are feeling not merely a temporary, but a permanent and serious curtailment of income. Notwithstanding the improvement which the finances of the Church have exhibited during the past year, and which has been noticed above, the Representative Body feel it to be their duty to renew the warning which in their report of last year they addressed to the Church on this subject. The largest subscriptions to Church funds have hitherto, for the most part, come from the landed proprietors. Not only does the income of the Church thus in large measure depend on the liberality of the landowners, but there are very many parishes in which one or two landowners have paid the greater part—in some parishes the whole—of the assessment. The circumstances of the time make it, therefore, the duty and the wisdom of the Church to prepare herself to face the possible result of a serious falling-off in these larger contributions to her funds. The Representative Body hope that the remedy which naturally suggests itself under these circumstances will be diligently used, and that it will prove effectual, namely, an increase in the number and amount of the *smaller* contributions of those who cannot give much, but who ought to give what they can.

Time's Feast Heaven's Foretaste. The Sabbath of Jehovah; its Origin, Character, and Perpetuity. By JOHN GRITTON, D.D. Pp. 141. The Lord's Day Observance Society, 20, Bedford Street, Strand.

To this essay, a note tells its readers, was adjudged the first prize of £50 (Mr. J. T. Morton's) by judges acting for "the Sabbath Alliance of Scotland." We are not surprised that it should have distanced other competitors, for the author, to say nothing of his literary abilities, is thoroughly "well up" in the details of the great principles of the Sabbath controversy as it is carried on at the present day. A little pamphlet, printed in clear, large type, it is likely to do good service.

Ants and their Ways. By the Rev. W. F. WHITE, M.A., M.E.S.L., Vicar of Stonehouse. Religious Tract Society.

This work owes its origin to a series of papers which Mr. White contributed to the *Leisure Hour* during the year 1880. Additional material

since that date has accumulated through the researches of Lubbock and McCook. Mr. White himself is an able and patient investigator, and his carefully written book is highly interesting and instructive. The appendix contains a complete list of genera and species of the British ants. It is neatly got up, well printed, and has several illustrations. Mr. Wood refers to it in an article on Ants in the present CHURCHMAN. It is worthy of note that Mr. White discovered a species of ants from Madeira, in large numbers at a baker's shop in the Borough.

Eleventh Annual Report of the South Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, on the Principles of the Reformation for 1882, together with the Annual Statement of Accounts, the Report of the South Eastern College, Ramsgate; and the Ninth Report of the Church Deaconess-Home, Maidstone. Maidstone: W. S. Vivish, 28, King Street.

We quote the title-page of this Report in full, omitting only the words "price one shilling;" and we may remark in passing that all earnest lovers of sound Evangelical Church principles will reckon this pamphlet a cheap shilling's worth. One fault we have to find, or one fault-finding criticism to make, regarding this Report (our remark will apply to the annual reports of other Lay and Clerical Societies), Why so long a delay? The meeting is held, say in July or August; surely it would be easy to get out the pamphlet by October. It may be desirable, on financial grounds, no doubt, to wait until the end of the year. Nevertheless, as a rule, we think it would be better to issue the Reports within two or three months after the annual meeting. It is from the deep interest which we feel in the Lay and Clerical movement that we make this suggestion. To the South Eastern Alliance, of which the Dean of CANTERBURY is the President, we have more than once invited attention. At the meeting in Folkestone, papers were read by Professor WACE and Dr. FLAVEL COOK, and an address was delivered by the Rev. J. F. KITTO. Several good speeches were made, and the proceedings seem to have been altogether promising and very successful. The Dean's opening address was excellent; and we should gladly quote some passages did space permit. But we turn to that portion of the Report which relates to the South Eastern College. A vigorous speech was made at the meeting by the Head Master of the College, the Rev. E. C. D'AUQUIER, of whose abilities, spirit, tact, and devotedness, testimonies from friends in many quarters abound. The school is growing, as might be expected, under such a Head Master (the number of pupils is now 100; there are 12 Assistant Masters), and it is gaining influence; but much remains to be done as regards the school buildings. Hitherto, the burden has been borne by a comparatively small number of persons; and the difficulties of a really great work must have been very trying. Some staunch supporters of Evangelical Church principles will, we hope, speedily come to the front: gifts of really large sums are evidently needed. The College has been admirably managed; and to a few members of the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Society all Evangelical Churchmen are greatly indebted. An appeal issued by such men as the Dean of Canterbury, Mr. John Deacon, Mr. C. J. Plumptre, and the Rev. J. E. Campbell-Colquhoun, deserves to be made widely known; and we gladly quote a paragraph, with most hearty good wishes:

The lease of the temporary premises in which the work has hitherto been carried on will shortly expire, and it is of the utmost importance that the erection of permanent buildings should be begun forthwith. A site of fifteen acres has been secured, and plans prepared for the erection of premises which will accommodate 300 boarders. For this we need a sum of at least £20,000, and we earnestly appeal to you and all Christian friends to help us to collect this amount. If poss-

ible it is proposed to begin this year the first wing, which will accommodate 120 boarders, and the cost of which is estimated at £5,000. The fees at the South-Eastern College have been fixed on such a scale as to ensure, without making profit, the covering of all expenses when once we are installed in permanent premises.

Heroes of Science, Chemists. By M. M. PATTISON MUIR, M.A., F.R.S.E., Fellow and Prælector in Chemistry of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Pp. 332. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

In preparing this useful book the author kept to the lines laid down for him, viz., "to exhibit, by selected biographies, the progress of chemistry from the beginning of the inductive method until the present time." The progress of chemistry has been made the central theme; around this has been grouped short accounts of the lives of those who have most assisted this progress by their labours, such as, *e.g.*, Berzelius, Lavoisier, Graham, and Sir Humphry Davy. The chapter on Dalton and the atomic theory has a special interest. Altogether, the book is bright, and it supplies a want.

Coming; or, The Golden Year. By SELINA GAYE. Seeley, Jackson and Halliday.

This is just one of the volumes which one expects from the well-known house in Fleet Street; a story written with skill and spirit, in tone reverent and sound, fresh, attractive, and with good aim; it must, of course, be neatly got up and well printed, and suitable for a gift. "Coming" is not so bright as some stories; picturing life in a mountain valley, it deals with serious and even sad experiences, and its key-note is:

So I am watching quietly
Every day;
Whenever the sun shines brightly
I rise and say,
"Surely it is the shining of His face!"

Or, again, in the words of Tennyson: That Day—

Has it come? It has only dawned. It will come by-and-by.

The Churchman's Altar Manual. Griffith and Farran.

What a pity it is that in preparing a Manual for members of the Church of England editors should not keep closely to the authoritative language of the Church of England. Loyal Churchmanship ought surely to be specially careful, when touching on main principles, to regard the Church's own words. Yet oftentimes the Prayer Book seems to be ignored. The keynote of the Manual before us, for instance, is the Altar; yet this word cannot be found in the Prayer Book. Again, the Manual states that "the Holy Eucharist . . . has ever been called by the Church the Eucharistic *Sacrifice*" (the italics are not ours). Why does the writer not at least try to show what his own Church—the Church of England—calls the Sacrament? Again, there is a prayer that those "who sleep in Jesus may rest in peace and hope." Why no allusion to "The Prayer for the Church *Militant*"? Again, the Manual teaches that at every altar Christ's "blessed Body and Blood are being offered;" and states that "*Perform*, *celebrate*, or *offer* this" is a better translation than "This do . . ."

Grain from the Granary. Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Bekesbourne, Kent. By the late Rev. STEPHEN JENNER, M.A., Vicar. With a Preface by the Rev. FREDERICK CHALMERS, B.D. Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

We have read these sermons—commended by Mr. Chalmers—with much interest; as thoughtful expositions of Holy Scripture they may

take high rank. For a Sunday evening reading in the family circle they are, we think, admirably fitted. One paper by Mr. Jenner appeared in this periodical some three years ago, and we were in correspondence with him about another paper for THE CHURCHMAN when he was taken ill and entered into rest.

The *National Review*, No. III. (W. H. Allen and Co.), contains several articles of much ability and interest. We do not intermeddle with party politics, but at least it may be said that Mr. Alfred Austin's criticism of the Prime Minister's policy will not be answered with ease.

A really good book is Canon HULBERT'S *Annals of Almondbury* (Longman and Co.); a worthy notice must appear hereafter.——A cheap edition of Dr. LANSDELL'S *Through Siberia* (S. Low and Co.), the third edition, is one of the very best books of travel in a cheap and convenient form. The work was strongly recommended in THE CHURCHMAN when it was issued.

Widow Tanner's Cactus (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), by the Author of "Mary Cloudsdale," lately recommended in these columns, is a capital little gift-book; a good story, with a tasteful cover. The author describes the good consequences that resulted from the gift of a few cactus plants among some London poor.

We have received from Messrs. Marcus Ward and Co. several packets of Sunday-school cards, by far the best assortment which we have ever seen—really good cards, at the same time very cheap and very tasteful. Some of the flower-pictures, with F. R. Havergal's verses on the back, are pretty. Packet No. 114, "Foundation Stones," is very good; so also is No. 17, "Raindrops and Rills." The reward tickets—just a text with a flower or bud, are wonderfully cheap. Sunday-school teachers and other teachers will do well to get some specimens of these varieties; they are sure to order more.

THE MONTH.

THE May Meetings have been, on the whole, exceedingly successful. The reports of most of the Societies are encouraging. Much earnest Christian work is being done both at home and abroad, in a truly Christian spirit; the reliance upon prayer, *qui orat laborat*, is of the highest promise in these bustling days.

At the meeting of the Church Missionary Society, the Archbishop of Canterbury, according to precedent, took the chair. At the British and Foreign Bible Society's anniversary, also, his Grace was present and spoke. The significant speech of the Archbishop of York at the meeting of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, concerning Reformation and Anti-Reformation principles, will, we hope, be published.

The Affirmation Bill was rejected by 292 votes against 289. A "previous question" motion for the "relief" of Mr. Bradlaugh, supported by the Prime Minister, obtained only 165 votes against 271. There are several signs that of late the

Ministry has lost credit in the House of Commons as well as in the country.

To the Deanery of Windsor, vacant by the death of the much-esteemed Dean Connor, the Rev. Randall Davidson has been appointed. Mr. Davidson, Resident Chaplain, and son-in-law of Archbishop Tait, will receive good wishes on every side.

Prebendary Cadman, lately appointed Chaplain to Archbishop Benson, has been returned in the two Metropolitan Archdeaconries; a great gain in the Lower House.

The Bishop of London's representations in regard to the Antiphons at St. Paul's have been successful. The Archbishop of York's letters (and monition) to Mr. Ommaney, of St. Matthew's, Sheffield, can hardly fail to do good.

A motion in Salisbury Synod to send representatives to the Central Council was, in deference to the Bishop, withdrawn. The Bishop explained that he was "not against a Central Council." Undoubtedly, the remarks of the Bishops of Salisbury and Liverpool about the defective constitution of certain Diocesan Conferences deserve most careful consideration.

With much pleasure we notice the promising results of the effort made to form a "Dean Close Memorial" Middle Class School in the West of England. Under the auspices of Canons Brooke and Bell, and the Rev. Talbot Greaves, such an effort should speedily succeed.

At the annual gathering of the Church Association, an excellent address was given by Mr. J. Maden Holt. It will, no doubt, be published. Mr. Shipton made some pertinent remarks upon the duty of Evangelical Churchmen to the Press.

The police investigations in Dublin, carried on with wonderful skill and patience, have at length unravelled the mysteries of the Phœnix Park murders and subsequent outrages; some of the murderers of Mr. Burke and Lord F. Cavendish have been hanged, and other agents of the hideous conspiracy have been condemned to penal servitude for life.

Archbishop Croke has at last been deservedly rebuked by the Pope; and the lawless agitation in connection with the Land League, supported by many Priests, has received a check.

Under the title of *The New Paganism*,[1] Canon Garratt has published a vigorous sermon (Jer. x. 10) dealing with the irreligious and Atheistic tendencies of the times here and on the Continent.

---

[1] W. Hunt & Co.