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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1885.

ART. I.—SUNDAY MUSEUMS, PICTURE GALLERIES, LIBRARIES, AND BANDS.

PROPOSALS have frequently been made in Parliament, in Town Councils, at meetings of governing bodies of Societies connected with Literature, Science, or Art, and elsewhere, to bring about the adoption either locally or generally, or first locally and then generally, of the policy of giving to the public on Sundays facilities which do not at present exist for visiting museums, and art collections, and for consulting books in public libraries, and for listening to music in public places of resort, such as parks and piers. These proposals, though hitherto, in practice, found to be little in harmony with the instincts of the English nation, and to have been attended with but very slight experimental success where tried (except, perhaps, in the case of bands, the most mischievous and offensive form of innovation), are nevertheless justified by many whose motives are above suspicion. It is, however, to be feared that not a few persons occupying positions of rank and influence have lent their purses and names to the movement from sheer thoughtlessness as to the cardinal principles which underlie the controversy. Others have aided the agitation, honestly intending to go but a very short distance along the road and then to stop, desiring to be regarded as actuated (as no doubt many of them are) simply by Christian and philanthropic motives, without any *arrière pensée* whatever. A third class, with no very particular intentions, moral or immoral, are pushing on this movement for personal profit, and for money-getting. In this category I include those railway directors and managers, brewers, and traders of any class likely to profit by Sunday trading, whose regard for principles is very slight, and whose god is Money. But besides all these there is a fourth class,

who to my mind are the most dangerous and insidious of all. I hardly know any one word which adequately describes them collectively, but they are those—as a rule—who, being at heart infidels, see in a Lord's Day kept inviolate by national laws and customs, a great public barrier to the spread of their infidelity. These men are the wire-pullers of this movement in favour of Sunday Museums, Picture Galleries, Libraries, and Bands. The first three classes, as I have enumerated them,[1] are more or less tools in the hands of the fourth class, who, so far as *public* agitation in *high* London centres is concerned, conceal with much carefulness their own inmost thoughts, intentions, and hopes.

All those men and women of high degree—not a few of them eminent in Church and State (some, indeed, clergy), or in science or art—whose names now figure on the lists of the so-called "Sunday Society," are, without the least doubt in the world, embarked on a course which many of them would in perfect good faith wish to repudiate did they understand what its inevitable extension must be in a few years if their present plausible and, as they intend, limited programme develops in the way that all experience shows it must develop.[2]

I pass on now to consider a few of the leading principles which underlie this Sunday Museums, etc., controversy. Many well-intentioned people, when you speak to them on it, exclaim sympathetically, "It is a very difficult question." If such is the case to them, it is simply that, intentionally or unintentionally, they make it such.

In order to keep these observations within conveniently narrow limits, I may here state that I do not wish to argue the Sunday question as a whole, but only that branch of it which is strictly covered by the title prefixed to this paper, namely, Museums, Picture Galleries, Libraries, and Bands. Be it clearly understood, however, that the observance of a day of rest, after six days of work, is neither Puritanic, nor Jewish, nor even Mosaic, but dates from and in a sense commemorates the foundation of the world. It is therefore binding on the whole human race, and of perpetual and universal obligation for all time.

Premising that I wish to address in particular those who

---

[1] An eminent member of the Legislature, a high-principled Christian philanthropist, who has done many things in many places to promote the moral and material welfare of his neighbours, opens to the public by ticket his picture-gallery constantly on Sundays in the summer.

[2] I designedly limit the remark in the text to Lord Dunraven's Sunday Society, because the older National Sunday League is confessedly a more political and democratic body, and has never received the upper-class patronage which has been given to the newer Society.

"call themselves Christians," and especially, members of the Church of England, I make bold to say, that it is extremely hard to comprehend how the Sunday Museums, etc., controversy can be called a "difficult" question. The fourth Commandment is one of the Ten Commandments; and often as the attempt has been made to show that whereas nine of the Commandments unquestionably lay down moral principles of justice of perpetual obligation, but that the fourth must be treated separately, the attempt has always been unsuccessful. Accordingly, the custom of the Church of England to recite the Commandments (including the fourth) every Sunday, and to have them conspicuously exhibited on the walls of her places of worship,[1] is the most convincing declaration possible of the mind of the Church of England. Now can any man in his senses read calmly the fourth Commandment and for one moment venture to deny that to open Museums, etc., and hire bands on Sunday, is a plain infraction both of the letter and of the spirit of the said Commandment? We are told to keep the Sabbath day "holy;" to do no "labour," nor to cause others, including "servants," "cattle," and "strangers," to labour; and all this for reasons plainly expressed, but which it is not necessary, for our present argument, here to dwell upon. Other statements of the teaching of the Church of England are to be found in the XIIIth Canon and the XXth Homily, in both in terms too plain to be misunderstood. Tried by any one of the tests thus suggested to members of the Church of England by their Church, the policy of Sunday Museums, etc., must, to any candid mind, be indefensible. Going with a crowd to stare at stuffed lions or oil paintings, or to listen to operatic or even to sacred music on a pier, can by no possible stretch of the imagination be regarded as a "holy" occupation, or "worship," or "rest;" but it is the secondary consequences which result from such a perversion of Sunday which, if possible, intensify the primary objections to the movement. Some of these were admirably brought out in the House of Lords, on March 20th, 1885, in the speeches of Lords Cairns[2] and Harrowby, and may here be exhibited in brief.

---

[1] The fashion that has sprung up of late years to neglect this legal duty is much to be deplored, and is very suggestive.

[2] Since the lines in the text were written Lord Cairns has been called away from the scene of his labours, and thereby has arisen a void in the political life of England which is absolutely irreparable. It is impossible to conceive what an appalling loss he is to the Church of England as a Christian leader and practical philanthropist; to the House of Lords as a high-minded judge; and to the Conservative party as a statesman of rare experience, acuteness, and eloquence. His career was a brilliant example of the success which always attends, in the case of English

The assertion is made that to spend an afternoon in a museum is better than spending it in a public-house. As an abstract proposition this is one which nobody will call in question, however strongly defined his Sabbatarian proclivities; but the particular proposition submitted to the House of Lords on the 20th of March, was to open the Natural History Museum at South Kensington, on Sundays, from 2 to 6 in the afternoon. Now, the London public-houses are closed from 3 to 6; therefore, except for the small space of one hour, there could be no competition between the Museum and the public-house, and the working-man, now debarred from going to the Museum, could not go to the public-house; so, how an open Museum is to draw away customers from a closed public-house is not at all clear. Naturally the Sunday Museum party have never tried to meet (they *cannot* meet) this flaw in their argument, which applies virtually to all England, and not alone to South Kensington. A curious and important result flows from these facts: whilst the law remains as it is as regards public-house hours just when the museums would be emptying preparatory to closing at 6 o'clock so the public-houses would be opening preparatory to filling. Thus well-meaning people, who know nothing of the practical details of the controversy to which they lend their names, are actually helping to bring about that which many of them loudly deprecate—a development of the Sunday drink traffic. No wonder that publicans do not profess any fear that they will suffer from the competition of Sunday museums. No wonder that the publicans in streets adjacent to the Regent's Park subscribe to the Regent's Park band.

Another matter of detail most carefully kept in the background by the advocates of Sunday museums, etc., is the question of the additional work which will be put on the officials in charge of the museums, etc., It is glibly asserted that a mere dozen or two of men will be made to work on Sundays, whilst thousands will derive pleasure and profit from the labour of those dozens. Letting alone the fact that we have no moral right to deprive even a dozen men of their birthright as Englishmen, even for the benefit, if so it be, of thousands (that benefit being secular, not religious), I desire to point out that this argument totally ignores and carefully conceals a difficulty of enormous intrinsic importance. South Kensington is, it is

public men, industry and singleness of purpose, fortified by strong religious principle. I heard him in the House of Lords, on March 20th, speak as Lord Shaftesbury's substitute in taking the lead in opposing Lord Thurlow's motion as to Sunday museums, and noticed that he spoke with less than his customary physical vigour, albeit there was no falling-off in his array of closely reasoned arguments.

well known, an aristocratic quarter of London, occupied almost exclusively by rich people living in large houses. Now it is professed that the opening of the Museum there is advocated in the interests of the working-classes. Yet, the proposal submitted to the House of Lords in 1885 was the seemingly modest, at the same time obviously irrational one, of opening a museum for working-men in a locality where there are no working-men. What does that practically mean? It means, if the opening is to be a success from the promoters' point of view, that thousands of people are to be conveyed every Sunday to South Kensington from the poorer parts of East and South London, by railways, tramcars, omnibuses, steamboats, or cabs. And what does *this* mean? That thousands of men and boys belonging to the passenger conveyance companies of the metropolis, deprived even now of nearly the whole of almost every Sunday during the summer months, are to be still further harassed and overworked in order that the imaginary working-man who loves pictures, but who lives at Bethnal Green or Lambeth, may be conveyed to the West End, to see that which he has not given the slightest real proof that he wishes to see.

If anybody doubts whether the London railway, omnibus, and tramcar men are overworked to a degree which reflects no credit on the Peers and Members of Parliament who, with others, are the directors of these companies, let him ask the next London General Omnibus Company's conductor, or Metropolitan Railway guard he meets, how many hours he was on duty last Sunday and the Sunday before. If the querist does not get an answer which will startle him I shall be much surprised.

I have used advisedly, in a preceding paragraph, words which cast doubt on the reality of the assertion that the working-classes of London, or indeed of our large towns at all, or any working-men anywhere, appreciate the aims of those agitators, titled and untitled, who are professing to labour on their behalf. All the available evidence goes distinctly to show that the working-classes of this country are more than indifferent—that they are hostile to the opening of museums, etc., on Sundays.

And moreover, the evidence to show this is singularly varied in character. It will not be questioned that the House of Commons represents the people, and the lower classes of the people, more than it does the upper classes. Now, what do we find to have been the votes in the House of Commons on the Sunday Opening of Museums? So utterly hopeless have been the chances of the movement in the House of Commons that of late years the attempts made to obtain the judgment of that House have been very few: the latest was in

May, 1882, when the Opening party mustered but 83 votes; 208 votes being recorded on the other side. The previous division took place in 1877, when in a House of a totally different political complexion the Opening party secured only 87 votes. These comparisons justify the statement that the political bearings of the question do not much affect Members of Parliament, and that an overwhelming majority of the representatives of the people are now, as they have been at any time during the last thirty years, dead against the Sunday opening of the national museums.[1]

Turning to the petitions to Parliament, which are a useful index of public opinion, the same tale is told, as will be seen by the following statement, which applies to the House of Commons from 1872 to August, 1882:

	Petitions.	Signatures.
Against the Sunday opening of museums ...	3,886 ...	524,028
For the Sunday opening of museums ...	158 ...	79,969
Majority against Sunday opening ...	3,728 ...	444,059

The petitions to the House of Lords disclose results even more striking. From 1881 to 1883 the Lords' petitions were as follows:

	Petitions.	Signatures.
Against the Sunday opening of museums ...	783 ...	161,000
For the Sunday opening of museums ...	12 ...	528
Majority against Sunday opening ...	771 ...	160,472

Turning from the records of Parliament to the information as to the opinions of the working-classes obtainable through the Trades Unions, Friendly Societies, and other working-class organizations of England, the results are, if possible, still more remarkable. When the subject was under discussion in the House of Commons in 1882, Mr. Broadhurst, the well-known Trades Unionist M.P., spoke out very strongly against the Sunday opening of museums. He was called to account sharply for his speech, and his title to act as the mouthpiece of the Trades Unions on this question was challenged by the various societies formed to promote Sunday Opening. In order to bring the controversy to a clear issue, the Working Men's

[1] I will here meet the retort, certain to be made, that in the House of Commons the nett majority against the Sunday opening of museums has recently been less than it was some years ago. For instance, in 1855, when the subject was discussed for the first time in that assembly, a motion to open museums was rejected by 245 to 57, showing a nett majority of 188, whereas in 1882 the nett majority was only 125. The answer to this simply is that when a cause is known to be hopeless, its opponents are more likely to be absent than its supporters. A party of attack is always more active than a party of defence. Witness the Church Disestablishment controversy.

Lord's Day Rest Association in February, 1883, made a direct appeal to the working-class organizations on this question; the result was that the managers of 2,412 societies, with 501,705 members, signed officially, on behalf of their societies, copies of a printed form approving of the amendment moved in the House of Commons by Mr. Broadhurst on the occasion in question against increasing Sunday labour by opening the national museums and picture-galleries on Sunday. Some 210 of those organizations belonged to the metropolis. On the other side, it appeared that only 62 London organizations, said to have 45,482 members, condemned Mr. Broadhurst's action.[1] Besides these, the officers of 116 societies, having 175,403 members, signed the form in their individual capacity, the rules of their societies not admitting of a corporate expression of opinion on political subjects.

Next after Parliament and the Trades Unions the Town Councils of the municipal boroughs of England may be ranked as the most completely representative bodies in England, chosen, as they are, by household suffrage on the broadest basis know to the constitution. Of these it has been calculated that 150 possess museums, picture-galleries, or libraries which would be suitable for opening on Sundays if their managers thought proper to do so. It appears that 4 only of the 150 local authorities open their institutions on Sundays, and that several (Chester, Maidstone, and Worcester) having once done so, have reversed their policy. The decision of Swansea had reference to a band in a park. This was sanctioned in June, 1884, but the vote was reversed in July by 13 against 8. Nottingham, however, presents the most remarkable illustration of our case. Nottingham is a municipal borough with a population of over 205,000. The question was first mooted in 1879, when the Sunday Opening party were only defeated by 3 votes, the numbers being 28 against, 25 for. Emboldened by this near approach to a victory, the party brought on another vote in 1880; on this occasion it was found that they had lost ground, for they were beaten by 32 to 24. The immediate result of the agitation was a special effort on the part of the friends of the Lord's Day to fight the question out at the municipal elections of November, 1881. So successful were they in returning candidates pledged against Sunday Opening, that when a third vote was taken in December, 1881, the Sunday Opening party were beaten by 26, the

[1] The names of all these societies, with the number of their members, etc., have been published in a shilling pamphlet by the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association, and forms the most important proof in existence of the opinions of the working-men on this subject. See also an article by C. Hill in the *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1884.

numbers being 8 for and 34 against. The Nottingham struggle supplies valuable matter for reflection and encouragement in two respects: it shows the feelings of the operative classes, Nottingham being chiefly a working-man's constituency; and secondly, it shows what may be done by the friends of the Lord's Day if they will only stick to their colours and patiently organize their forces.

It would not be difficult further to multiply proofs that the demand for Sunday museums comes from mere fractions of the community, largely recruited from the ranks of non-Christian men of science, who personally can have no practical knowledge of the working-men of England, whose mouthpieces they claim to be. For instance, at a conference of librarians held at Edinburgh in October, 1880, a proposal in favour of the Sunday opening of free public libraries was discussed and rejected by 38 votes against 8. This decision, arrived at as it was by men occupying the highest position in the management of existing public libraries, men who must be taken to know perfectly well the wants and tastes of the classes who frequent their institutions on week-days, is highly significant in every sense. Moreover, it may be taken to show that these officials are grateful for the Day of Rest, and are not likely to wish to be deprived of it.

What have we on the other side of the question? The experience of a very small number of museums, picture-galleries, and libraries opened on Sundays at Manchester, Birmingham, Wigan, and one or two other places. And what is this experience? That for the museums scarcely anybody cares; and that the libraries are chiefly appreciated for the newspapers, and are largely frequented by mere loungers, who, when they read anything, are girls and lads reading novels. The Birmingham picture-galleries seem to come nearest to a "success" from an attendance point of view, and even as to them the statistics yield figures relatively insignificant when one considers that the population of Birmingham is about half a million.

In order to render this review of the *pros* and *cons* of this important controversy as general, and as methodical in form, as possible, I have up to this point left entirely out of consideration the personality of the leaders on either side. It is, however, a fact that of our public men who have studied the controversy, and have made themselves familiar with its bearings, whether political, social, religious, or medical, an overwhelming preponderance of numbers and of weight will be found ranged on the side of keeping the national museums closed. I am quite prepared to admit that the preponderance of numbers is less marked than that of weight, and the reasons for this will readily appear. Those who have declared against

opening (I am speaking, of course, here of the upper, educated, and intellectual classes) are those mainly who have investigated the subject in all its bearings; on the other hand, it is an undoubted fact that a very large proportion (I feel almost inclined to say a majority) of the upper classes who have gone in for Sunday opening have given their adhesion to the movement *without having studied it thoroughly*, and have allowed themselves to be captivated by the plausible, sentimental idea, "how much better for the working-man that he should have the opportunity on Sunday afternoons of gazing at works of art than at rows of gin-bottles." This is no mere picture of fancy, but the actual result of numerous conversations which I have had during the last five years with Members of both Houses of Parliament, and with educated and independent people moving in good society. If any of my readers have doubts as to this, let them discuss the matter themselves on the first possible occasion with a few of the Peers and Members of Parliament who have voted for Sunday opening, and with some of the ladies and gentlemen eminent in science and art whose names appear amongst the subscribers to the so-called "Sunday Society."

This however, is a digression, and I wish to bring this paper to a close by giving a few citations from eminent men who understand what is involved in this controversy far better than sentimentalists like Lord Thurlow, or doctrinaire philosophers like Professors Tyndall and Huxley, *et id genus omne.*

Lord Beaconsfield, who twice voted in the House of Lords against Sunday museums, having I believe previously done the same thing in the Commons, said on May 5, 1879:—"Of all Divine institutions, the most Divine is that which secures a day of rest for man. I hold it to be the most valuable blessing ever conceded to man. It is the corner-stone of civilization, and its removal might even affect the health of the people. . . . . It [the opening of museums on Sundays] is a great change, and those who suppose for a moment that it could be limited to the proposal of the noble Baron [Thurlow] to open Museums will find they are mistaken."

Mr. Gladstone has always voted against the Sunday opening of museums. In reply to a deputation in March, 1869, he said:—"The religious observance of Sunday is a main prop of the religious character of the country. . . . From a moral, social, and physical point of view, the observance of Sunday is a duty of absolute consequence." Mr. Gladstone has repeated these sentiments on subsequent occasions. In a letter to Mr. C. Hill, dated January 13, 1876, he said:—"I have myself, in the course of a laborious life signally experienced both its mental and physical benefits."

Mr. W. H. Smith, M.P., whose connection with the newspaper trade renders his opinion on such a subject of special value, said in the House of Commons, on June 8, 1877, in opposing the Sunday opening of museums:—"Taking the proposition as it stood, it involved very much more than stood on the paper of the House. He himself attached enormous value to the day of rest which had been preserved for many centuries. Whether working-men desired to go to church or not on Sunday was not the question. The question was whether they should have the day of rest preserved to them, which the practice of this country had established."

Citations of this kind might be presented *ad infinitum*. What is there on the other side? Absolutely nothing beyond a few sneers at the "Puritanical" character of the English Sunday, interspersed with silly platitudes about "freedom" for the working-man; which, by the way, if it means freedom for one class, means, as a matter of necessity, the loss of freedom and Sunday rest for a good many other classes.

Amidst all the excitement of controversy, it must never be forgotten that the advocates of Sunday museums are generally very eager to tell us that to introduce into England the "Continental Sunday," with all its toil and slavery, is the last thing they desire. Whilst willing to give them every credit for disclaimers of this kind, I cannot but suspect that they themselves often feel they are standing on slippery ground, and that if the seemingly restricted changes which they desire in the way of a "harmless" visit to a museum or a band are carried out, other organic changes must inevitably follow. Indeed, the impossibility of drawing a line between a band out-of-doors and a theatre in-doors, constitutes one of the most serious secondary dangers involved in Lord Thurlow's proposals. On the Continent, indeed, no pretence is made of drawing the line; and if it were drawn in England, it clearly could not be long maintained. Or, as the *Times* very well said on June 9, 1877:—"We should make a complete breach in the defences which now protect the Sunday as a day of rest, and should have definitely abandoned our general rule. Once throw open by resolution of the House of Commons, all national museums and picture galleries on Sundays, and it is hard to see what institutions, public or private, we could insist on closing." These are weighty and wise words. May they sink down deeply into the hearts of our legislators, and of the various well-meaning philanthropists now grievously led astray by sentiment and want of knowledge!

G. F. CHAMBERS, F.R.A.S.

Art. II.—THE NATURAL THEOLOGY OF SIR ISAAC NEWTON.

THE splendour of Sir Isaac Newton's genius is, we suppose, beyond dispute. When every allowance has been made for the decisive researches of Galileo and Kepler, as well as for the trembling guesses of Wren, of Halley, and of Hooke, Newton still stands out as the chosen instrument through whom it pleased Almighty God to publish to the world the chief principles on which the physical machinery of the universe is built. Of the book on "Optics" the main theory, it is true, has been abandoned since the days of Young, and was never without opponents even while Newton lived. Yet the book itself abides—the treasure-house of a noble store of facts of the highest interest to all who make the nature of light and colour the special subject of their study. Possessed, moreover, of a geometrical sagacity superior by far to that of his great predecessor, and in some respects rival, Descartes, Newton was at the same time completely free from the rashness which led the latter to renounce the painful methods of experience and to construct a world from those unproved assumptions which developed later into the pantheism of Spinoza. To a happiness of conjecture which almost seemed to fit him for the anticipation, as Bacon terms it, rather than the interpretation of nature, he joined a laborious patience in experiment which was not unworthy of Kepler. Deeply was he convinced that supposition was of value in science only so far as it ministered to proof, and that no theory could be maintained as true which was not the fruit of an induction as exhaustive as the case permitted. His mind, alike by nature and by training, was hence pre-eminently fitted for the discussion of great subjects with perfect freedom from prejudice and the calmest sobriety of judgment. As long, therefore, as any weight is given to authority as a guide to truth, it is neither possible nor right to overlook what we may term the natural theology of Isaac Newton. Judging merely by the prodigious results which it achieved in physical and mathematical science, the religious conclusions of such an intellect as his would be worth, at least, that passing notice to which we hope to draw our readers in this paper.

1. That, then, which strikes us first in this inquiry is the close relation which seemed to Newton to subsist between theology and science, or at least between the knowledge of the Creator and the study of His works. The error, indeed, of hampering science with theology, or of marring theology by science, he would no doubt have recognised as clearly as Bacon had already done before him. Though he constantly appeals

to that argument from design, which Bacon sometimes wittily depreciates, he would never have allowed its practical application to stand in the way of scientific research, or to hinder a further acquaintance with those facts of the outward world with which physical science is concerned. Yet, on the other hand, he not only assigns, as Bacon does, its special place to theology, but he holds that the fear of God, as an active principle of human life, is bound up closely with the advance of physical knowledge. Thus, in the last of the Queries attached to the treatise on "Optics," he not merely unfolds what seemed to him to be the nature of the relation in which the Creator stands to His works, but the whole book closes with the statement of his opinion that increased knowledge of God's works must bring with it of necessity an increased reverence for their Author's majesty and will. So, in the first of his "Letters to Bentley," who was himself an ardent and sometimes, like Jackson of Leicester, even a fierce defender of some points of the Newtonian theology, he declares that even while he was engaged on his immortal "Principia," he had an eye to such principles as should be of use in proving the existence and attributes of God. Accordingly, in the glorious Scholium, which was added to the second edition of this stupendous work, he rises without effort, and almost by way of necessary consequence, to the statement of the great conclusions he had reached upon this subject. The light, in fact, in which the works of God are presented to us in Scripture, is exactly the light in which they are regarded by Newton.

Newton, however, goes far beyond this. In the course of those parts of his writings to which we have referred,[1] he takes occasion to suggest such lines of thought as seemed to carry with them the convincing evidence, if not of the existence, yet at least of the Supreme Creator's power and wisdom, as well as of the freedom of His will. Yet, though in one passage he even sketches out a view of the way in which he

[1] All the passages in Newton's works, to which in this article reference is made, are to be found in the "Principia" (def. 3, and schol. ad def. 8; lib. i., prop. 64; lib. iii. schol. gen.), in the "Optics" (adv. 2 and queries 18, 19, 21, 22, 28, and 31), in the "Letter to Boyle," and in the "Four Letters to Bentley." Add the striking letter to Dr. T. Burnet given in Brewster's "Life of Newton" (vol. ii., App. No. 6), where he lays down distinctly that the optical is the true principle on which to interpret the record of Creation and other similar passages of Scripture. In Rigaud's "Historical Essay," Playfair's "Dissertation" (Works, vol. ii.), and in Brewster's "Life of Newton" will be found ample information on the historical relations of Newton's discoveries, while on their metaphysical aspects there are many profound remarks in Whewell's "Philosophy of Discovery" and in his "History of Scientific Ideas." Sir J. Herschel ("Discourse," § 301) has paid a splendid tribute to the transcendent intellectual greatness of Newton.

thought that God had formed material substances, he would doubtless have been ready to grant, had he been pressed, that he assumed, here at least, one point which could only be proved by Scripture. As the existence of God is from the first assumed in Scripture, and indeed in some of those uninspired reasonings which profess, apart from Scripture, to demonstrate His attributes and His being, so certainly the fact of the creation of matter is assumed by Newton, and not proved. That which here is really due to Newton is not a proof of its creation, but the revival of that view of its atomic constitution which, while it seems to underlie the Daltonian law of definite proportions in modern chemistry, was substantially the view of many of the ancient Greek philosophers. In their hands too, at first, as in the hands of Newton, it was bound up, as Cudworth argues, with a real theistic belief, though later on, in the hands of Democritus and Epicurus, it became the instrument of the atheism which the genius of Lucretius has so brilliantly adorned. A proof, in truth, of the creation of matter it is beyond the power of human reason to devise. The mind even of Newton, or of Leibnitz, is unequal to the task. One reason is, that the act of creation out of nothing is precisely one of those forms of the Divine working to which we know nothing really similar in our own experience. It is a truth, therefore, for which we are wholly indebted to revelation, and hence it is not only the first which the Word of God reveals, but our knowledge of it is declared expressly to be a knowledge which depends on faith. On the other hand, though the eternity of matter could never be disproved by human reason only, it is but right to add that its existence also is not only, as Berkeley saw, incapable of formal proof, but (as it is vulgarly conceived at any rate) is actually needless, in the view of Boscovich and his followers, to explain the phenomena of the world. It would be wrong, too, to ignore the forceful arguments which were used by the Newtonians of the last century —by Clarke, for instance, and by Baxter—to show, as they term, its merely contingent character. As soon as the Newtonian system had made its way, with its doctrines of the inertia of matter, the order of its dispositions, and the relatively insignificant proportion that all of it together bore to the boundless vastness of what seemed mere empty space, it was easy to see that belief in its contingent and thus created nature was at least more consonant to reason than the belief in its eternal self-subsistence. Yet even here the argument was hard to grasp. It was wholly unfitted to convince the mass of men who, but for the decisive teachings of Scripture, are just as prone as the philosophers to identify the workings of matter and spirit, or at least to confuse them so

inextricably together as to render distinct conception of their respective characters impossible.

2. But however this may be, the discoveries of Newton have recognised as fixed one point with respect to matter which is fraught with consequences of the highest value to natural theology. This is the reality of that property which Kepler termed its *vis inertiæ*, and on which, as on a base, the Newtonian physics are securely built. Apart, therefore, from all metaphysical arguments as to the precise nature of matter in itself, it may be held as certain that wherever matter is, there will be found the property in question. Matter without this *vis inertiæ* would not in fact be matter, either in the popular conceptions of everyday life or in the formal reasonings of men of science. At first sight, the mere statement of this property enforces the conclusion that matter has not within itself the power to change its state of motion or of rest. But this conclusion does not exhaust the subject, or go to the depth of the strangeness of the property in question. The full truth is, that in every particle of matter a force resides which *constantly resists* each effort to move it from its state of rest or motion—resists, moreover, in proportion to the force applied. Insignificant, that is, as the particle is, it is capable of an indefinite resistance notwithstanding. Apart from this, moreover, matter would be of no use for the purposes which it serves at present. The earth would in that case yield under the pressure of the footsteps of a child; the strongest buildings would be ruined by a breath. Strip again from the matter of the earth and planets its resistance to a change of state, and not merely would no force but the slightest be needed to draw them round the sun, but round the sun they could never be drawn at all. Into it by the shortest route they would soon speedily fall. The tangential impulse, if such it really was, by virtue of which the planets were launched upon their orbits, could not for a moment hold out against the attracting influence of the sun. The sun himself, if made of unresisting matter, might be stayed on his course by the resisting finger of a child. Though, therefore, it may be true that motion is in our experience the constant accompaniment, yet it can never with propriety be described as an inseparable attribute of matter. Matter may not merely be conceived to be devoid of motion, without a contradiction in thought, but thus devoid of motion, or at least of self-moving power, in itself and by its very nature it actually seems to be.

Taken by itself, therefore, matter can have no other share in the formation of the world than that which its passivity admits. The atoms of Epicurus, as their patron clearly saw, could of themselves effect nothing. Concourse of atoms there could be none, unless some further principle were introduced not merely

to set these atoms in motion, but to cause them to come into contact with each other. In fact, wherever (save perhaps in one connection) matter is found in motion, there of necessity must be implied upon it the action, direct or indirect, of a something which is not matter, of an immaterial entity—call it for the moment force or spirit. It matters not so far whether we study the stupendous motions of the planets or the hardly discernible changes of a microscopic organism. The argument is still the same. Matter cannot change its state unaided, and in its every change it postulates a force outside itself. In the case, moreover, of such a motion as that of gravitation, the force must needs be ceaselessly and from moment to moment applied. Actually, in any case, as far as our experience goes, this matter-moving entity is everywhere; for, as the modern view of correlation seems to teach, all forces physical may be resolved with more or less distinctness into modes of motion. With the material universe, therefore, this moving principle is coextensive—distinct from, yet embracing the wills of the human and the impulses of the animal creation. But the Christian speculator, with Newton, may go further. This immaterial entity is more than omnipresent. It reveals itself in all its forms as everywhere endowed with the signs of will, intelligence, and power. Even within the limits of the single science of astronomy Newton, as we shall see, has found abundant evidence of this. Nay, of the very atoms which make up the substrate of material things, Herschel and Clark-Maxwell have said that they bear upon themselves the marks of manufacture, that is, of a designing mind.

So far, therefore, as His merely physical attributes are concerned, the Christian conception of God seems to be easily reached—almost, in fact, demonstrably—to all, at least, save those who, to the contradiction of one of the first and most irrepressible principles of their nature, reject the argument from final causes altogether. An immaterial and all-pervading entity, give it what name you will, which is endowed with will and boundless power and wisdom, is at any rate but little distinguishable, His spiritual attributes excepted, from that Divine Creator and Preserver of the world whom the Christian's Scriptures disclose. All who would do justice to this argument should study closely the elaborate reasonings of Andrew Baxter in his Enquiry into the nature of the human soul. No one will then wonder that such a masterpiece of rigid argument should have challenged in our own century the all-but-undeviating discipleship of Robert Hall, and in the last the still more valuable commendation of Warburton.[1]

[1] See Warburton, "Divine Legation," book iii., § 4; book ix., note A; and for Hall's opinion, the Memoir added to his Works (vol. vi.). Baxter

It is true, indeed, that the disciples of Boscovich view what we term matter from a standpoint very different to that which Newton occupied, and seem to reach on physical grounds conclusions almost as far removed from his as those of Bishop Berkeley. In the case, moreover, of Newtonians, their master's conception of matter has in modern times been doubtless altered much. This does not, however, alter greatly the bearing of the argument. Inertia is clearly one of the characters by which the presence of matter is made known to us. What this is in itself, as it is known to God, is after all a question of but slight importance. To us it is an ultimate fact beyond which we cannot go. If, therefore, matter in its essence should prove to be a something wholly different from that which the disciples of either Newton or Boscovich suppose, the fact which is represented by the term inertia would still remain exactly where it was. The terms in which our knowledge is expressed might perhaps require to be altered, but the relation which these terms express would undergo no change. Light is still light whether we explain it by the corpuscular theory of Newton or the undulatory theory of Young. So, whatever be the intrinsic essence of matter, the consequences of its inertia abide the same.[1]

3. At first sight, notwithstanding, the light in which we have regarded matter may seem to be opposed to that great law of gravitation which Newton was himself the first to prove. By virtue of this it is that every particle of matter in the universe attracts every other particle with a force directly proportioned to the mass of the attracting particle and inversely to the square of the distance between them. Hence it is that a stone thrown into the air falls back again to the ground; that the moon is retained in her path around the earth; that the planets roll ceaselessly around the sun; that the sun himself, it may be, revolves around some other sun. By one splendid generaliza-

is certainly one of the most remarkable of the physico-theological writers who in the last century grew up under the shadow of Newton. His "Cosmotheoria," as well as the "Appendix to the Enquiry" in answer to Maclaurin, are well worth study. So also, in spite of the fierceness of his tone, are the last three of Bentley's "Boyle Lectures," which were composed almost under Newton's eye—being, in fact, the occasion, at Bentley's own request, of Newton's famous "Letters." Cheyne, Colliber, and Jackson of Leicester are almost forgotten. But besides his own remarks, Bishop Law has given many extracts from these and other contemporary writers in his Notes to the first chapter of Archbishop King's "Essay on the Origin of Evil."

[1] See Newton, "Principia," def. 3; Boscovich, "Theoria Nat. Phil., p. iii., §§ 382, 516. Cf. Whewell, "History of Scientific Ideas," p. 1, book iii., chap. v.; "The Unseen Universe," §§ 131-136. "Pro materia mihi," says Boscovich, "sunt puncta indivisibilia, in extensa, *prædita vi inertiæ*" (§ 516).

tion it was thus given to Newton to include under a common principle the superbest motions of the planets and the commonest appearances upon the earth. That this law extended throughout the whole of the solar system, and ruled the motions of the comets as well as those of the planets and their satellites, Newton himself was able to show; that it further extends to the motions of the fixed stars also is one of the great results which the astronomers of the present century have wrought out. The rigid proof of this has been indeed as yet presented for only a certain number of the stars, yet no one doubts the literal universality of the law. The negative instances, which could alone cast a doubt upon the point, are not as yet forthcoming, nor is it likely that any such exist. Here, therefore, is found a principle of motion connected so uniformly and so strangely with matter as almost to justify its claim to the title of an inseparable property—if not as essential to our conception of matter, yet universal in our experience of its nature. This was the view of Cotes,[1] the profound mathematician under whose superintendence the second edition of the "Principia" was brought out, and whose early death was so deeply deplored by Newton. Such a position, however, does not seem to be tenable. View gravitation as a principle of attraction on the part of one particle towards another, and there is then no place for this conclusion. The inertia of the particles in question is overcome indeed; but that which is under this term assigned to matter is no longer a self-moving power from within, but a controlling influence from without. View it again as a tendency to motion implanted in the separate particles, and then it is irreconcilable with the inertia which we have already considered.

Clearly the co-existence of a tendency to resist and a tendency to effect a change of state in one and the same subject, is contradictory in reason and practically impossible. If the opposing tendencies are equally balanced, the result would be as though they neither of them existed. If the tendency to change were in excess, that of inertia would be overcome, so that its existence could never be known. If that of inertia were the stronger, as it clearly is, then the tendency to change is to our apprehension as though it existed not. As an inherent tendency to motion, therefore, gravity cannot be an essential attribute of

---

Whewell and continental writers have assigned to Cotes the view which is combated in the text. If, however, Mr. Edleston's interpretation is right, Cotes has denied that this was the meaning he intended to convey in the well-known sentences of his Preface to the "Principia." See the curious letter to Dr. Clarke—No. 83 in the "Correspondence between Newton and Cotes," edited by M. Edleston in 1850. For the rest see Brewster's "Life of Newton," vol. i., app. No. 10.

matter. Newton, accordingly, while he accepts the law of gravitation as a fact, guards himself repeatedly against the supposition that he looked on gravity as an essential attribute of matter. So strongly, in fact, was his own judgment set against the view, that in a letter to Boyle, as well as in his "Optics," he hazards what he terms a conjecture on the physical cause of gravity. Vague as the conjecture is, and utterly unable to stand against the remorseless criticisms of Baxter in the last century, or the briefer dissent of Playfair, for instance, in the present, its very nature shows how eager Newton was to seek outside of matter for the cause of that phenomenon whose law he had himself discovered. The conjecture itself, however, of an ethereal medium which pervaded all space and penetrated all bodies was for this purpose of no scientific or philosophic value. It assumed the reality of an ether, of the very existence of which, in the special form which Newton's theory required, we have no proof whatever. In the last century, therefore, this and other objections convinced S'Gravesande, the Dutch exponent of the Newtonian physics, as well as Baxter and Clarke in England, that a mechanical cause of gravity was not to be ascertained by any of the principles which were known to philosophy then. The present century has on this point been as fruitless as its predecessor. So far as appears as yet, there is no reason to give up the conclusion once at least suggested by Newton and so powerfully vindicated by Baxter, that in the force of gravitation we are brought face to face with the immediate hand of God. It is but reasonable, says Sir J. Herschel, to regard the force as the direct or indirect result of a consciousness and a will exerted somewhere, though beyond our power to trace. Efficiently, of course, and in the last result, on any view but that of atheism, God must be the Author at once and the Effectuator of the law. The First Cause, as Newton says, is certainly not mechanical. The only room for question is whether here, as elsewhere, He acts through instruments, or whether we have reached the point where He acts directly and apart from any mediate intervention. To this the only answer is, that in spite of many efforts and assumptions, no mediate instrument adequate to explain the effect has as yet been brought to light and clearly proved.[1]

True, indeed, it is that of the existence of an infinitely light

[1] See, besides the brief statements in "The Unseen Universe" (§ 141), a most instructive article in the *Edinburgh Review* (No. XXV., art. 7), based on the late Professor Vince's pamphlet on "Gravitation." The reviewer, while admitting the physical objections to Newton's conjecture, considers that he has fully shown its merely mathematical possibility. The theories of Descartes and Bernoulli are easily set aside. Against all forms of fluid pressure Boscovich objects the resistance which must

resisting medium in the inter-planetary spaces we have some proof in the increasing diminution of the period of Encke's comet. True it is, also, that the wave-theory of light assumes as its condition the existence of an ether filling all that realm of space that parts us from the farthest of the fixed stars. But this gives us little or no aid. Light is indeed propagated under that same law of the inverse square which governs the force of gravitation; but light is propagated outwardly from its material centres, while gravitation, as we have seen, draws inwards from without the particles on which it acts. Whether, therefore, the luminiferous ether and the inter-planetary medium be one and the same substance or not, it is hard to see how either of them could become even the mechanical instrument of gravitation. But should they be so regarded, it would do no more than remove that difficulty of conceiving how matter could act on matter apart from any intervening means, which weighed on Newton's mind so heavily that he was glad to use the aid of that infinitely subtle ether of which he speaks continually, in spite of his resolute rejection of it to explain the phenomena of light. Real, however, as is Newton's difficulty, the solution involved in a material medium brings no relief to the minds of Boscovich or Playfair or the younger Herschel.

Meantime, it is well worthy of remark, that though we are ignorant of the mechanical cause of gravitation, if such there be, yet the law itself is stamped with the traces of design and the marks of an arbitrary arrangement. No one can well maintain that the law of gravitation, as we find it, is necessary (unless, indeed, the force were of the nature of an emanation) on the ground that any other law involves a contradiction to any of those other physical conceptions which we regard as proved; nor will anyone doubt that other laws of attractive influence might easily in fact have found a place. Gravity, that is, might have been found as now in constant connection with matter, and yet the law by which it acts might have been very different from the present. Thus the force might have acted directly as the distance simply, or inversely as the distance simply, or in a great many other ways—so far, that is, as a mere abstract possibility is concerned. Of some, indeed, of these the possibilities have been actually discussed, and of one

result to the onward motion of the impelled planet or comet ("Theoria," p. iii., § 400). In the theory of Le Sage, which received the countenance of Prevost, and to which the authors of "The Unseen Universe" seem to incline, assumptions are required which are destitute of any proof; and not the least—that to which Boscovich objects—the seemingly prodigious waste of matter. Cf. Herschel's "Astronomy" (chap. viii., §§ 438-440), as well as his important Essay on the Origin of Force (§ 8, "Popular Lectures," No. 12). In the latter passage he pronounces as strongly against the supposition of Le Sage as against that of Newton.

at least Newton himself has shewn the consequences. Upon the whole, however, it results, so far as we know, that while many are wholly inadmissible, none of these laws of central force would subserve completely all the purposes of order and of use which are found under the present arrangement. The mere stability of the system, it is true, would be secured as effectually as it is at present under one or it may be more of the possible alternatives. Other advantages, however, which are nearly as essential as the stability of the system would not be gained under any other law than that which actually rules. Taking, therefore, the fact of the abstract possibility of many other laws of central force with the provable advantages resulting from the present law, and in some respects peculiar to it, we are surely justified in finding, in the form which the law has taken, the evidence of a designing mind as clearly as the force itself infers the constant presence of an immaterial power. Newton himself, we are persuaded, would have argued thus, and would have mentioned this as an evidence of design in his correspondence with Bentley, had he been fully aware of the advantages which the present law of the inverse square possesses over other laws under which an attractive force might have been guided.[1]

4. It is time, however, to leave this, and to come to some further questions on which Newton has left for us the decided expression of his opinion. Assume for a moment not merely that motion is inherent in all matter from its very nature, but that even the special form it takes in gravitation is strictly necessary and therefore inherent also! Even with these concessions the atheist's cause is not greatly the gainer. The existence even then of the solar system as it is, and by consequence of the stellar systems also, would still call for explanation. Matter and motion only may be shown to be unequal on physical grounds to the task of constructing even by the happiest accident the orderly worlds with which we are familiar; or, if in these days we may not say as much as this, at least in Newton's judgment the suggested means are unequal to the effect. Briefly he has touched in the course of his "Letters to

[1] See on this point. and on the evidences of design presented generally by the solar system, Paley's "Natural Theology," chap. xxii.. as well as the whole of the most important second book of Whewell's Bridgewater Treatise on "Astronomy and General Physics." For other possible arrangements for the perpetuity of the solar system with or without the existing law of gravitation, see Sir J. Herschel's "Collected Essays," No. 2. Boscovich is as eager as Newton to demonstrate, on the grounds of his theory, the need of the wisdom, power, and will of God. See "Theoria," App. de Anima et Deo, §§ 550-557. Cf. Herschel, "On the Origin of Force" (§ 12).

Bentley" on some of the possibilities which the atheism of his own and ancient days contemplated, and has recorded his opinion upon each. The problem to be solved is the origin of the solar and other similar systems. The elements which the atheist gives us are space finite or infinite, according to the speculator's choice, matter in clearly limited quantity and motion inherent in it, in the form of gravitation at least. Putting aside the eternity of the system exactly as we now know it, the other alternatives which spring from the possible combinations of these elements may be reduced to three. Matter, in the first place, may be supposed to have been evenly distributed over space whether this be finite or infinite, so that afterwards, by the power of gravity, it became condensed into the solar and planetary globes. But the very supposition of this original state contradicts in Newton's view one of the elements upon which it is based. If gravity be inherent in it, matter never could have been thus evenly disposed without the exertion of the Divine arm to keep in equipoise the assumed tendency to motion of all its particles; and, if such equipoise were once adjusted, the resulting state must stay unchanged for ever until the Divine arm again dissolved it by the liberation of the inherent element of motion. An uneven distribution, therefore, is all that remains, and this in a space finite or infinite. If the space be finite, all the particles of matter would be drawn at length together to form one single mass—a state, that is, to which the solar system has not as yet and cannot ever come. If, then, the space be infinite, the formation of systems of suns, planets, and comets, which might in some respects be like our own, seems to be a barely possible, however improbable, result. Even then, however, certain peculiarities of our system remain which cannot be explained on the principles assumed or on the assumption of any merely mechanical causes. Intelligence and power and will combined, in other words God, is the indispensable requirement to the rational explanation of the facts.

This leads us straight to the consideration of that system with which we are and for ever must be far more closely acquainted than with any others that fill the boundless realms of space. At any rate, in its present form its literal eternity is impossible. With regard to the earth, geology decidedly teaches this. Though it may not be able to point out exactly what was the earth's primeval state, yet it can show distinctly, and with some real approach to chronological order, that successive changes of vast importance have already taken place upon its surface, that others are even now in progress, and that, as ages roll on, yet others will probably follow. These flow, moreover, in the main, from the regular action of constant forces

which are bound up with the very structure of the earth and that relation to the sun in which it has for ages stood. This, therefore, disproves at once that the present order on the earth either has been in the past, or will be in the future, eternal. So again, if the question be argued on merely physical grounds, there are reasons which similarly disprove the literal eternity in the past or in the future of the other elements of the solar system in their present shape. In fact, the desire in ancient times to construct the universe out of the principles of matter and motion only, and the desire at present to accept in some form or other the nebular theory of La Place, proceed equally on the assumption that there has been a time when the facts of the physical world were different from what they now are.

When we go further and inquire whence these changes came, Newton points to several facts which seem to him to prove the presence of thought and power and will acting on elements in themselves unable to effect the results in question. (1) As things are, the sun, which is not merely the mightiest power of the system but its all-but-single source of light and heat, is found in that central position which enables him to act to the greatest advantage for the benefit of all the bodies which revolve around him. Even if it be true that Jupiter and Saturn are in themselves to some extent, as well as by reflection, light-givers to their attendant moons, the force of this argument is not much changed. The same appearance of design, which is suggested by the position and office of the sun combined, is suggested with almost equal force in connection with those secondary systems of which these planets are respectively the rulers. (2) In three respects, at least, the orbits of the planets and their satellites deserve remark. They are all nearly circular, are found in nearly the same plane, and with the exception of the satellites of Uranus, their direction is from west to east. For this there is no necessity in the nature of things, and accordingly the numerous comets of our system move in orbits highly elliptical with every possible inclination to the ecliptic, and with motions, as the case may be, from east to west or west to east. From gravity alone, whatever might be the case with the motions of the comets, this orderly arrangement of the planets could not spring. (3) The largest planets are not merely placed on the outskirts of the system, but have orbits which deviate from the perfect circle less by far than those of the smaller planets Mercury and Mars. As a rule, that is, where the orbits are most eccentric, there the masses of the planets are the smallest. (4) To this, moreover, should be added the diurnal revolution of the earth upon its axis with the similar revolutions of the sun and planets, as well as that adjustment

of the special velocity, mass and distance of each separate planet, apart from which the present orbits of the planets could never have been traced.

Strange, however, as under any circumstances these arrangements must appear, they have grown in intellectual interest from the time that La Grange and La Place announced the splendid discoveries which they had achieved. To Newton himself, the permanency of the solar system was not only not proved, but, as he may have thought, it lay beyond the reach of proof. At least, as ages passed, he contemplated the necessity of God's interposing hand to correct the effect of those internal elements of change which, if unchecked, would bring in time the present system to a close. It appears, however, that no such interposition is needed. The stability of the system and the permanent though periodic regularity of its motions have been demonstrated by La Place to be secured, and as it seems so far for ever, by some of those very peculiarities of arrangement which attracted the eye of Newton. Within the system itself, the provision is found which puts a limit to the power of those elements of change, whose otherwise unrestricted progress would have wrought eventual ruin on the present form of things. Had Newton known this, he would have been struck yet more by the manifest signs of contrivance and design which the planetary system thus exhibits. La Place, who had neither the religious faith nor the mental comprehensiveness of Newton, was yet himself so struck by the results of his inquiry that he searched for some physical cause which might explain the mystery. The theory of probabilities convinced him that of all improbabilities the greatest was that these appearances should be the effect of chance. Hence therefore, and to avoid the religious conclusion of Newton, he conceived that nebular hypothesis which in one form or another has since his time exercised so great a fascination on the minds of men of science. So far, however, as the cause of religion is concerned, it leaves the matter nearly as it was. Granting, what some may still doubt, that the hypothesis explains the facts, yet the conjecture, for as such only La Place proposed it, cannot then dispense with the conception and the workings of Almighty God. In the construction and development of this primordial nebula, with the central sun whose atmosphere it was, the Divine skill and power are needed just as fully as upon Newton's simpler view. The primitive vapour must be capable of coherence, of contraction, of separation, as well as of a constitution generally such that in the issue and under the appointed laws it would yield these fruits of order, use and beauty with which our minds and eyes have grown familiar. The power, therefore,

and the skill of God are not proscribed as needless, but only shifted in their place and mode of working.[1]

After all that we have now said, it is hardly needful to dwell upon the fact that Newton by conviction as well as by education was a devout believer in a personal God. To him the Supreme Creator and Preserver of things was far more than a mere mechanical or dynamical postulate, necessary argumentatively to explain in reason the origin and continued subsistence of the world. He was a living Entity to Whose power, wisdom, goodness and will no limits could be set by either the nature of things or the reason that was devoted calmly to their study. Nothing can be finer than that expression, not of his faith only, but of his rational conviction, with which the immortal "Principia" is wound up. However ignorant of the ways and teachings of science, all serious searchers after truth should read the splendid sentences in which the great geometer opens out his own conception of the infinity, eternity and substantial omnipresence of God. Add to these his "Letters to Bentley," and the striking Queries in the book on "Optics" which treat of the same subjects; and whether he assents or not no man of sense and reason and (we may add) of modesty, will doubt that he has something put before him which is worth his study. As a matter of fact some of our greatest masters in the last century of philosophical theology drew their forms of reasoning and fundamental arguments from the teaching of these pages. That these writers are so little studied reflects no credit on the mental patriotism, while it detracts from the argumentative vigour, of the present generation.

5. Two points, however, still remain in connection with our subject on which we feel that something should be said, how-

[1] In one form or another, the so-called nebular hypothesis is constantly assumed by modern scientific writers as though it were proved. It is right, therefore, to observe that such is not the case. Rigid proof is of course impossible; but as yet it can hardly be said that it has upon its side more than a possibility—a probability, at any rate, determined as yet rather by scientific preferences than by cogent evidence. Accordingly no less an authority than Sir J. Herschel, in his address to the British Association in 1845, has decisively denied to the hypothesis any other than a merely speculative character ("Collected Essays," No. 14). Brewster similarly has pronounced against it as "incompatible with the established laws of the material universe" ("Life of Newton," vol. ii., chap. xvii.). See also the powerful objections marshalled aggainst it by Professor Sedgwick ("Discourse," 5th ed., App., Note D, and Supp. No. 1)—objections recently reiterated by Mr. Proctor in defence of his own theory of meteoric aggregation ("Other Worlds than Ours," chap. ix.). But no explanation of the means employed can overthrow the evidences of design exhibited in the result. Cf. Janet, "Final Causes," book i., chaps. i., v., vii.

ever brief. The first of these relates to the mighty question of the Unity or Oneliness of God. In defence of this Newton suggests an argument which, though it has its value, is far from strictly proving the attribute in question. In the same sentence in which he assumes the similarity of the general structure of the solar and the stellar systems, he fastens upon the wonderful phenomenon of light as still further leading to the conclusion that the Creator of these worlds and of the light by which their presence is declared to us, can be but One. The similarity of solar to stellar light was up to a point known to him from his own researches, and had he lived to witness the discoveries of Fraunhofer and the later developments of spectroscopy, his argument so far would have been greatly enlarged. Even if light does not imply that bond of physical continuity between our own and other worlds, which the Duke of Argyll seems to suggest, it is at least an evidence of the general identity of those physical principles which pervade, as far as we can trace them, the farthest limits of the visible universe. The proved universality, so far as we can gather, of the law of gravitation, as well as a multitude of facts connected with our own earth, illustrate the same view certainly with an ever-accumulating force. Greatly, however, as the sphere of the argument has been enlarged since Newton's days, and indefinite as may be the future sphere of its enlargement, it is still to be noted that under no circumstances can it rise to the height of a complete proof of the absolute Unity of God. A unity of counsel as respects our earth and the world of which it forms a part is all that can thus be strictly proved, as Paley and Brown put it in the meagre chapters they have given to the subject. But this unity of counsel is quite consistent not only with that view of the Divine Trinity which the early Fathers took, as Pearson and Bull interpret them, but equally so with that later scholastic view which in its tendency to give not merely distinction but mutual independency to the Divine Three, goes far to break up that view of the Unity which is suggested by the language of Scripture. Nay, further, this unity of counsel is quite consistent in reason with the existence of any number of Divine beings, provided that for the time they act in concert and with a joint combination of purpose and resources.

But if within the known limits of the universe it be thus impossible to prove the existence of one Divine Being only, proof of any sort is clearly hopeless in regard to those parts of the universe which are placed beyond the utmost boundaries of our knowledge. Finite, as in a sense the universe is, that is, as bounded at least by the wisdom and power of the glorious Being Who created it, yet to us it is so practically infinite

that we can set no bounds in thought to its extent. Hence, therefore, we can have no proof that there may not exist, in darkness to us impenetrable, other worlds besides our own, ruled by other Divine Beings, in power, will, and wisdom equal to Him Whom we on this earth adore. The plain truth is that to Scripture, and to Scripture only, we must look for the proof of the absolute unity of the Divine Being and the refutation of all polytheistic claims. As Waterland tacitly admits in his minute dissection of his opponent's famous argument, Clarke and his champion Jackson are not wrong when they deny to human reason the power to prove by any of the ancient methods the unity and in their full extent the physical attributes of God. On the other hand, few would now rest the proof on that metaphysical reasoning which Clarke and his admirers consider as not only reasonable but triumphant; though it must be confessed that both the famous Nonconformist Howe, and, among our own divines, the not less famous Dr. Thomas Jackson, while they use a different form of words, seem still in substance to reason in much the same way. Even Bishop Butler, however reluctantly, assents to the postulate of Clarke, that whatever be the internal necessity for the Divine existence, it must act equally, not only at all times but in all places, and thus become exclusive of the claims of any other unknown rival to the place and attributes of Deity. So helpless, therefore, is the unaided human reason on what at first sight seems to be an obvious truth. The very Scriptures, which prove to us decisively the doctrine of the Trinity, are also the only sure authority for that side of the truth which forms the basis of the Unitarian creed.[1]

The second point which still remains for notice is the view which Newton took of space and time. To each of these he assigns a substantial reality, not merely as the fruit of the power, but as inseparable from the existence of God. While he allows to the full the relative aspects in which they may both be viewed, he yet maintains that these relations do not exhaust the full conception which the terms imply, and that to each an absolute existence must be assigned, dependent not upon the will but on the being of God. God, by the very

[1] See Waterland, "Dissertation," chap. ii.; Clarke's "Demonstration," "Correspondence with Bishop Butler," and "Answers to a Sixth and a Seventh Letter;" Jackson of Leicester's "Defence," chap. v. Cf. Howe, "Living Temple," part i., chap. iv.; Dr. T. Jackson, "On the Creed," book vi., part i. Howe, as Mr. Rogers has observed, has anticipated Clarke in much of his reasoning, as well as Paley in his illustration of the watch. Clarke, as well as Paley, may, however, have been ignorant of Howe's writings, though Jackson, Clarke's disciple, quotes from the "Living Temple" more than once.

modes of His existence, constitutes, as he phrases it, both the one and the other. The real removal or annihilation of space seems to him impossible. This would be to remove itself from itself, as he expresses it in a well-known sentence of his "Principia." Against, therefore, the common view, he does not hesitate to identify space and duration with the so-called immensity and eternity of God. He thus suggests an easy argument, not merely for the virtual, but also for the substantial or essential omnipresence of God. Though he is most careful to refuse to God the merely abstract titles of immensity and eternity, though he rejects as wholly inadequate the view that would make God the vital spirit merely of the world, and though he earnestly warns against assigning more than a relative value to those human phrases and conceptions under which the Divine nature must to us be imaged, yet he does not hesitate to affirm that space, in some sense, stands to God in the same relation as the brain stands to His intelligent creatures. As we in our brains perceive the images of things sensible, so in some similar sense in space God perceives the things themselves. Hence, therefore, of course results further the universal knowledge or omniscience of God.

Whether Newton himself intended by these statements more than an illustration of the Scriptural truths of God's physical attributes, may reasonably enough be doubted. His disciple Clarke,[1] however, was not content with this, but claimed, on the strength of the Newtonian conceptions, to raise a proof even of the very existence of God. Space, he reasoned, and duration are substantial things. They remain, and to our apprehension they must remain, even after the universe has been cleared of every form of created being. Self-subsistent, however, they cannot be. It results, therefore, that they are properties, and demand as the cause of their existence a Being in time and place commensurate with themselves; in other words, the infinite and eternal God. So tempting is the view thus opened out, that even Bishop Butler in the end appears in part to have endorsed it. Yet still the argument cannot be thought conclusive. Even if we grant the absolute nature of space and of duration, and recognise so far the superiority of Clarke's reasonings to those of Leibnitz, and Jackson's of Leicester to those of Law, yet still the assumed conclusion will not follow. Though the abstractions of immensity and eternity cannot of course be self-subsistent, yet it could not be proved that their concretes, space and dura-

[1] See Clarke's "Demonstration," and "Correspondence with Leibnitz and Butler;" Jackson's "Defence;" and compare Saisset's beautiful Essay on Newton's Theology in his "Religious Philosophy" (vol. i., Eng. Trans.).

tion, might not perhaps be so. At any rate, if it should seem to any that Clarke's reasonings here may fairly challenge something of the value which he claims for them, and are free from that tendency to Spinozism which Clarke would have abhorred as fully as his critic Saisset, it is a clear misuse of words to connect the title *à priori* with this portion of his famous "Demonstration." Really the reasoning proceeds from effects to causes in that *à posteriori* method which was not only that which we have seen Newton himself delighted to use, but which alone has been admitted by divines in general as of strict validity in inquiries into the existence and attributes of God.

ARTHUR CHARLES GARBETT.

ART. III.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

V. MAY. ST. PHILIP AND ST. JAMES.

A. THE JOY OF TEMPTATION.

"*Blessed is the man that endureth temptation.*"—JAMES i. 12.

WHEN our eye falls upon the description given in our Prayer Book of the commemorative character of the first of May, a question immediately arises as to the combination of the two names which meet us there. We ask why St. Philip and St. James are associated so closely together, and why in this association they are separated off from all the other Apostles. Now we might without difficulty enter at once upon a very profitable train of thought, without caring to answer such questions. We might call to mind that the Lord, during His earthly ministry, sent forth His disciples "two and two;" that this arrangement contains a very useful instruction for us in regard to many parts of our Christian work, and that the principle involved in it reappears very suggestively in earlier and later parts of the Gospel history.[1] We might even be content, taking the title of this festival as our starting-point, to dwell on the mere fact of *association* in Christian work as involving an admonition to us of perpetual value; and to this side of the subject we may revert when we reach another case of duplicate commemoration in the month of October.

In the present case—in the instance of May-day—there is something more to be said on this side of the subject, which is worthy of a moment's attention. This first day of May was in ancient times a festival commemorative of all the Apostles;

[1] See Mark vi. 7, comparing xiv. 13 and i. 16-19.

and afterwards, when they were distributed throughout the year for the orderly suggestion of devout thought, St. Philip and St. James were left behind.[1] There still remains the unanswered question as to why the combination should have been precisely thus. But, without entering further into any speculation of this kind, we may now accept St. Philip and St. James as having no special connection, and may proceed to deal with them separately. The Epistle and the Gospel will furnish us with two very distinct and useful topics for the Saints which the Collect here combines together.

As to the St. James, who is before us here, we may dismiss all the intricate and difficult questions which are connected with his name. It is the St. James who wrote the Epistle that is here intended. This is proved by a passage of Holy Scripture selected for this Festival.[2] There is no other personal question with which we are concerned.

St. James—after the salutation—springs at once upon his first selected subject in a most remarkable manner. That subject is *Temptation.* Again he returns to it with equal abruptness a few verses below, within the space included in the Epistle for this day. More follows on the same subject afterwards;[3] but we may limit ourselves to what we find here, and to the manner in which the subject is presented to us here. The writer says that we are to "count it all joy when we fall into divers temptations:" our "temptations" may be manifold, and yet they are to give occasion to the increase of our rejoicing. And when he returns to the subject he puts it in the form of a beatitude: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation:" it is as though an addition was made to the Sermon on the Mount, after the manner of the words addressed by our Lord to St. Thomas, and by St. Paul to the Elders of Ephesus.[4]

First, we must be exact in assigning the right meaning to the word "temptation;" and with it we must combine the word "try." It is evident that the kind of "temptation" which is intended here is not that which is applied for the purpose of alluring and enticing us into sin. It is the "trial" which is part of God's discipline, to put us to the test, to make us know ourselves, to improve and strengthen our character.

Another word which demands our immediate notice here, at the beginning of the passage is the word "*faith.*"[5] It is a

[1] Until 1662 the Collect concluded thus: "Following the steps of St. Philip and other Thy Apostles," the name of St. Philip not being mentioned. See Hampson's "Medii Ævi Kalendarium," pp. 150, 318.

[2] James i. 1-12. [3] See *Ibid.*, i. 13-15.

[4] John xx. 29; Acts xx. 35.

[5] Stier has some good remarks on this point in his "Commentary" on this Epistle.

popular and not unnatural view of this Epistle, that its writer deals in it with Works in opposition to Faith. This being so, it is of great consequence that we should mark this word "faith," used at the very commencement as a kind of keynote to the whole. It is worth while to observe this, both as a rebuke of hasty and flippant criticism, and as to a help towards the diminution of a theological difficulty.

But why should we have "*joy*" in the midst of temptation? and why should it be "*all*" joy, when our temptations are "divers"? and why is the man that endureth temptation "blessed"? It is not really difficult to answer these questions: and it may be noted that St. James suggests two answers, one having reference to this world, and the other to the next.

Christian life is a struggle. With all its promises and comforts, we must enter upon each day with the consciousness that it is a day of campaigning. "Temptation" or "trial" is a proof of the reality of the struggle; and therefore is a firm ground for rejoicing. It must be a cause of joy to us that we have clear indications that we are honest, active soldiers of Jesus Christ. It follows that in each new turn of this diversified conflict, great variety of this attestation may be given, and therefore occasion for *manifold* joy. "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith: prove your own selves," is one of St. Paul's precepts;[1] and this is among the methods for securing the reality and satisfaction of this self-examination. But let two cautions be well borne in mind. There ought to be proof, not only of the reality of struggle, but of progress towards victory. Hence the importance of what follows regarding patience having "her perfect work."[2] And again, this "falling into" temptation is a phrase clearly chosen to show that we must not rush into it, but that it must come through Divine Providence. This being well remembered, we see that "rejoicing in temptation" is not the contradictory, but the correlative of the petition in the Lord's Prayer—"Lead us not into temptation." When these rules are well observed, we need not hesitate to throw ourselves with the full force of a thankful heart upon the consolation of what St. Paul writes elsewhere: "We glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."[3]

This early part of the exhortation of St. James regarding "joy in temptation" has reference to our present ground of rejoicing in this life. When he reverts to the same subject, before he turns to the future, he speaks of heavenly joy as

[1] 2 Cor. xiii. 5. [2] Verse 4. [3] Rom. v. 3.

resulting from the experience of temptation: "When he is tried he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love Him." Here our appointed Gospel ends with *love* as it began with *faith*. This is strictly analogous to that passage which gives so wondrous a glow to the early part of the First Epistle of St. Peter: "Ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations; that the trial of your faith . . . might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: Whom, having not seen, ye love; in Whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."[1]

B. CHRIST THE WAY.

"*I am the way.*"—John xiv. 6.

This sentence, transferred from the Gospel to the Collect, is so rich in meaning that we need not travel beyond it in our short meditation upon the share which St. Philip has in this Festival.

"I am the way." This use of the word "way" or "road" suggests, in the first place, the action of *progress*. The Christian is not meant to stand still. True religion is an advance from point to point. It is quite possible, indeed, to make progress (and too many do make continual progress) from bad to worse. But in union with Christ by faith, we make continual progress from good to better. The proper characteristic of the true disciple is that, amid many troubles and difficulties, he advances "from strength to strength." The path of the just is "as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day;" and Christ is not only the way, but the *Light* which shines upon the way.[2] With this thought of progress strongly fixed in his mind, St. Peter says to us, "*Grow* in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour.[3]

And next, the image here employed by that Saviour in His discourse to Thomas and Philip, reminds us that there is a definite *end and aim* of our journey. A road is not made unless there is some place to which it is worth while to go; and those who follow the road are presumed to know why they travel therein. It is a miserable thing not to know the end of our journey—to have no definite aim in life—to be on a road without knowing whither it will lead us. The Epistle for this

---

[1] 1 Pet. i. 6-8. [2] See John ix. 5. [3] 2 Pet. iii. 18.

day tells us that a "double-minded man, *i.e.*, a man who does not set his face definitely in one direction, is unstable in all his ways."[1]

But there is no doubt as to the point to which Christ leads us; and that point is the best of all points. Christ is the road from earth to Heaven. By this road the exiles return from their captivity; by this road the prodigal comes back to his father again. "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me," says Christ in the very verse of which a part has been quoted.

And this word of our Saviour calls us to remember that this "way" of which He speaks, and which is Himself, is *exclusive*. There are not half a dozen ways out of our sin and misery—not a choice of ways over the steep hills and desolate waste-places of this mortal life, so that by any of them we may reach Heaven at last, but only one way. To take no heed to the matter, to leave the result to chance, is the maddest thing in the world. The road is distinctly defined — well marked out from the beginning to the end. There is no doubt in regard to it. But it is the only one. "There is none other name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," but only the name of Jesus Christ.[2]

The ways in which men walk of their own free disposition are *very various*, but not one of them can *conduct us to Heaven*. The following passage occurs in a very old sermon, and perhaps it may not be deemed too long for quotation: "We may go over the whole world, and find no way that will "lead us to God. Every way of man carries us further from "Him. The way in which man commonly walketh, is called "'*a shadow*;' it is only an image, an awkward semblance of "life, which, like a shadow, soon 'departeth.' Try all his "ways by this rule, and you will find them all alike. When "he is in the way to be rich, he is laying up for some other to "gather when he is gone. If he is in the way to be happy, "his pleasures turn into thorns and vexations. If he is in the "way to be great, a short time will put him upon a level with "all mankind. If he is in the way to be wise, his wisdom is a "wisdom of words. If he is a discoverer, he brings in a fresh "generation of terms; persuading the world that he has new "knowledge, because he has new expressions. Thus is man "constantly seeking his way, but he is still estranged from it, "and missing his true object." So the matter is put, and very truly put, in a sermon preached about ninety years ago, *i.e.*, about the time when the oldest people now living on the earth

---

[1] James i. 8. [2] Acts iv. 12.

were just born. And the truth remains the same, and man's habit of missing his way still continues.

And nothing at all has been said here of that path of *wilful or acknowledged sin* in which many are walking. The end of *that* course is stated briefly and strongly at the end of the first Psalm, which is always recited on the festival of St. Philip and St. James: "The way of the ungodly shall perish." It is as when a traveller is alone upon the mountains, and all trace of roadway is lost, and the night is coming on, and he looks round in vain for any token to give him guidance. Who shall say what the desolation is to that soul, which is placed in this vast universe with the gift of immortality, and which has finally and irretrievably lost its way?

But, if this is the only way, it is likewise a *perfectly secure way.* "Via unica, via certa," is a Latin proverb in which this truth is stated very forcibly. Beyond the limits of this road there is in spiritual matters nothing but doubt, error, mistake, and disappointment. Along *the whole line* of this road there is perfect safety.

And now, if Christ is thus our "way"—our way of making progress—our way to the "heavenly city"—our only way—our safe way—how, and in what manner, does He become this to us? Three very simple, but very momentous answers can be given to these questions. First, by His atoning death; secondly, by His infallible words; thirdly, by His perfect example.

First, *by His atoning death.* Through sin we are all naturally "out of the way,"[1] but He by His own blood has given us "boldness to enter into the holiest by a new and living way."[2] To quote again the same old writer as before, "When man was shut out of Paradise, a flaming sword was "interposed, to keep the way of the truth of life; and there "was no return for him into Paradise, without facing the "fire of that sword. This is the thing that Christ did for us: "He suffered that fire and survived it; and thus recovered for "us the way to Paradise. He overcame the sharpness of "death, and opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers."

Secondly, Christ becomes our "way" by *His infallible words.* In Him is no misleading, either through any desire to deceive us, or through any defect of knowledge. He knows all; and all that He reveals is for our safety and our progress. Let His words be truly understood, and truly received into the heart, and our feet are on the road.

Lastly, *by His example.* Following Him we are in the "way." No doubt there are other subordinate examples:

[1] Heb. v. 12, xii. 13. [2] Heb. x. 20.

and on these days of our Church Calendar these subordinate examples are our subjects of thought. We follow the Apostles as they followed Christ, and it is cheering thus to see the footsteps of the Saints on the road which we are travelling. We are made in this manner to feel that we are not going to Heaven alone. If Heaven were a solitary place, we could not be happy there. Yet these, after all, are only footsteps. Christ is "the way," and He is more than the way. As the Collect says, echoing the full tones of the Gospel for the day, He is "the way, the truth, and the life." He came that He might bring us into the truth. He came "that we might have life."

J. S. Howson.

Art IV.—THE AUSTRALASIAN CENTENARY.

A RETROSPECT NOT TO BE FORGOTTEN.

"WELL, it is many a fine fellow besides you who was sent that way," remarked the driver of a Dublin car, in the year 1848, to his passenger, Mr. Therry, an Australian Judge, who was chatting about his recent return from Botany Bay, after an absence of twenty years. During the drive the Judge had occasion to remonstrate with the man for reckless driving, whereupon the latter burst out with—"Ah, hould your tongue, man! why, you ought to be as bould as a bulldog, coming from Botany Bay." Some twenty years later, Miss Jane Whately, in the memoir of her father, the late Archbishop of Dublin, when referring to the state of Alban Hall, Oxford, before he was its principal, gave a point to her remarks by stating that it was "a kind of 'Botany Bay' to the University—a place where students were sent who were considered too idle and dissipated to be received elsewhere." "Botany Bay," indeed, was a proverbial expression. Happily, however, for the present generation, "Botany Bay," with its sad associations of convict hardship and brutality, is a tale of the past, and the Australian world now ranks as the most highly favoured of the British dependencies.

At first thought we might be inclined to regard the early history of the Australasian Colonies as having no particular interest for us at the present time; and this seems to have been the opinion of our leading educationists, for the late Professor Green, in his "Short History of the English People," a volume of 800 pages, referred to the Australasian world merely as a

place where English "settlers were to wrest New Zealand from the Maori, and to sow on the shores of Australia the seeds of great nations." But this is a grand mistake, for we cannot fully sympathize with or understand the present status of the colonies, unless we can enter somewhat into their experiences of the past. We propose, therefore, to give a brief survey of the origin and early history and trials of the great Austral Empire, ever bearing in mind the hand of God in its growth.

Early in the sixteenth century Portuguese ships navigated the Southern Seas, and possibly they may have discovered Australia; but in 1601 the Spaniards, and a few years later the Dutch, certainly did visit the northern and western and southern portions of that vast island from Carpentaria in the north to that great bight in the south, of which part is even now called Nuyts' Archipelago, after the Dutch navigator Peter de Nuyts.

Early in the year 1642, a few months before the day when Charles I. raised his royal standard in opposition to the Parliamentarians, Tasman, a Dutch navigator, discovered (as he imagined) the southernmost part of Australia, and called it Van Diemen's Land,[1] in honour of the Dutch Governor-General of Batavia. Subsequently, he discovered New Zealand, where some of his men were murdered by the aborigines, an event which impressed him with the ferocity of the latter.

Tasman made a careful chart of his discoveries, and in the year 1744 it was published by Harris in his work on "Voyages." In a remarkable note by Harris, inserted in the centre of the chart, attention was drawn to the position of the great *Terra Australis* as compared with that of other gold-yielding countries, and the author added: "This continent enjoys the benefit of the same position, and therefore, whoever perfectly discovers and settles it will become infallibly possessed of territories as rich, as fruitful, and as capable of improvement as any that have been hitherto found out either in the East Indies or the West." More than a century elapsed before these anticipations were realized, as it was not till the year 1851 that gold in Australia was discovered; and we have no reason to suppose that Edward Hammond Hargreaves, the discoverer, had ever seen or heard of Harris's note.

As a nation we were very slow to engage in Southern Ocean voyages; but in 1768 Captain Cook (who was a Yorkshire peasant by birth) was despatched on an expedition to observe the transit of Venus, and to make explorations in the South Seas. Accompanied by two distinguished naturalists, Mr. (afterwards Sir) Joseph Banks and Dr. Solander, he set

[1] This designation, so long associated with convictism, has been discarded for "Tasmania," in memory of the discoverer.

out well equipped and full of hope as to the results of the expedition. Early in the year 1770 he discovered the south-easterly extremity of *Terra Australis*, or *Hollandia Nova*, as it was called in Tasman's chart, and this he named Cape Howe, in honour of Lord Howe. Steering northwards, he explored the coast, giving names to bays and headlands, and keeping a carefully written diary of his discoveries. Early in May he entered a bay, which, in consequence of the rich vegetation in the neighbourhood, he named Botany Bay. On 6th May he left Botany Bay for the north. "We steered (he wrote) N.N.E., and at noon our latitude by observation was 33° 50′ S. At this time we were between two and three miles distant from the land, and abreast of a bay or harbour in which there appeared to be good anchorage, and which I called Port Jackson. This harbour lies three leagues to the northward of Botany Bay." The wonderful capabilities and beauty of Port Jackson could not be realized, of course, by any passing its entrance in this manner.

It must be interesting for those who delight in tracing God's hand in history to notice how opportune for the interests of our country were the explorations by Cook, for the Declaration of Independence by our North American Colonies in 1776 deprived us suddenly of our only outlet for convicted criminals, and, as the sequel shows, our statesmen in their perplexity were led to conceive the bold idea of substituting Australia for America.

At first, the scheme had been to form a convict settlement on the shores of Western Africa; and a Parliamentary Committee, after taking the evidence of several persons acquainted with the coast, reported in its favour; but thoughtful persons, like Burke, dreaded the idea of consigning the convicts to one of the most unhealthy climates in the world, and through their opposition the scheme was abandoned.

Sir Joseph Banks strongly urged the formation of a settlement at Botany Bay, in New South Wales; but it was opposed with great vigour by the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the great organ of literature and science in those days. Referring to the proposal of Sir Joseph Banks, which it was believed the Government were ready to adopt, the editor wrote: "If this report is true, the expense will be equal to that of an expedition to the South Sea against an enemy; and if it is to be continued with every freight of felons, it will annihilate the surplus that is intended for augmenting the payment of the National Debt. It is certainly a most extravagant scheme, and will probably be reconsidered." The strength of the opposition may be measured by the pertinacity with which it was renewed, even so late as the year 1803, when the penal

settlement had actually been in existence sixteen years. At that date a writer in the newly formed *Edinburgh Review* wrote as follows: "It may be a curious consideration to reflect what we are to do with this colony when it comes to years of discretion. Are we to spend another hundred millions of money in discovering its strength, and to humble ourselves again before a fresh set of Washingtons and Franklins? The moment after we have suffered such serious mischiefs from the escape of the old tiger, we are breeding up a young cub whom we cannot render less ferocious or more secure."

All opposition, however, was useless; and in the year 1784 the colony of New South Wales was formed, and the Crown was empowered by Parliament to constitute a competent Court of Criminal Judicature in the new settlement. In December, 1786, the requisite Orders in Council were made by the King; and in May, 1787,[1] Captain Philip, R.N., sailed as Governor of the intended settlement, with a frigate, an armed tender, six transports containing 548 male and 230 female convicts, and three storeships with provisions for two years.

After touching at the Canaries and Rio Janeiro, and also at the Cape of Good Hope, which then belonged to the Dutch, the expedition reached Botany Bay in the month of January, 1788; but they did not disembark, as the bay was exposed to tempestuous seas from the eastward. Captain Philip lost no time in exploring Port Jackson, which Cook had only seen from a distance, and he was delighted to find it a magnificent harbour. Selecting one of its coves, in which was an ample supply of fresh water, he called it Sydney Cove, in honour of Lord Sydney; and there, on the 26th day of February, 1788, he planted the first British colony in Australasia.[2] His entire live stock consisted of six head of horned cattle and seven horses.

For many years, the anniversary of the discovery of Sydney Cove was observed in Sydney as a general festival; and in 1845 the *Sydney Herald* wrote of the event as follows:

> As we look upon the noble ships riding in our harbour, and the steamers, yachts, wherries, and boats innumerable gliding to and fro amid the joyous excitements of the regatta, let us picture the three humble boats which this day fifty-seven years ago were slowly creeping up the unknown waters of Port Jackson in quest of a sure resting-place for our first predecessors. As we cast our eye over the elegant buildings which now skirt our shores on either side, and over the crowds of well-

---

[1] In August, 1787, Captain Bligh left England in the *Bounty* on his disastrous expedition to the South Seas. He had been the companion of Captain Cook in one of his voyages, and subsequently Governor of New South Wales.

[2] Australasia is a term including Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand.

dressed men, women, and children who are keeping holiday on this our national festival, let us think of the dense woods which then frowned on Governor Philip, of the profound silence that reigned around him, of the awful sense of solitude with which he and his little band must have been impressed, and of the exultation they would have felt if they could have foreseen that within so brief a term the wilderness they were approaching would have become "replenished" with a teeming population, and have been "subdued" to the beauty and affluence of civilized life.

Captain Philip commenced his rule of the new settlement by a stirring address, in which he set before his men the vast importance of the work in which they were engaged, and referring to the American Declaration of Independence, he said: "Britain, resigning the North American continent to the dominion of her full-grown offspring, magnanimously seeks in other parts of the earth a region where she may lay the foundation of another empire which will one day rival in strength, but we hope not in disobedience, that which she has so recently lost."

In a wild and uncultivated country whose capabilities had never been tested, surrounded with aborigines who might resent any attempt to appropriate and break up the soil, and with only the convict castaways of our land as the nucleus of that future empire which he hoped he was founding, Captain Philip had indeed a position to occupy which must have severely tested his judgment and skill, as well as his courage and energy.

Even after the lapse of twenty-four years, Sir S. Romilly stated in the House of Commons that the founding of this settlement "was an experiment more unpromising and bolder than any ever tried in any former age, or by any other nation; for it was an attempt to found a colony which was to consist altogether of thieves and convicts—of the very refuse of society, and of men and women having no motive for wishing success to it. Convicts transplanted to North America found themselves, immediately on their arrival, in a society where habits of industry and regularity prevailed; but in the infancy of the colony of New South Wales guilt and vice were the characteristics of the whole nation. It was in fact to be a people of thieves and outlaws, under the control of their military guards."

This "experiment," as Sir S. Romilly called the Austral Settlement, must have failed, had not God in His good providence stirred up Mr. Wm. Wilberforce and his Evangelical friends to supply the one thing needful for its success, which our Church and country had so carelessly overlooked. We refer to the need for spiritual instruction, of which the expedition, though otherwise so well equipped, was, as originally planned, entirely destitute. Wilberforce used his influence with Mr. Pitt, and a chaplaincy for New South Wales was

founded, with a salary of £180 per annum. The Rev. R. Johnson was appointed to this important post, and he went forth cheered with the prayers and sympathy of such men as Mr. Thornton, and the Rev. H. Venn, and John Newton Mr. Venn, in a letter to his daughter, Miss J. C. Venn, dated Oct. 28, 1786,[1] after stating that on the Sunday previous, Mr. Johnson had been introduced by Mr. Thornton to two hundred and fifty of his future congregation aboard the hulk at Woolwich, and after referring to the origin of the chaplaincy, wrote as follows:

I trust he will prove a blessing to these lost creatures. Those that stole will there steal no more; for having no receivers of stolen goods, no alehouses, etc., they will be under no temptation to steal. With what pleasure may we consider this plan of peopling that far-distant region, and other opening connections with the heathen, as a foundation for the Gospel of our God and Saviour to be preached unto them: when "a vast multitude whom no man can number" shall "call upon His Name;" when "the wilderness shall become a fruitful field," and all the savageness of the heathen shall be put off, and all the graces of the Spirit shall be put on. . . To be the means of sending the Gospel to the other side of the globe—what a favour! Mr. Thornton says the Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir Charles Middleton seem much to approve the sending of Mr. Johnson.

The Rev. John Newton had known Mr. Johnson for several years, and wrote the following lines on the occasion of his appointment to the chaplaincy:

The Lord, Who sends thee hence, will be thine aid;
In vain at thee the lion, Danger, roars;
His arm and love shall keep thee undismayed
On tempest-tossèd seas and savage shores.

Go, bear the Saviour's name to lands unknown,
Tell to the southern world His wondrous grace;
An energy divine thy words shall own,
And draw their untaught hearts to seek His face.

Many in quest of gold or empty fame
Would compass earth or venture near the poles;
But how much nobler thy reward and aim—
To spread His praise, and win immortal souls!

---

[1] The biographers of the late William Wilberforce have not understood the history of this chaplaincy for they have confused its institution with the formation of the second and auxiliary chaplaincy which was afterwards filled by the Rev. S. Marsden. The reader of the "Life of Wilberforce" would imagine that Mr. Johnson was not appointed till 1790, after the post had been offered to the Rev. S. Crowther, who was shipwrecked on his way out, and returning home, resigned the post. There is some difficulty in making this event take its proper place, but in all probability Marsden took Crowther's post as second chaplain. Mr. Johnson is called in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of January, 1787, "chaplain to the intended new settlement," and as such his marriage on Dec. 4, 1786, is referred to.

At the present day, when steamers reach Australia in six weeks, we find it difficult to realize the position of the infant colony in the far-distant unknown world, which it took them eight months to reach. Ere long starvation, amongst other perils, threatened their very existence; and death by famine was on one occasion only dispelled by the timely return of one of Captain Philip's ships from Batavia, with an ample supply of provisions. As soon as possible, Captain Philip planted a small offshoot colony at Norfolk Island, which lies one thousand miles to the north-east of Port Jackson, in the hope that by reason of its fertility it might prove a granary for Sydney in times of dearth, and might also be used as a receptacle for the more hardened convicts whom he wished to keep separate from the rest. Subsequently his explorations in the districts of Broken Bay, and of the river Hawkesbury which flowed into it, opened up a rich fertile country from which in course of time supplies of grain were obtained.

In the third year of the colony's existence, Captain Philip commenced a plan of emancipating the better disposed of the convicts who seemed to him to be desirous of leading a life of honesty and industry, and he granted two acres of land and a house to each emancipist, with the conditional promise of a further grant, as an encouragement to persevere in raising themselves to the level of respectability and independence.

In 1794 the Rev. Samuel Marsden reached the colony, as second chaplain. He was appointed in January, 1793, whilst still an undergraduate at Cambridge; and as the fleet was to sail in the summer, his ordination had to be arranged without delay, and it was followed by his marriage.

Marsden may be truly called one of the Fathers of Australia, and we shall endeavour to notice presently some of the more important points in which his influence helped to build up that distant colonial world. The son of a Yorkshire farmer in a small way, he was educated in a village school, and afterwards in the Free Grammar School of Hull, from which he was removed to a place of business at Horsforth, near Leeds. Anxious to become a minister of the Gospel of Christ, he was sent to St. John's College, Cambridge, by the Elland Society, to study with the view of becoming a clergyman. Through the influence of Mr. Wilberforce, who was guided by the Rev. Joseph Milner, head-master of the Grammar School at Hull, he was chosen to fill the chaplaincy to which we have referred. As a link with the past, we may mention that Marsden's Bible passed into the possession of Dr. Broughton, first Bishop of Australia, who gave it to the late Bishop Selwyn, and by the latter it was presented, in 1869, to Marsden's grandson, the

Right Rev. S. E. Marsden, on his consecration as Bishop of Bathurst in New South Wales.

At the close of a rule of five years Captain Philip returned to England, and for a period of three years the colony was administered by a deputy-governor. In 1795 Captain John Hunter arrived as governor. About the same time the Cape of Good Hope became a British possession, and our naval and military commanders there sent to Governor Hunter an official notification of the fact, with an expression of their earnest desire to offer every assistance in their power to this young and struggling colony.

Free settlers soon began to arrive in New South Wales, and explorations were made in various quarters. Through the energy of Mr. Bass and Lieut. Flinders the important discovery was made that Van Diemen's Land (now Tasmania) was an island. Subsequently, Flinders[1] explored and surveyed a considerable portion of the southern part of Australia which lies to the west of Victoria, and he also visited the great bay called Port Philip, part of which was subsequently named Hobson's Bay, on whose shores are the port and suburbs of Melbourne.

In 1800, Governor Hunter was succeeded by Captain King, who had been commandant of Norfolk Island under Captain Philip.[2] At this time the entire lands granted to settlers, whether emancipist or free, amounted to 47,678 acres, and in 1801 the colonial population numbered 5,547 on the mainland, and 961 in Norfolk Island.

The unfortunate Captain Bligh, of the *Bounty*, succeeded Governor King in 1806, and his rule of Australia was as disastrous as his command of the *Bounty*; for in 1808 the military and civilians combined and effected a revolution, in which he was placed under arrest, and the government exercised by the commander of the forces.

In those days a British Government did not allow its embarrassments at home to impede the development of imperial interests at a distance; and notwithstanding that our country was at this time politically isolated on the Continent of Europe, the Australian crisis was promptly dealt with, and Lachlan

[1] In Flinders's later explorations Mr. (afterwards Sir John) Franklin took part as a midshipman.

[2] In 1803 a settlement of ten male and six female convicts, with a sufficient guard, was planted in Van Diemen's Land, near the site of the present city of Hobart Town; and soon afterwards their numbers were increased by a fresh consignment of convicts from England. The latter had been sent out to Port Philip to make a settlement there, but through lack of water they were unable to remain, and were transferred to Van Diemen's Land. It has always been a subject of congratulation in the Port Philip district—now better known as Victoria—that this first and only attempt to form there a convict settlement signally failed.

Macquarie, a man of extraordinary vigour—though somewhat arbitrary in the exercise of his power—was sent out as Governor of New South Wales. He reinstated Bligh for twenty-four hours, and then himself resumed his post as Governor, and with much energy applied himself to the reorganization of the various departments of the public service, and to establishing rules and regulations for the better observance of order and decency.

In the time of Governor Hunter a rule had been made under which every civil and military officer could claim a grant from the Government of one hundred acres of uncleared land, and also an assignment of thirteen convicts as servants to bring the land into order. Governor King added a further rule, under which the employer of convict labour was bound by a deed of covenant to clothe and maintain his assigned servants for twelve months according to the same rate of allowance as that allowed to convicts in the employ of the Government; and the hours of labour were limited to six on Saturdays and ten on other week-days, whilst Sunday was a day of rest. Oftentimes the convict was able to perform his allotted task so quickly as to have extra time for himself; and if he could not turn this to profit by extra work, for which his master paid him, he necessarily had plenty of idle time for mischief. This was felt to be a great evil; and the attempts to correct the convicts by corporal punishment, which was too often very arbitrarily and even cruelly exercised, were by no means generally successful.

During Macquarie's time, the best mechanics, or those who were supposed to possess qualifications especially useful to Government, were taken direct from the convict vessels on their arrival, and sent to the Government-gangs, whilst (as the *Edinburgh Review* pithily wrote) "the poets, attorneys, and politicians were put up to auction." The settlers naturally complained bitterly that they could not get any efficient workmen to execute their designs, whilst the Governor himself was being transformed into a useless and expensive builder.

Any of the convicts who were thus favoured by the Government, and had money, found opportunities of ingratiating themselves with the overseers and clerks of the different offices, and, in consideration of a regular weekly payment of ten shillings each, they were allowed to be at large at Sydney and elsewhere. Any convict who had the advantage of this indulgence, and conducted himself so as to avoid the censure of the police, had a good opportunity of maintaining himself with comfort; but the system was most prejudicial to the real welfare of the colony, and was also most unfair to the less favoured convicts. By degrees the management of the con-

victs passed chiefly into the hands of men of their own class. The chief-superintendent was an emancipated convict, having under him 142 remunerated overseers, of whom only 42 were free settlers.

Mr. Bigge, who was sent out from England by the Government to inquire into colonial matters, and whose reports were published in 1822-23, remarked that the superintendents of the higher class were too much occupied by interests of their own to attend to the labour of those under them; and those of an inferior class possessed neither sufficient courage nor integrity to compel the convicts to work, nor sufficient skill to direct them. When, in addition to this, we take into account the almost complete freedom which the female convicts had to give way to unbridled vice, we can well imagine how, even under the rule of such an energetic man as Macquarie, the colony must have been in a state of fearful degradation. In 1822 the number of emancipists was 4,376, of whom only 369 bore a good character. Still they were the wealthiest class in the community. One emancipist owned 19,000 acres; another 2,620 acres. In 1820 the emancipists had 92,618 acres, 40,643 head of horned cattle, and 221,079 sheep. They were also the chief traders. One of them gained his wealth as follows. Arriving in the colony as a young and active man, he was employed in the penal gang of stone-masons, and then set up a small retail shop, in which he continued till the expiration of his term of service. He then repaired to Sydney, where he extended his business, and by marriage increased his capital. For many years he kept a public-house and retail-shop, which was the resort of many of the smaller settlers, whom he led into habits of intoxication, and induced to sign documents which placed their property under his control. By these means and by an active use of the commoner arts of overreaching ignorant and worthless persons, he accumulated considerable wealth.

Some of the educated convicts opened schools and became private tutors: and Mr. Bigge mentions the case of one who, in his capacity as writing-master, used to instruct the son of a free settler in the art of skilfully copying the signatures of persons then living.

Alongside, however, of all this vice and degradation progress was being made in material prosperity, though far too slowly in the paths of respectability.

Even before the close of last century, the young colony had begun to create an export trade in cloth manufactured from the wool of colonial sheep, and which, together with linen made in the colony and some excellent iron ore, were forwarded to the mother country.

We have already referred to the grant of land which each civil and military officer was entitled to receive, and in many cases this must have been very beneficial to the colony. The Rev. S. Marsden, with the natural shrewdness of the Yorkshireman, soon turned his one hundred acres to good account, and, largely increasing his estate by purchase, he made a model farm, which drew from M. Perron, a French explorer in 1802, the following remarks:—"No longer than eight years ago the whole of this spot was covered with immense and useless forests; what pains, what exertions must have been employed! These roads, these pastures, these fields, these harvests, these orchards, these flocks, the work merely of eight years." M. Perron also referred to Marsden as a man "who generously interfered in behalf of the poorer settlers in their distresses, established schools for their children, and often relieved their necessities; whilst to the unhappy convicts whom the justice of their offended country had banished from their native soil, he administered alternately exhortation and comfort."[1]

One of the greatest impediments to colonial progress in the paths of purity was the rule that with the exception of the Governor and chaplain, no military officer should be allowed to have his wife with him. This, and other circumstances which tended to impede Christian progress, induced Mr. Marsden to return to England in 1807, and on starting he received a gratifying memorial from three hundred and two of the principal inhabitants, expressing their thanks to him for his exemplary conduct in the many important offices held by him, and for all the benefits he had even then conferred on the colony. He took with him some wool from his own farm, and had it manufactured at Leeds into a material equal, if not superior, to the manufactures of Saxony or France, and he frequently expressed his firm conviction that Australia would become the great wool-producing emporium for English trade. He had frequent interviews with members of the English Government, and endeavoured to impress upon them the importance of reform in the treatment of the convicts.

Marsden had observed that by far the greater number of reformed criminals consisted of those who had been either married before they were transported, and whose wives had

---

[1] Marsden's experience, too, was useful in showing that convicts were reclaimable and might be treated with confidence, for at a later date he could write thus: "The greater part of my property is in the charge of common felons, more than a hundred miles from my house, in the woods; and much of it I have never seen. I can truly say I feel no more concern about my sheep and cattle than if they were under my own eye. I have never once visited the place where many of them are, having no time to do so."

obtained help to get out to the colony, or of those who had married in the colony; and he endeavoured to induce the Government to allow convicts' wives (who chose to do so) to accompany their husbands, even at the public expense. This was refused, but the wives of officers and soldiers were permitted to accompany their husbands, and not less than three hundred forthwith went out with a single regiment.

Noticing that oftentimes convicts, through ignorance of profitable kinds of skilled labour, were either unemployed or were occupied in work which was extremely irksome to themselves and of no advantage to the colony, he urged the Home Government to appoint practical mechanics and general manufacturers as instructors for them; but his scheme met with no official sympathy, until by dint of perseverance and by setting clearly before the Secretary of State the fact that remunerative work would materially lessen the expense of the convict establishment, and so benefit the home country, he succeeded in obtaining a formal consent to its adoption.

On receiving this consent Marsden forthwith hastened, at his own cost, into Warwickshire and Yorkshire, sought out four artisans and manufacturers, and sent them off without delay to the colony. With the same energy he urged the Home Government to institute a female penitentiary, as there were 1,400 women in the colony, and of these more than 1,000 were unmarried, nearly all convicts, and many of them living in a state of great moral degradation. The Secretary of State promised his aid, but several years passed before the Governor of the Colony would give his consent to such an institution being formed.

At the present day we can scarcely imagine what New South Wales was at that time, and even so late as the year 1822 it was designated "the fifth or pickpocket quarter of the globe;" but this did not adequately express its degraded condition. In 1818, when Marsden replied to a memorial of sympathy from the colonel and officers of the 46th Foot, on the successful result to an action which he was compelled to bring against the Government *Gazette*, for a libel written by the Governor's Secretary, he was constrained to write as follows:

When you first arrived in New South Wales every barrier against licentiousness[1] was broken down, every fence swept away. There were

[1] In 1805 Wilberforce wrote: "I have been of late making strong representations to Lord Castlereagh on the dreadful state of morals in New South Wales. I have been assured on good authority that of near 2,000 children now in the colony, there are not 100 who receive any education at all." In 1809 Wilberforce wrote: "Mr. Marsden's coming over to this country was so opportune, and the services he has been able to render while here are such, that I cannot consider him any otherwise than as a special instrument of Providence, sent over on a particular

a few, and but a few, who resolved to stand their ground, and preserve that line of conduct which the wisest and best men consider essential as marking the distinction between the good and the evil. . . Had you not arrived in New South Wales and acted the honourable part you did, the few who were marked for future conquest would not have been able to have stood out longer, but must have either yielded to superior force or have withdrawn from the colony. You just arrived in time to turn the wavering balance, and to inspire the desponding with hope.

How one wishes that every regiment could emblazon on its ensign the glorious record that, like the 46th Foot, it had promoted the cause of morality and piety in the district in which it served.

Having succeeded in inducing the Government to allow three more chaplains and three schoolmasters to go to the colony, Marsden at once set to work to find men like Venn and Milner, who, being renewed in the spirit of their minds, were desirous to devote themselves to the spread of the Gospel of the Saviour. He went from parish to parish to seek for them, and after a long search he selected, as well fitted for two of the chaplaincies, the Rev. R. Cartwright and the Rev. Mr. Cowper, who, with their families, returned to the colony with him. Mr. Cowper afterwards became Archdeacon of Sydney, and one of his sons became Prime Minister, whilst another was Dean of Sydney, under the late Bishop Barker.

New South Wales was at this time in the Diocese of India, but until it was nearly fifty years old it remained without the personal supervision of any Bishop.[1]

Marsden was near his end before Australia had a Bishop of

---

errand, just when he could do most good here, and be delivered from most evil in New South Wales. I hope we shall get the moral state of the colony greatly reformed. Alas! in how many instances does our national conduct in foreign countries call aloud for the vengeance of heaven! I hope I have been able to prevent some shocking violations of our national religion in one of our distant settlements, some short time ago."

[1] In the "Memoirs" of the late Dr. Daniel Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta, we find a letter from him, in September, 1832, to the Archdeacon of Sydney, who was evidently perplexed with reference to the admission of the unconfirmed to the Lord's Table. The Bishop wrote: "The permission for the young to approach the Lord's Table when desirous of confirmation is allowed by the rubric. The examination of them privately, and the decision upon their qualifications, all fall within the office and duty of a presbyter. Of course you do not read the Confirmation Service, nor proceed to imposition of hands, nor pronounce that Apostolical benediction which has ever been accounted (with ordination, jurisdiction, correction of doctrine, and discipline and superintendence), the peculiar spiritual province vested in the office termed Episcopal. Any solemnity which can be given to your examination and admission to the Holy Communion, short of these things, would of course be most desirable, at your distance from your diocesan."

its own. The first Bishop (styled the Bishop of Australia) was Dr. Broughton, who had previously been Archdeacon of Sydney. At the present time there are eighteen Australasian bishoprics, and the Nonconformists are organized as in England. One of the first acts of Dr. Barry, the present Bishop of Sydney, has been to unite the Nonconformists to join with Episcopalians in united opposition to infidelity. Of the good work done in Sydney by the late Bishop Barker and in Melbourne by our esteemed friend Bishop Perry, or of the labours of Bishop Kennion in Adelaide, Bishop Thornton in Ballarat, and other pious and devoted Bishops, it does not fall within the scope of this paper to make more than a passing mention.

During Marsden's visit to England he was much in the company of the managers of the Church Missionary Society, which had then been established only about seven years, and he considered very fully with them the subject of Missions to New Zealand. Little did any of them then perceive how the door for such mission work was to be opened; but, in God's good providence, there was on board the convict ship in which Marsden returned to New South Wales in 1809, a dark-skinned sailor whose distressing cough and weak state of health attracted his attention, and who appeared to be a New Zealand chieftain named Ruaterra, working his way back (as he hoped) to his native land. In 1805 he had been induced to become a sailor in a British whaling vessel which had touched at the place where he resided. And passing from one vessel to another, he had experienced such foul play and perfidiousness, as well as personal ill-treatment, that he was almost reduced to a dying state when Marsden became acquainted with him. On this convict ship, however, Ruaterra received great kindness, and, having recovered his health, he formed a deep friendship for Marsden, and subsequently assisted the early mission work in New Zealand.

On Marsden's return to New South Wales his attention was so much occupied in colonial matters that he was obliged to defer, for a time, the missionary enterprise; but as soon as the opportunity afforded he purchased the *Active*, a brig of 100 tons burden, and in this he prepared to start for New Zealand with two laymen, Messrs. Hall and King, who, however, were obliged to sail by themselves, as Governor Macquarie forbade his leaving the colony.

These first heralds of the Gospel to New Zealand sailed for the Bay of Islands, and, through the influence of Ruaterra, were received with kindness. In 1814 they returned to Sydney in the *Active*, with Ruaterra and six other chiefs, who were most kindly received by Marsden. In the same year—a year famous amongst us for the triumphant entry of the Peninsula

hero and his forces into Paris—Marsden himself sailed to New Zealand, accompanied by Messrs. Kendall, Hall, and King, with their wives and children, and eight Maoris,[1] and some mechanics. The mission work now began in earnest, and was carried on amidst much peril and many difficulties. Marsden made in all seven voyages to New Zealand, and his last was in the year 1837, when he was able to write to the Church Missionary Society an account which glows with pious exultation, describing the success which God had granted to the work of the missionaries. The want of unity, however, amongst the native tribes and the disgraceful[2] conduct of the English and European traders and settlers much troubled him, and he longed for the country to come under the strong hand of British rule; but he was not permitted to see the fulfilment of his desires on this point. He died in 1838, and it was not till the 1st of May, 1840, that the Queen's sovereignty—the result in the North Island of a treaty obtained with the Maoris through the influence of the missionaries—was proclaimed, and New Zealand became a British dependency.

One of Marsden's missionary fellow-workers, the Rev. Mr. Williams (who went to New Zealand in 1825, and afterwards became Bishop of Waiapu) wrote thus, in 1867, of the state of Christianity amongst the Maoris: "Great numbers have fallen away; but it is a cheering fact that there are twelve native clergymen, supported by the contributions of their flocks, amounting to upwards of £3,000, who are labouring with diligence and zeal to lead their countrymen in the right path. The present period is the sifting-time of the Church, a sifting which will be for its benefit."[3]

From the "Church Missionary Report for 1883-84," we gather that, at the present time, the native Christians belonging to the Church of England are 31,865, and that the native clergymen are 27 in number. The total native population is about 45,000. When Marsden was in England, he wrote from Cambridge to a friend, in 1809, respecting what he called his mission to this country: "The object of my mission has been answered far beyond my expectations. I believe that God has gracious designs towards New South Wales, and that His

[1] Maoris are the New Zealand aborigines.

[2] The late Professor Darwin visited the north of New Zealand in 1835, and referred in glowing terms (in his "Naturalist's Voyage round the World," pp. 417-430) to the signs of civilization about the Mission Station at Waimate, Bay of Islands, as well as to the energy and cordiality of the missionaries themselves. He did not think that the Maoris compared favourably with the natives of Tahiti, and he added: "The greater part of the English are the very refuse of society. I look back to one bright spot, and that is Waimate, with its Christian inhabitants."

[3] "Christianity among the New Zealanders," p. 377.

Gospel will take root there, and spread amongst the heathen nations to the glory of His grace."

Governor Macquarie, after consulting Marsden with reference to the Australian aborigines, formed a farm and a kind of reformatory school at Paramatta (which was fifteen miles from Sydney), for the purpose of civilizing and Christianizing them. The attempt, however, failed, partly because the civilized mode of life was so unnatural to the free-roving savage, but more especially because Christianizing was made only subsidiary to the civilizing process. The Governor having conceived a violent prejudice to Marsden, gave him no share in the management of this institution, and several years elapsed before the latter took an active part in its affairs.

The state of the aborigines as years went on became more and more a matter of deep anxiety to Christian men. Attempts to Christianize them were made by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, aided by the Colonial Government, by the Wesleyan and Church Missionary Societies, and by the London Missionary Society, but without success; and yet in Tasmania, in 1830, some 300 aborigines, of the same type as the Australians, and the remnant of a body which numbered 1,600 in 1803, were placed by the Government in Flinders Island, which is two hundred miles in circumference, under the care of a kind protector, Mr. Robinson, and he has earnestly denied that they were incapable of gratitude, courtesy, or kindness, or were not alive to the simple truths of Christianity. At the religious services "their conduct" (he said) "would be a pattern to many congregations of civilized Europeans. In sacred melody they displayed great proficiency. They learned to write, and answered well questions in Scripture history, doctrine, and duty, as well as in arithmetic and useful information. The females showed much aptitude in sewing, etc.; in fact, both sexes gave ample proofs of some degree of mental application and physical industry."

The whole, however, of this little band have melted away, and not one of the aborigines of Tasmania now exists. We might fill pages with tales of the atrocities perpetrated by ill-disposed colonists on the aborigines of Australia and Tasmania, which were quite sufficient to make the latter look upon Christianity as only a designation for more subtle and successful modes of retaliation than the savage black man of the woods possessed; but we must not forget that the Home Government frequently urged on the colonial authorities the necessity for upholding the just and humane treatment of the aborigines, and that, in the fourth year of the present reign, when the Colonial Council passed an Act to check such atrocities, the Governor of New South Wales issued a proclama-

tion, stating plainly that the aborigines were subjects of the Queen, and had an equal right with the people of European origin to the protection and assistance of the law of England.

We turn to a brighter page. When the news of the victory at Waterloo reached the colony, the settlers exerted themselves to send home a subscription to the fund for the relief of the widows and orphans of those who had fallen in the battle[1]. Young Australia soon began to compete for English prizes; and early in the reign of George IV., William Charles Wentworth, an Australian born, was second amongst twenty-five competitors, at the University of Cambridge, for the Chancellor's Medal for the best English Poem on a stated subject. Mr. Praed gained the first place.

In 1822 Sir Thomas Brisbane became Governor of New South Wales, and under him the colonies gained the privilege of a free press and trial by jury; explorations were pushed forward, and reached even to Moreton Bay, which lay 450 miles north of Sydney, and gave the name to a large district now forming part of the great colony of Queensland.

Science received a great impetus under Sir T. Brisbane, for at his own expense he founded an observatory at Paramatta, with skilled assistants to help him in his observations, and he published a catalogue of 7,385 stars.

Year by year, fresh settlements were formed; and in 1826 one was formed at King George's Sound, at the south-west of Australia, to prevent an anticipated attempt on the part of the French to found a colony there. In the early part of the present reign, a fresh impetus was given to immigration; but the discovery of gold in 1851 attracted vast numbers of settlers from all parts of the world, and proved to be a great incentive to the opening up of previously unexplored districts. Cities and towns sprang into existence with marvellous rapidity, and with increased population there came the extension of political privileges, so that in a very few years to the greater part of Australia free parliamentary and legislative powers were fully conceded.

When the centenary anniversary of the Colonial Settlement is celebrated in 1888, the progress of the colonies in material prosperity, unless adversity intervenes, will be the theme of much exultation; and no doubt attention will especially be drawn to the rapidity with which the colony of New South Wales has contributed a force of 800 men to form part of the British army now in Egypt and to the vast loans which

[1] The like practical sympathy of the colonists with the old country has been frequently shown even to the most recent times. More than one-tenth of the Crimean Patriotic Fund was contributed in Australia.

the Colonial Governments have been able to raise in England, and which amount in the aggregate to nearly £100,000,000. These loans are not the same burden to the colonies as the National Debt is to us at home, for they have been expended on remunerative public works, and in the case of New South Wales the interest of its loans is nearly defrayed out of the profits from its public works. Looking at the map of Australasia, which is generally on a scale far smaller than that of the British Isles, we almost fail to grasp the vastness of its area, which is equal to that of Germany, Austria, Italy, and European Russia, and Turkey combined; but if we bear in mind that the smallest colony (Tasmania) is of the area of Ireland, whilst New Zealand is as large as the British Isles, and New South Wales, even in its present reduced condition, is more than three times the size of New Zealand, we may form some idea of the extent of the great Southern Dependency, and realize the responsible trust which God has committed to the British nation.

The rapidity, however, of its growth, and the special drawbacks of its early degraded condition, have been serious obstacles to its religious and moral progress; and we must draw attention to this, as there is no doubt a special risk in its being in some degree lost sight of amidst the glare of the material and financial prosperity to which we have already referred. In 1817 an auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society was formed in New South Wales, and in seven years its remittances to London amounted to £1,400. We turn to the Society's Report of 1884, and we find that the entire Australasian contributions (exclusive of moneys from sale of Scriptures) amounted to only £3,749 1s. 2d., of which the Sydney Committee contributed £1,200; whilst against the name "Melbourne" is a sad blank under the heading "free contributions." We turn to the Church Missionary Society Report for last year, and the *only* entry of contributions from Australia is the sum of £213 17s. 8d., raised in New South Wales. Cannot the Australasian Churches rise to the dignity of being Missionary Churches? We would fain hope that they lack only the opportunity and not the will, for when the late Bishop Patteson visited the Dioceses of Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane in 1864, he received encouragement such as he had never anticipated, and he thanked God for the opportunities afforded to him "in the crowded meetings to tell people face to face their duties, and to stand up as an apologist of the despised Australian black, and the Chinese gold-digger, and the Melanesian islander."

We hope that confederation, which the colonists are earnestly desiring as a means of mutual support in matters

political, may set an example to the Churches for more united action in matters spiritual, and that New South Wales, becoming more and more interpenetrated by a true missionary spirit, may stir up the other colonies to help in the realization of those hopes which Henry Venn expressed in 1786, and to which we have already referred, that the Australian Settlement might prove to be the means of "opening connexions with the heathen, as a foundation for the gospel of our God and Saviour to be preached unto them."

B. A. Heywood.

Art. V.—ARISTOPHANES.

IF a student seeks to epitomize in a single author the greatest difference between the ancient and the modern world, let him turn and re-turn the pages of Aristophanes, more especially the grander, more vigorous and earlier of the eleven extant plays. Probably nothing more trenchant and unscrupulous in manner and in method, and yet few things with a sounder moral purpose, according to the standard of those days, ever issued from human pen. The standard, indeed, was lamentably low—had been higher, and was falling fast. There is some reason to think that Aristophanes was painfully conscious of this—that he felt his own moral convictions pulling him one way, and the popular taste another, and at last found himself unsupported by any adequate reserve of decency and sobriety in the public, and so gave way, at least at intervals, overcome by the strain. He struck hard at the rascal institutions, as he deemed them, into which public sympathy was drifting: the demagogues plunging their country ever deeper in ruin; the sophists, with their new-fangled pretensions of culture, effacing the distinctions of right and wrong; the war-party, with their vain bluster and selfish ends of personal aggrandisement; the Dikasteries, where justice was mobbed out of court by their train of peculating perjurers. The Sovereign people loved a laugh at their own follies, but loved those follies better still. Festive license and factious uproar went hand in hand. The whole male adult population, save those from home on distant expeditions, and absent on indispensable public duty or private business, were at such oft-recurring seasons packed bodily in the theatre. It was no picked audience of casual playgoers, each anxious to see and hear to the full limit of his money at the doors. It was the vast promiscuous public, who at other times filled the Agora, lounged in the baths, lined the wharves of Piræus with traffic,

voted war or peace in the Ekklesia, prepared resolutions in the Senate, acquitted or condemned in the Law Courts. All these and more were there, in one ferment of national enthusiasm, patriotic ardour (or what passed for it), religious fervour, (where the most popular cult was the most scandalous), and holiday frolic, all combined.

Thus the liberties taken with his public by Aristophanes were such as we have no record of elsewhere. He probably never drew more boisterous applause than when assailing the cherished idols of the populace. The exhibition of the Sovereign people itself held up to its own ridicule, "Demus" made the butt of his own stage, in the character of grand old fool, cajoled, wheedled, fleeced, and plundered by his own time-serving varlets, till his fullest confidence is gained by the one who outbids the rest in profligate offers, and outbawls the rest in virulent "Billingsgate"—this is a picture which we don't meet twice in human history. The perfect *carte blanche* of abandonment, the utter irresponsibility with which the power of merciless exposure was for years exercised, the moral tar-and-feathers to which popular celebrities were exposed, are only rivalled by the rich piquancy of sauce in which the whole is served up. How widely different is the attitude in which the modern stage-manager, ever since the traditions of our stage became settled, ventures to stand, or rather cringe, to his public! Sheridan, in a well-known prologue, says,

> I know 'tis hard to deal
> With this dread Court, from which there's no appeal.

Johnson, in a couplet among the best known of all he ever penned, adds,

> The drama's laws the drama's patrons give;
> For they who live to please, must please to live.

But all the distinctions implied between "patron" and patronized, "Court" and pleader were effaced on the Greek stage—even the last distinction between actors and audience faded out. When the "chorus" wheeled round and faced the grand arc of human faces, and unloosed their torrent of uproarious quizzery on the ear, if the lucky key was hit and the popular mood of mind caught in its swing by the poet, a single enthusiasm prevailed and pervaded both performers and public. The minds of all alike, before and behind the curtain (as we should say) danced to the same time and tune. The poet could not hit too hard. If only there was a plausible case which might be put, or questionable issue possible to be raised, the most trusted and meritorious public servant was no more safe from the coarsest personalities and most vehement invective, than a scullion in the royal kitchen of our ancestors would

have been safe from the gibes of the court-fool. But even this does not exhaust the chartered license of the sock. The audience themselves, in that spirit of festive *abandon*, are belaboured with the same cudgel as the social or political scapegoat of the moment; even as in the Horatian entertainment the parasite in his cups cracks jokes at the expense of host as well as guests. Thus the poet rates them in the "Knights", (514 foll.), explaining why he had hesitated to put his play on the stage at once:

'Twas no want of wit that kept him undecided, but the thought
That a comedy's the stiffest work by author ever wrought.—
Comedy, of thy many suitors few indeed thy favours gain!—
Like a man he therefore bids us to your face the facts explain.
Well he knows your captious tempers, annuals that bloom and fade;
How you treated those before him, veteran favourites how betrayed!
Seeing, too, what Magnes suffered, when his hair was turning grey;
None like him from choral rivals so many trophies bore away.
Every note in all his gamut—minstrel touches, birds that flew,
Tried he, Lydians, stage Ascidians,[1] daubed his face a froggy hue—
All he tried, but all too little public favour to secure;
His in lusty youth undreamt of, doomed when agèd to endure;
Cast off, superannuated, when his jokes had lost their sting—
Who shall say, with such examples, comedy's an easy thing?

Can we imagine a modern audience sitting patiently through such a lecture as this on their special prerogative of cashiering their favourites? Garrick's "public," or Kemble's, would have made short work of chandeliers, seats, and scenery, had such liberties been attempted with them.

Of all the greater poets Aristophanes flourished in the period fullest of events most exactly coincident with the city's fortunes. He remembered the rise of Pericles to ascendency, and the outbreak of the war into which his leadership plunged her. He witnessed her overthrow, and shared and survived her political ruin. His plays are a laughing commentary on the severe and stern narrative of Thucydides. He himself helped to make history by his attacks on Cleon.

As the play which includes the most of true poetry with the least of scurrility, has fewest faults of construction and personalities, and is richest in a continuous flow of action, we place the "Birds" unquestionably first. Its motive has not been generally fathomed, and the obscurity hence arising has extended itself to the judgment of certain recent critics.[2] Unless we see the moral clearly, we cannot judge the fable. The idea of grouping the western colonial Greeks under the ægis of

[1] The word means precisely small gall-insects that puncture figs. Magnes, determined to be novel or nothing, brought out among other plays one that contained numerous allusions to this fact of natural history, probably as a vehicle for grossness.

[2] See *Quarterly Review*, No. 316, p. 351.

Athenæ Polias, and thus extending the empire of Athens to the western Mediterranean basin, was the grand possibility which lay on the horizon of the popular mind, then full of the Sicilian expedition. That expedition had newly sailed, was still in the flush of its early hope, was pursuing its diplomatic course among the supposed friendly Sicilian cities, as advised by Alkibiades, and the comparative failure of those negotiations could not be known at Athens till the play was nearly or quite finished. In the presumption of their success, the poet probably sketched his "Castle in the Air." About the time that its merits came before the dramatic censors, probably came home from Sicily the news that nothing was yet done, and that more cavalry and money were wanted. The depression of popular enthusiasm at these tidings was probably what thrust the "Birds" down to the second place of merit. The poet had played for a high stake on a chance die. Had it turned in his favour, his success would have been triumphant. But it depended on the fervid sympathy of the public, and this latter on the absence of any chill to the public hopes. He had thrown his whole heart into his work, but kept still a second string to his bow. It was, after all, but an allegory wrapped in a comic adventure and decorated with all the accessories of a brilliant *fantasia*. If the allegory failed, through any miscarriage of its prototype, the expedition itself, there remained the vehicle thereof and its poetical interest. It was then but a story of "A Cuckoo and a Cloud," with unlimited scope for the tinsel glories of the stage. But that the poet shared to the full the patriotic hopes, and cast into an enchanting form the grand results to which they pointed, there seems no reasonable doubt. The crowning point, however, of the dramatic action, is the starving the gods into surrender. The failure to perceive the allegorical meaning of this has been the reason for missing the entire political bearing of the drama. There seems no doubt that by the "gods" we are to understand the power of Carthage in the far west, with the prospect of ascendency over the various barbarian tribes more or less under her commercial tutelage. This would open up fresh markets to Athenian enterprise, and might place in Athenian hands the key to the commerce and carrying trade which at present Carthage held. This would balance the crippling losses caused to Athenian merchandise in the Levantine and Egyptian direction by the Peloponnesian war, and, to borrow a phrase of modern commerce, would "send up Athenian stock" in all the markets of the world. The flit-about habits of the birds represent the lack of union among the western colonies. The master-eye of a political architect is supposed to detect the grand future which lay before them when combined under the

hegemony of Athens—reproducing in the west the confederacy of Delos and its consequences among the Ægean Islands and coast-towns on the eastern side. The following is the key-note struck in "Birds," (162 foll.). While the shallower adventurer of the two, Euelpides, sees only in the happy random life of bird-land a perpetual honeymoon, his more far-sighted comrade, Peisthetærus, makes a meditative pause and draws a long whistle.

PEISTH.—Whe-w-w-w! A mighty future for the race of birds
I see. Power waits for you. Take my advice!
EPOPS.—Take *what* advice?
PEISTH.—This which I'll give. Stop first.
Those habits flit-about and gape-about. . . . .
EPOPS.—What should we do then?
PEISTH.—Join, and found one city.

The "bird's eye view" of the situation, to which Epops is at once invited by his suggestive friend, includes the heaven and the gods as the foremost object. A power which lay beyond the proposed western confederacy, just as the heaven and the gods in popular conception lay beyond the bird's region of mid-air, is obviously intended. What, then, lay in that direction from the standpoint of Athens? Nothing else than Carthage and the barbarous tribes of the west. For this new Hesperian hope, the first landing-stage was Sicily. Had Athens succeeded there, the "westward march of Empire" might have been hers. In it she would have found the key to the golden west, including the sands of Tagus, the tin of the remote Kassiterides, the purple bales and ingots of Carthage herself—even as the Romans found later. At that sanguine crisis all seemed possible—humanly speaking *was* possible. The conception was grand and the venture heroic. We judge by the event when we pronounce it Quixotic. We ought to consider how near it actually came to success. A little less of blind confidence in the old-womanish strategy of Nikias, a little longer dilatoriness in the mission of Gylippus from Sparta, and the investment of Syracuse in the summer of 414 B.C., would probably have been complete. On that, as far as we can see, the turn of the scale depended. The Athenians would then at any rate have been like the angler who has struck his fish, and only needs dexterity in the use of the landing-net.

We learn from the play (505-6) that the Cuckoo was the signal for the Phœnician harvest, earlier by some months than the Greek.

Cuckoo, at thy voice's signal, the Phœnicians, one and all,
Fall to on their wheat and barley in the plains that hear thy call.

A possible inuendo of the "Phœnician harvest," to be

reaped from Carthaginian traffic on the western main, is conveyed in the fact, that the Cuckoo, in itself an insignificant bird, becomes the *eponymus* of the new city of bird-land, "Cloud-cuckoo-ton." The embassy sent from the starved-out gods is further suggestive. It consists of three members, Poseidon, Herakles, and Triballus. The first of these is the god of the sea, and therefore directly representative of the maritime supremacy of Carthage. In the supposed Homeric reflex of the Phœnician empire of wealth, luxury, and seamanship, found in the Phœacians of the "Odyssey," Poseidon is the local god, whose cult dominates in the Phœacian capital, and whose dangerous wrath is represented as appeased by the transformation of the Phœacian galley to a rock in the harbour's mouth. Herakles,[1] the next deity, has Carthaginian affinities through the Syrian Herakles, or Melkarth, besides his traditionary hold upon the west through the legend of Geryon and its localization at Gades. He may well, therefore, be the colleague of the sea-god here. The third represents the local deities of aboriginal barbarians generally; although the best known to the Greeks, those namely of their own northern border, the Triballi, naturally furnish the denomination of the deity actually introduced in the play. The popular mind would appropriate this symbolization readily, while any actually western Celtic or Iberian name would have only puzzled his audience, if the poet had known of any. Thus we are inclined to solve the riddle of the "Birds."

The "Wasps" plants us face to face with the most cherished, frequented, and characteristic of all the Athenian institutions —that of the Heliastic Courts or "Dikasteries." The great political assembly (*Ekklesia*) met monthly, or on special occasions; but on most days of most months, some or all of these courts would be found sitting. Let us consider what they were. Every year six thousand citizens of thirty years or upwards were selected by lot, from whom, in batches of five hundred, the members constituting the courts were empanelled. Each was awarded about sixpence a day for his services; and, as far as we know, no fine or censure lighted upon anyone for non-performance of the duty. The consequence naturally was, that only the poorer and older class would find it worth their while to attend, unless in exceptional cases of high public interest, such, perhaps, as the impeachment of Sokrates. The fact of seniority would be some guarantee for experience and sobriety of judgment. The fact of poverty would create a bias against men of wealth, and incline the court to view them as fair game for fines, etc.,—

[1] Homer, "Odyssey," xiii., 125 foll., cf. vii. 56 foll.

would, in fact, tend to make it a "poor man's court." It would further, with wealth, exclude the higher education and the more liberal standard of public sentiment. A court thus constituted, though its individual members might often be changed, would not be modified in its moral and social elements. It would thus tend to generate and fix its own traditions of class-feeling, and the better born or better educated citizens of the higher class, on the probably rare occasions when they took their turn of duty, would find themselves without influence and with little support. But two further considerations lead us to depreciate the efficiency of such courts as instruments of justice: 1. The numerous body, probably seldom less than four hundred, among whom the responsibility was shared. To divide responsibility is notoriously to dilute it. The lowest moral standard current among the various members is then apt to prevail. Men who are packed in courts four or five hundred strong feel the weakness of conscience in exact proportion as they know the power of numbers is on their side. To empanel such a phalanx, even of men individually without reproach, would be to abase their sense of public duty and to give free play to the more corrupt instincts of their common nature. But much more would this be the case when they came from the promiscuous civic body, with no guarantee whatever for personal rectitude. But, 2. The unwieldy and irresponsible mass were wholly without judicial experts to guide them, and consequently without any traditional rules of evidence or collected body of precedent. They were judges at once of law, and of fact, and of the application of the former to the latter, and all without appeal. The whole thing forms such a ready-made caricature of judicial institutions that the work of the satirist was nearly done to his hand. The nervous horror with which such a court was regarded by men made sensitive by higher culture, and whose wealth led them to court retirement and seek leisure, may easily be conceived. Nor should we lose sight of the army of spies, informers, pettifoggers, and perjurers, whom such a system was sure to encourage, and who found their harvest in the intimidation of the former. That this was the bane of Athenian life would seem pretty certain, if we had not the testimony of Aristophanes abundantly in the play before us, and occasionally in various others. But if the Athenians themselves suffered much, the subject foreigners, whether resident at Athens or not, must have suffered vastly more. And the oppressiveness thus felt must have made heavy a yoke of subjection which every dictate of sound policy should have made as light as possible. This accounts largely for what else we should have found it difficult to assign an adequate

reason for, tho inherent unpopularity and consequent weak hold of Athens upon her subject states. The payment of tribute and other strictly public burdens are comparatively little felt by individuals; but the liability to be haled before an Athenian court, where the weakness of popular government was a standing peril to justice, and the contemptuousness of the sovereign citizens invited to a studied outrage of its claims—this brought home to the private citizen of Lesbos or Byzantium the feeling of how little account his interests were in the eyes of his political masters.

Of course, the moral evil of the system came home most surely to those engaged in it. The temper of wanton arrogance and waspish intolerance, the love of doing mischief in order to display power, was what debauched the political mind of Athens, and degraded her civic type. Aristophanes probably exaggerates least in this of all his broader pictures. We will sketch from his draught.

In this play an old thorough-paced court-monger, Philocleon (*i.e.*, fond admirer of Cleon, the demagogue), has a son, Bdelucleon (*i.e.*, detester of the same), who, impatient of his father's disease of Law Courts "on the brain," blockades the dwelling-house to keep the latter at home.

The symptoms are humorously detailed as follows:—The old man is always in the rush for the first bench in Court; can't sleep a wink for dreaming of the Clepsydra (or water-clock, by which proceedings were timed); then starts up with two fingers and a thumb firmly grasping nothing; the attitude of one fingering his ballot-pebble—then chides the cock, though it crows overnight, for not waking him soon enough, from corrupt motives; calls for his walking shoes the first thing after supper; repairs at once to Court, and is found fast asleep there with his head against a pillar, "like a limpet sticking" to a rock. Wax clings to his thumb-nails, as if he secreted it like a bee, from his everlastingly scratching on the waxed tablet, the sign of condemning a culprit; and for fear voting-pebbles should ever run short, he keeps "a whole beach of them" in a closet. Boxed up by his son by main force, who has tried persuasion in vain, he makes an amusing scene by his efforts to escape by roof, window, gutters, bath-drain vent, etc. At last they pitch a stout net over all possible exits, and catch him attempting to escape, like Ulysses under the ram's belly from the Cyclops' cave, by hanging on under a donkey. There would clearly be plenty of room for stage business of the most farcical kind here. Supposing they have him safe at last, guard is relaxed. Enter the chorus of fellow-jurymen, all accoutred as magnified wasps with prodigious stings, and led by link-boys, for it is

not yet daylight. They come to rouse their mate, whose unwonted tardiness, so unlike his eager appetite for business, they account for by supposing that it must be the effect of letting a defendant slip through his fingers the day before. The following is part of their song (278-90):

CHORUS-LEADER.

Of our lot he was aye the most resolute found,
Most rough to persuasion,
Whom no supplication
Could move; but who'd sit with his eyes on the ground,
And answer each moan
A suitor could make with "You're cooking a stone!"[1]
But in yesterday's Court, one defendant o'ercame us
With false protestation
Of zeal for the nation,
That "he was the first to inform against Samos;"
And letting him go,
To our friend's such a blow,
That to-day he's in bed, and can't hold up his head—
That's exactly his sort. But (*to* PHILOCLEON) old fellow, instead
Of eating your heart with vexation—rouse up!
Here's a sop for your cup!
Here's a promising case!
From the frontiers of Thrace
A very fat traitor is come to be bled!
In court when we've got him,
Look out that you "pot" him.
(*To Link-boy.*) Lead on, boy!

BOY (*coaxingly*).

Please y'r honour, remember the boy!

CHORUS-LEADER (*patronizingly*).

Of course, little fellow, you'd like a nice toy:
It's dumps or it's marbles, you'd wish me to buy.

LINK-BOY.

No, not if I know it; figs, guv'nor, says I—
Them's nicest!

CHORUS-LEADER.

Want figs?—want a whipping, I'm thinking!

LINK-BOY.

Then, next time you get some one else to come linking.

CHORUS-LEADER (*indignantly*).

Why, it's all I've got
To boil the pot,
For me and two others *this* pays the scot!
To find all three
On a sixpenny fee,
And then to be bothered for figs by thee!

The reader will notice the tempting prospect of fleecing a rich plaintiff, which is expected to set the old limb of the law on his legs again at once; also the trumpery benevolence

[1] Greek proverb for "You're flogging the dead horse," or the like.

offered to the link-boy, and the recoil of the leader of the chorus of pauper jurymen the moment the gratuity demanded threatens a serious tax on their sixpence a day!

As a sample of insolence revelling in the limitless democratic power wielded by poverty-stricken jurors over wealthy suitors, and the abject court paid to them by the latter, take the following (548-575), where the father, Philocleon, is declaiming on these sweets of office to his son, Bdelucleon, who takes notes here and there with a view to his reply:

FATHER.

Right along from start to finish, take this with you all the way;
Dikasts we: our lot is royal, absolute our kingly sway.
Jollier life than ours, or happier, find me; oldish though we be,
Find a creature half so pamper'd, half so idoliz'd as we!
When we quit our beds, escorted, waited for within the bar,
By your men of wealth and riches: almost, ere I've got so far,
Some one puts in mine a hand with peculation in the palm;
Down he knuckles, humbly truckles with persuasion's softest balm—
"Won't your worship have a fellow-feeling, when you call to mind
How *you* pick'd the public pocket, now in money, now in kind—
Perquisites and contracts?" All this from a fellow who'd ignore
My existence, but for one fact—that I'd let him off before!

SON (*interrupting*).

If you've with supplications done,
There's memorandum number one.

FATHER (*not heeding*).

In I go, while such entreaties smooth my anger's edge away.
Once inside, I just do nothing of the things I always say.
But I hear defendants whining to elude the verdict's blow—
Nothing they won't say to win me—none of 'em can cringe too low.
If I'm deaf to this palaver, in their children next they trail
By the hand, both sons and daughters, our compassion to assail.
Down they crouch—a bleating chorus; like a god I keep my seat.
On behalf of all, the father, like a suppliant at my feet,
Pleads with agonized entreaty: "Only let me off my bail;
If a lambkin's voice can move thee, be not deaf to childhood's wail."
Then we let judicial sternness down a peg or two—declare,
Aren't we kings downright, and *don't* we make the wealthy abjects stare?

A machinery here appears ready to hand, by which public security was loosened, and the social bond sensibly relaxed. Any political enemy might on frivolous pretences be impeached. The same voices which howled him down in the Ekklesia were ready to inflict ruinous fine or imprisonment in the Dikastery. The villain army of hireling informers flourished and fattened on every such job. The judge and juror, both in one, or rather equally everywhere in five hundred, came to the decision flushed with political rancour, eager at once to insult and injure. The primary conditions of social atmosphere which make justice possible were wanting here. This, far more than the bitterness of the Spartan ravages, or the collapse of costly

armaments, had a disintegrating effect on Athenian patriotism, by making the worthiest citizens a constant prey to the vilest. A legalized terrorism of extortion, under the forms of justice, made civic life unbearable, and led men to seek a remedy in revolution. Hence the frequent and violent fluctuations between the "few" and the "many" which mark the latter years of the Peloponnesian War. After all the costly sacrifices made, the men who had made the most felt that they were made in vain. Domestic peace and personal security within the walls of Athens were a vain dream, while each Dikastery was a band of guerillas armed each with his stiletto vote. Why not join hands with the Spartans outside? The result of the Peloponnesian War, up to this time, had been to crowd the city with those who should have been pursuing their special industries without its walls. The rural homestead was no more; agriculture was, over the greater part of Attica, stamped out, and the soil lay fallow in the cold ashes of the farm-buildings, with their stock and plant which had stood upon it. Driven from occupation as well as domesticity, the rustic was demoralized by the laziness of the Agora, and became a needy shiftless recruit of the lower class of population in the capital. The one small, sure wage which he could now earn lay in the business of the Courts; he made the plunge, accepted the situation, and became a Dikast, as the only means to "keep the wolf from the door." The pauperized citizen soon became ardent in his new calling, and a standing menace to all whose fortunes were better than his own. This background of circumstance, inseparable from the enforced domiciliation within the walls, throws out in salient angles the harsh, hunger-sharpened features which the Dikasteries, as an institution, had newly assumed when Aristophanes drew them. The real caricature contained in the "Wasps" is the latter portion, and the piece, like its namesake, carries its sting in its tail. Here a moral *tour de force*, such as belong to extravaganza rather than to comedy, is supposed to suddenly convert the elderly Dikast into a fashionable debauchee. Being persuaded by his son to set up Court at home, he tries the house-dog *in foro domestico* for pilfering the larder, and by a stage-trick, not perhaps more violent than Hamlet's exchange of rapiers, drops his pebble in the wrong urn, and acquits when he would condemn. On discovering this error his remorse rises to a tragic pathos of self-abhorrence, and he bewails his unwitting act in terms worthy of Œdipus on discovering his woe. Taking advantage of this moral collapse of his whole nature, his son with little difficulty persuades him to utterly abjure all that he has been hitherto. Gradually coaxed into a new dress, the father drops (if a pun may be excused in such

matter of farce) his old *habits*, and at once out-herod's fashionable vice in its most offensive forms. From this transformation scene the moral tone of the piece, which has been comparatively pure hitherto, drops down below zero. This probably became a dramatic necessity when this line of development was once adopted. It would be only by gross exaggeration that the comicality of the situation could be sustained. But the result is a compound of bibulous ribaldry, quarrelsomeness, coxcombry, and sensuality, in which all trace of the graces of manner of an Athenian symposium vanish under the influence of Comus.

A recent commentator[1] supposes that the poet, finding his improved edition of his "Clouds" still unsuccessful, in which, and in some earlier plays he had attempted to chasten the style of the comic stage, and having up to that time written the first part of this play, the "Wasps," upon his own higher canon, now in disgust abandoned it, and finished the latter part by pandering to the baser Athenian instincts in a style of coarse and vulgar buffoonery. That the two parts of the "Wasps" do not cohere, is certain. Poverty is, we have seen, the proclaimed characteristic of the average Dikast. Yet here Philocleon is arrayed, by a turn of the poet's wand, in luxurious attire, and supposed to be introduced as a matter of course into the society of *bon-vivants* and fashionable profligates, who, we are to suppose, receive him with open arms. The absurdity of this is manifest, when judged by any possible social standard, past or present. And this leads us to note the weak point of Aristophanes' poetical development. That he had in him the power to draw and sustain original character with wholeness and consistency, we can hardly doubt, from the partial sketches which he has given us in his "Dikaeopolis," his "Trygæus," his "Peisthetærus," and others. But he always wrote with a motive, at once to teach and to amuse, and the exigencies of the double task—the web and woof, as it were, of this motive—obliged him to cut his characters according to his cloth. The ethical march of each of them accordingly halts, and no harmonized result of the character and its surroundings is ever achieved. With all the artist touch for face and figure in their higher types, he has condemned himself to caricature, and the result is one which seems a blending of Raffael with Gillray,

[1] See some remarks by Mr. B. B. Rogers, late fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, who has lately revised and translated this play with much merit. The "Clouds" appeared twice, the last time with some piquant additions in 423 B.C., but not even thus remounted was successful. The "Wasps" appeared some two months after this failure. The poet had thus plenty of time to revoke his first ideas and remould the termination.

Thus moral consistency and consequent dignity is perhaps the only point at which Molière surpasses him, while in poetic brilliancy of imagination and sudden flashes of Parnassian lightning he leaves Molière far behind. But Molière travels on a paved road, where all the comic writers of the old world, besides the mighty Spaniards of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, had been his pioneers. Aristophanes had to hew and pave his own way, through rock and quagmire. Aristophanes is the explorer of an unknown ocean in the infancy of navigation. Molière sails on a sea with the chart before him, where all soundings are registered and all shoals lighted by the experience of those who have gone before.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

(*To be continued.*)

ART VI.—DISESTABLISHMENT AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

CHURCHMEN of all schools and of both political parties have a very unwelcome alternative thrust upon them. A General Election is evidently impending, and the active preparations for it on all sides have already generated amongst us something of the heat of the contest. Everyone who has "a vote and interest" has already laid on him the duty of considering what he will do and say. We Churchmen find, to our regret, that the Church is pressed into the foreground of the political strife. We must either stand passively by and see her made now the theme and ultimately the victim of unscrupulous calumny and unmeasured misrepresentation, or we must speak out and act too with a vigour, a determination, and a unanimity which thus far we have never yet applied. Concession after concession has been made in the hope of appeasing those gentlemen who bear the question-begging appellation of "Liberationists," and, far from being satisfied, they are only emboldened to demand the instant and total destruction of the National Church. Wherever they can bring any influence to bear that is worth using they exercise it without the smallest reserve or compunction, and the effect has already been marked in more than one constituency. Professor James Stuart, when he asked the electors of the University of Cambridge for their votes at the General Election, pledged himself definitely against Disestablishment. And why? Because he knew well enough that his cause was hopeless unless he did so. But when he had last year to solicit the suffrages of the electors of Hackney

—a borough in which Nonconformists are thought to be unusually strong—he was constrained to declare himself in favour of Disestablishment "in principle," and in favour too of applying that principle immediately in Scotland and Wales. This is only a very gross and glaring instance of what is going on elsewhere. Does any reasonable person believe that Professor Stuart's views had really undergone such a change on this very large question in four years, or that if he had had the same constituency to court in 1884 that he had to deal with in 1880, he would not have used the same language? He said what he said at Hackney because he feared that he would not win the seat if he did not say it. That is the plain English of the matter.

And if this be so, is not the duty and the policy plain of those Churchmen who are altogether opposed to the plans of the Liberationists? Whether they be Tory Churchmen or Radical Churchmen—whether they be "High," "Low," or "Broad"—their proper course is to make it understood by candidates at the next election, that they will vote without hesitation against any of them who will not pledge himself to maintain the rights and property of the Church. No doubt this may involve in some cases a sacrifice from the political point of view. That sacrifice will, however, seldom be very considerable. Between the moderate Liberal and the moderate Conservative, between the man of sense and patriotism who sits behind Mr. Gladstone and Sir W. Harcourt, and him of the same sort who ranges himself under Sir Stafford Northcote, there is not that wide and deep gulf of divergence or political principle that there was between the two sides of the House forty years ago. Moreover it is manifest also that party differences turn—with the exception of this very question of Disestablishment—rather upon the foreign than the domestic concerns of the empire. And if in every constituency those Churchmen will act together who deem that the maintenance of the Church's claims to her own is a vital matter, they are quite strong enough to make a distinct impression on the result of the elections. In many places they would hold the key of the situation, and might turn the result this way or that by the transfer of their votes. It is very instructive to remember that in 1880 the seats were many which would have been lost to those who carried them had a score of electors migrated from one side to the other. It is quite evident, too, that tactics like these are being employed by Mr. Lyulph Stanley, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Richard, and their allies; and such tactics can only be effectually met and baffled by a counterstroke of the same description. If we can dispose of the Liberationist agitation at the next General Election, we shall, in all probability, have settled its fate permanently. There

are many signs that Dissent, as a religious power in the land, is declining—we believe somewhat rapidly declining. If they cannot score a victory at the ensuing elections, they will never win one at all, at least in our generation. It is the sense of this—the conviction that it is "now or never"—which goads the Liberationists and their allies to those spasmodic efforts which we see them to be making just at present.

The strength of the political Dissenters lies simply in their unity of action and in the belief, which they contrive to produce by their energetic attitude, that their voting power and influence are really very considerable. The truth is that the Protestant Dissenters in England are certainly less in number than a quarter of the nation "all told." Nothing could be more decisive in its way than the voluntary census taken in Liverpool, in 1881, under the auspices of the Bishop, and on a scheme arranged by that master of statistics the late Canon Hume. There is no pretext for alleging that it is so imperfect as to be worthless for argument, for it was taken but some three months after the thoroughly exhaustive Government census. The latter was dated in April; the former was begun in August. The numbers registered in the two corresponded so nearly as to shut out all possibility of serious errors in the result. The difference between the Government return and that secured by voluntary agency was about 50,000 out of a population of near 600,000 in the city and immediate neighbourhood. And of this unaccounted 50,000, nearly half was due to sailors and emigrants, who sojourn in or near the port for a night or two, but cannot be got at by non-official persons; and a large portion of the rest consisted of the inmates of prisons, asylums, workhouses, hospitals, and so on. Now, no Nonconformist could fairly object that, in taking the population of Liverpool, we are taking a sample either too small for argument or too peculiar to be fair to his cause. On the contrary, the very large proportion of non-English elements in the population, render Liverpool a place where Dissent is undoubtedly above rather than below its normal strength. There are thousands and tens of thousands of Welsh and Scotch in Liverpool who contribute greatly to swell the ranks of Dissent there. What, then, were the relative dimensions of the religious bodies represented in the city and suburbs, and included in Canon Hume's return? The Church counted 53·7 per cent. of the grand-total; the Roman Catholics, nearly all Irish of course, 27·1; those who declined to make a return were but 1·1; and the Protestant Nonconformists were but 18·1 per cent.

Nor are these the only facts and figures which yield similar results. Of our seamen and marines, more than 75 per cent. describe themselves as members of the Church of England.

In the army there are always very large numbers of Irish ; but yet more than 62 per cent. of its rank and file are Churchmen. Of the poor in workhouses, nearly 80 per cent. are so ; and of prisoners undergoing their sentences quite 75 per cent. The marriage-rate furnishes perhaps less reliable ground for argument, since many who would certainly enrol themselves as Dissenters in a census, prefer to be married at Church. This fact has, however, a value of its own, as indicating that there is not always insuperable alienation from the Church even when the Chapel is preferred. Yet, making all allowance for such inconsistency amongst Dissenters, it is surely of great significance that in 1884 very nearly 83½ per cent. of all the marriages that took place within the Metropolitan area were solemnized in Church, only 4 per cent. by Protestant Dissenting ministers. And this, we think, is a larger disproportion than was ever before known, though the disproportion has always been very large indeed.

It is impossible fairly to withstand the inferences which these statistics disclose. The strength of the Nonconformists in Parliament is altogether out of proportion to their numbers in the country ; and there is no way to redress the disadvantage to which the Church is in consequence exposed, except for Churchmen to resolve unanimously that when it comes to a question of the Church's property and the Church's national status, minor differences shall be sunk, and those members of Parliament who vote on the wrong side or absent themselves (a favourite expedient with weak-kneed politicians) on a critical division be made to understand that Churchmen of all sorts will remember at the ballot-box their failures of duty. Candidates who falter when plain questions are put to them about Church measures now in Parliament, or announced as projected, ought to be opposed without compromise or hesitation. Before we altogether quit the subject of the Liverpool census, we may remark how completely its success disposes of the difficulties decennially alleged by Dissenters in Parliament when Government decennially proposes that inquiry should be made as to the religious profession of the people. Such statistics are collected without the least difficulty in Ireland, and could be obtained just as easily and as thoroughly as any other statistics in England. The reason why Dissenters in England object to their being asked for is plain enough. They know that the results would at once explode the false and exaggerated notions which they have artfully contrived to manufacture about their numbers and their importance. How awkward their position has become in consequence of their boasts about their numbers on the one hand, and their dread of being enumerated on the

other, is apparent enough from the reiterated attempts made under the auspices of the Liberation Society to get up here and there—wherever they think Nonconformity specially strong—some sort of a partial substitute for a real census of religious opinion. The last enterprise of the kind was in February last, when, under the pretext of enlightening the Bishop of London as to the real state of the diocese which he was called on to govern, the *Nonconformist* newspaper published a statement of "church sittings" provided by the Church and the sects in the Metropolitan area. The point of the return concerned Mission-rooms, Schoolrooms used for worship, and such like. In these it was alleged that the Dissenters provided 194,685 sittings against 64,200 furnished by the Church. Nobody who knows anything about the Metropolis believed this, and it is a stretch of charity to believe that the compiler believed it himself. However, somewhat later in that same month the "Official Year Book" for 1885 came out, and showed that in the diocese of London there were 93,042 such sittings, and in that of Rochester, 63,190; to say nothing of many hundreds more which are found in those parts of London included in the county of Essex and diocese of St. Albans.

We are a little afraid that the real bearings of this whole question upon the welfare of the country have not been by many at all seriously considered. We take it for granted that no one with the least tincture of statesmanship in him would ever deem it possible that a measure of Disestablishment would pass without its being accompanied with a Disendowment partial or total. That any Parliament in its senses would ever set entirely free from State supervision and official regulation a community like the Church, and would leave it in so doing in full possession and independent control of its property of various kinds, is simply inconceivable. That property is too little, indeed, for the work the Church has to do; and its amount has been vastly, and we fear we must say purposely, exaggerated by Liberationist orators, who are not ashamed to appeal to the cupidity of ignorant hearers. But yet in the aggregate the property is large. The inheritance of the Church is but a fragment of what was once hers, but it is a noble fragment notwithstanding. The statesmen who should take in hand the gigantic enterprise of severing Church and State would undoubtedly feel it incumbent on him to try and weaken the ecclesiastical power thus emancipated from civil superintendence by reducing it to as deep a poverty as he could hope to be allowed to inflict. Have those who palter with the question ever thought out the consequences of a wholesale spoliation of the Church of England? Those conse-

quences would be manifold and far-reaching. First and foremost we must name the general surrender of Church Schools. These would be "thrown on the rates," and Churchmen would save thereby something not far short of three-quarters of a million of annual contributions. The ultra-Radical, of course, would reckon this as one of the recommendations of Disestablishment, not as an evil incident to it. What the British ratepayer would have to say when the enormous extra burden was suddenly thrown on him, we can guess very well. For the amount of that burden would certainly be double or treble the sum now raised from Churchmen in the shape of "voluntary contributions" by reason of the excessive costliness of the School Board system. To many of us, the instant unpopularity of the cause of education altogether, and the serious check it would receive all through the land, will seem serious considerations.

If our property were taken from us, Churchmen would undoubtedly have to concentrate on maintaining their churches and clergy very large sums which are now set free for general charitable purposes. We will not quote the figures which the Hospital Sunday collections in every large community afford. The churches often contribute two-thirds, sometimes three-fourths, sometimes more, of the totals. These amounts would certainly be largely reduced under the state of things we are suggesting. There is not a medical, or benevolent, or educational institution in the land which would not suffer terribly, and many would be simply ruined. Similar results must be apprehended for Home and Foreign Missionary work; for all enterprises of extending and improving religious machinery; for all societies and organizations which dedicate themselves to caring for and curing the manifold vices and miseries which infest this fallen world. Of course we shall be reminded of "the six million of annual income" with which the Church is credited, and of the immense sums available out of this for national purposes. To which it is enough here to rejoin that no such income, nor anything near it, exists for the spoiler's hand to reach. Those who talk of these amounts cannot be acquitted of deliberate misrepresentation until, indeed, they plead guilty of culpable ignorance. And whatever amount could by any ingenuity be laid hold of, as "national property," would be greatly diminished by the inevitable compensations. All experience, too, —that of the Irish Disestablishment the last—shows how lamentable is the waste always connected with processes of this nature. It does not at all follow that the State would get three or four millions of anuual available income for its purposes because it had ousted the Church from possessions which to her had been worth that amount.

We abstain from entering on the large and grave consequences to the security of property at large, and from describing the general mistrust and apprehension which the spoliation of the Church would beget. Speaking broadly, the property of the Church is the gift of individuals. It cannot be pleaded, in any way, that the purposes to which their gifts were dedicated are obsolete. It cannot be pleaded that church endowments, like some ancient charities—we will say, *e. g.*, those left in the earlier part of the Middle Ages to found hospitals for lepers—ought now to be taken in hand and diverted to some useful object, since that for which they were bequeathed has ceased to be. Nor is there room here for the principle of "*cy près*." The very cause for which the Church revenues were parted from the private possession of individuals and dedicated to God's service is as conspicuous in the national life and as much needing succour as in the dim ages far away when the first tithes were allotted to the Church. And these donations of individuals have been in every way sanctioned and encouraged by the State. To seize them now, and apply them to quite other purposes than that for which they were originally destined, is a transaction quite unprecedented in this country. It is not at all similar to the readjustment of old endowments by the Charity Commissioners; it is not even similar to the dealings of Parliament with the Church of Ireland sixteen years ago. Indeed, at the time, no little pains were expended in demonstrating that the case of that Church was altogether in another category from our own.

The Church of England is living, growing, and working, and what has been given to her by her children to help her in her mission, cannot be taken from her by anything else than mere violence and robbery. Is it possible that measures of this character can be got through the Legislature without other ancient institutions being undermined and shaken? It is noteworthy in this connection that almost half the tithes at present belonging to parochial incumbents have been bestowed or restored to the parishes, not only since the Reformation, but since the Restoration. They were given to a Church which is identical in creed, worship, and discipline with that of our own day, even down to the Act of Uniformity. And even as regards the older endowments at present in possession of the Church, it is false to say that the State diverted them from Roman Catholic purposes to those of the national faith. The endowments that were specially mediæval in date and Roman in nature—the legacies for masses, chantries, and monastic institutions — were confiscated wholesale in the sixteenth century, and hardly any part of them remains to us. What does remain is the still more ancient parochial endowments,

or rather some portion of them, assigned by landowners and others interested in the parish priest and the parish church in ante-Papal times, if we may so say. Unless property become national property simply because it was bequeathed to a religious purpose long ago, there is no more reason for asserting that the State can justly confiscate the revenues of an ancient English rectory, than that it can appropriate the funds raised five years ago to found a Bishopric of Liverpool.

It ought, we think, to open the eyes of those who hesitate about defending the Church Establishment, and it ought to embolden those who are prepared to resist the threatened revolution, when they mark what allies the Liberationists are not ashamed to invoke. When we are asked to believe that this movement is designed for the benefit of the Church as a religious organization, and that, when it has wrought the change, the Church will find herself much more strong, free, and efficient, we inquire whether this can be the reason why Mr. John Morley, a leading Agnostic, aids the Liberation Society as a member of its council; or why Mr. Frederic Harrison, the leading Comtist, does so by lecturing? Do Mr. Lyulph Stanley, Mr. Labouchere, and others of the same clique, who work with the Liberationists, desire to invigorate and extend the religious agencies of the country? We think it is time that men, personally pious and earnest, such we believe Mr. Richard to be, laid aside these unworthy allegations, with which it is indeed quite possible that they have sometimes been deceiving themselves. Disestablishment and disendowment would greatly cripple the religious work of the Church in every department; and these men might easily know, if they do not, that it would do so. What their own forefathers in the faith, Baxter, Howe, Matthew Henry, or to come down to more recent times, Angell James and Pye Smith, would have said to an alliance offensive and defensive with unbelievers, we forbear to inquire. The truth is that the whole character and attitude of Nonconformity in this country have been greatly modified in the last two generations. Formerly the Dissenters had substantial grievances, for which they sought redress. In seeking this, they had, and deserved, the help of many good patriots and loyal Churchmen. They have no grievance left at all now, except indeed that which Mr. Guinness Rogers gave utterance to a few months ago, that the mere existence of the Church Establishment wounded his conscience. This is as nearly a sample of pure envy, to use no harsher word, as could well be imagined. The modern Dissenter is too often a politician first, and sometimes acts and speaks as if he were nothing else. And it is curious that, whilst the conscientious objections of the old-fashioned Dis-

senters to Church doctrines and modes of worship have receded into the background, the hostility to the Church herself, which used to be explained wholly by these objections, has grown if anything more intense. The more unreasonable the attack on the Church, the more firmly, the more unanimously ought it to be resisted. We are not in the least afraid of the verdict of the new constituencies if Church-people will take a little trouble to enlighten the minds of the people about the facts of the case. The Liberationist movement is more imposing than solid. The Society has a revenue of £8,000 a year or thereabouts; but the bulk of it comes from a few wealthy individuals who contribute large sums. If the friends of the Church, and indeed we might say the friends of religion in the broadest sense of the word, and of morality and charity as well, exert themselves wisely and perseveringly for the next few months, we shall probably see a decline if not a collapse of the misnamed "Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Control."

T. E. ESPIN.

Short Notices.

God in Nature. By Rev. R. APPLETON, M.A., Fellow and Senior Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: Church of England Sunday School Institute.

THIS little book consists of a series of lessons on Natural Theology. It is based on Psalm civ., and is intended primarily for teachers. The lessons are of the nature of outlines. They often suggest lines of thought without developing them; and to carry out the author's plan in its integrity, should be supplemented by wider study before the subject is dealt with in public. For such study a valuable list of works is given in the Preface; and constant reference is made throughout to the highest authorities, as Barry, Kingsley, Flint, on the one hand, and Mill, Darwin, Huxley, on the other. These latter are named not because the author accepts all their conclusions, but because their writings should be studied by those who would know what opinions are held by scientific men of the day. The originality of the book lies in its method and aims, rather than in its matter. It does not pretend to do more than collect in a convenient form the arguments on which Natural Theology is based. The latest results of scientific research—such at least as are established by consensus of the leading physicists—are set forth in a lucid mode devoid of technicalities, and they are shown to be, when viewed in their true perspective, not incompatible with the Bible's teaching.

As a specimen lesson we select that on the words "How manifold are Thy works, O Lord." This introduces the argument for Causation. The steps are stated by which we infer that as a clock or table has a cause to which it owes its existence, so the human mind must owe its existence to a cause of some sort. And since it is *primâ facie* improbable that

Mind originated from Matter, and there is not even a shadow of scientific evidence to support such a theory, we are entitled to draw the conclusion that the human Mind originated from a Divine Mind. But Mr. Appleton points out that this conclusion is not one of absolute mathematical certainty, but only of a high degree of probability, which is, however, enhanced by other converging lines of argument and by the revelation of the Bible in particular.

The above is an imperfect sketch of a book which may be cordially recommended as a very useful basis of a course of teaching on a most important subject. If the spread of materialism is to be arrested, it will be by teaching such as "God in Nature" contains: teaching candid and reverent, which neither shrinks from scientific investigations nor evades their meaning, but which, recognising the limitation of human faculties, steadily refuses to contract the infinite within the compass of the finite.

C. ALFRED JONES.

His Personal Presence. The Secret of a bright and fragrant Life. By the Rev. T. W. THOMAS, B.A., Curate of St. Giles', Norwich. With Introduction by H. F. BOWKER, Esq. Pp. 128. Nisbet and Co. 1885.

Simple, earnest, and affectionate; this little book may help many. It is all about Christ.

Family Prayers for Four Weeks. By the Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, M.A., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury. Suttaby and Co. 1885.

Many who know Mr. Calthrop's writings will be glad to secure this volume. The prayers are short, suggestive, and spiritual. The volume is, as to size, convenient, and is printed in large clear type.

The Pulpit Commentary. Jeremiah, Vol. II. Exposition by Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.; Homiletics by Rev. W. F. ADENEY, M.A.; Homilies by various authors. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co. 1885.

The second volume of this Commentary on Jeremiah appears in every respect equal to the first which we recommended when it was published. Dr. Cheyne's views of the authorship of the Lamentations we are not able at present to state and criticize. His notes are excellent.

Child Life in Chinese Homes. By Mrs. BRYSON, of the London Mission, Wuchang, China. With many Illustrations. Pp. 297. R. T. S. 1885.

"More than nine years ago I set sail for far-off China. Since then the city of Wuchang-fu, six hundred miles up the great Yang-tse-kiang, has been my home. When I arrived there, how extraordinary the little pig-tailed boys and small-footed girls looked to me!" So opens the preface of this book. The author tells about Chinese children in the city and in the country; children paying visits to the Mission House, living in mountain cottages or on lake and river-boats. Her pictures of social life are very well drawn. You see boys and girls at home, at school, at play. Mrs. Bryson also talks about the results of Mission labour. "Chih Shwin, or the Mandarin's little Page," and "Chwin-E, or the Flower that faded," for example, are interesting records. The "Jesus religion" is spreading in China: devoted men and women are not without encouragement. One of Mrs. Bryson's chapters is about the two boy-Emperors. The engravings are numerous and good; "Chinese Chess-players" is excellent. The volume is tastefully got up, and forms an admirable prize or gift-book.

Brief Thoughts and Meditations on some Passages in Holy Scripture. By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin and Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick. Macmillan and Co. 1884.

For Dr. Trench's books many readers, like ourselves, have always had a peculiar regard. All his Grace's writings have characteristics of a high order, and some of them may be regarded as in certain respects standing by themselves, nearly if not quite alone. The charms of style and rich ripe culture are heightened by gentleness and devotion. The Archbishop of Dublin has made his mark upon the Church on both sides the Channel in divers manners; but the generation which may know little of the fidelity, modesty, and self-sacrifice of the honoured prelate, will at least be able to profit by his books. The little book before us is excellent; it is both practical and suggestive. The "True Vine," "Humility," "Esau," and "Fear of Death" are some of its thirty-four brief chapters.

The King's Palace. By Rev. J. H. ROGERS, M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Pau. Morgan and Scott.

This little book, says the esteemed author, is "intended to be personal, particular, and practical." It offers to busy people one thought each day for a month. With the key-note "Yield your members . . ." (Rom. vi. 19), are thoughts for the heart, the lips, the eyes, the ears, the hands, the feet.

The Two Homes. A Story of Life's Discipline. By EMMA MARSHALL, author of "Mrs. Haycock's Chronicles," etc. "Home Words" Publishing Office.

Here is a really good Tale. The trials of stepmothers are a vein which has, indeed, been well worked; but an able writer of Mrs. Marshall's imagination can always present something which has point and interest. In "The Two Homes" the old prejudice against the second mother is exhibited in the light of common-sense and Christian charity. The story is very readable, and the volume has a tasteful cover.

The Teacher's Prayer Book. The Book of Common Prayer, with Introductions, Analyses, Notes, and a Commentary upon the Psalter. By the Most Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., Bishop of Sydney, and Metropolitan Primate of Australia and Tasmania; and a Glossary, by the Rev. A. L. MAYHEW, M.A. Eyre and Spottiswoode, Queen's Printers.

A new edition of an excellent book. It contains a Glossary of important words and phrases, with references to the text and illustrative passages from English classical authors, and so forth. Mr. Mayhew has done his work with skill and judgment. The present edition is also enriched by annotations on the Psalms. Dr. Barry is a scholarly divine, who knows well how to compress; and his brief Commentary is clear and rich. The Most Reverend Prelate's "Teachers' Prayer Book" has had already a large circulation, and has become quite a standard work. A remark may be added that the edition which we have now received from her Majesty's printers is tastefully bound, and forms an admirable gift-book.

The Church of England; her Principles, Ministry, and Sacraments. By the Rev. WILLIAM ODOM, Vicar of St. Simon's, Sheffield, author of "Gospel Types and Shadows of the Old Testament," etc., pp. 190. London: Nisbet and Co. Sheffield: T. Widdison, 14, Fargate. 1885.

The contents of this book are as follows: I. Preface; II. Introductory Chapter; III. The Holy Catholic Church; IV. The Church of England; V. The Christian Ministry; VI. The Sacraments; VII. The Sacrament

of Baptism; VIII. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; IX. Confession and Absolution; X. Prayer for the Dead; XI. Church and State; XII. The Prayer Book; XIII. Concluding Chapter; XIV. Chronological Table; Index. The key-note of the book is sounded in a quotation from Dean Hook, which runs thus:

"THIS IS QUITE CERTAIN, THAT WE, WHETHER MINISTERS OR PEOPLE, CLERGY OR LAITY, CAN ONLY DO GOD'S WORK IN THIS CHURCH OF ENGLAND, BY ADHERING FIRMLY AND CONSISTENTLY TO THE PRINCIPLES OF OUR CHURCH AS LAID DOWN AT THE GLORIOUS AND BLESSED EPOCH OF THE REFORMATION."

The first edition of this comprehensive hand-book was strongly recommended in THE CHURCHMAN as tending to supply a felt want. We thoroughly agree with the author that *Church teaching*—sound and definite—is one of the great needs of the day. In a constructive spirit he has sought to set forth the real teaching of the Church, quoting from the legal standards and also from eminent authorities. It is here that many good books fail; they point out and protest—positive enough in this—but they are critical rather than constructive. Mr. Odom's quotations, so far as we have examined, are candid and correct. He gives "chapter and verse" with carefulness; it is hard-hitting, but fair. His history of the grand old Church—National, Protestant, Catholic—is in tune with the lines which are not as well known as they ought to be:

> "Hail to the State of England! and conjoin
> With this a salutation as devout,
> Made to the spiritual fabric of her Church:
> Founded in Truth; by blood of Martyrdom
> Cemented; by the hands of Wisdom reared
> In beauty of holiness."

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England. 1885. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Through some mischance, which we regret, this volume did not reach us until the April CHURCHMAN was being printed. Our notice of it, therefore, may now be brief. There are in it many new points of interest; and the work as a whole is excellent, with a rich supply of matter for thought and use. What we wonder at is that so few of the laity, earnest, thoughtful Churchmen, are acquainted with the Official Year Book. We may be wrong, but our impression is that the work is by no means so well known as it ought to be. It is an excellent Church Defence book, in many ways. For instance, it shows how much of good honest work is being quietly done by the National Church. The new volume, edited with marked ability and judgment, will have, we hope, a worthy circulation.

The April *Quarterly Review* contains a review of Bishop Temple's Bampton Lectures, and an article on "General Gordon's Life and Letters." These two papers will for most, or at all events for many, of our readers form the great attraction of the number. But the last article in the number, "The Government and Parliament," probably expressing the views of the Party leaders, is written with great ability, and by all in whom true patriotic as well as political feelings are just now stirred, it will be read with painful interest. "Five years of Liberal rule," says the Tory writer, "have sufficed to undo Lord Beaconsfield's work, to reduce England from a station as high as she ever held to one lower than she has ever endured to occupy since the days of Charles II."

The *Quarterly* reviews Bishop Temple's book in a very friendly spirit, but eulogizes with discrimination, pointing out some of its defects and certain

expressions likely to mislead. "It is a curious fact" we read "that the "year which has just closed has witnessed the publication of three books, all "in their way remarkable, though for very different reasons, all professing "to deal with the difficulties to religious belief suggested by the present "predominance of physical science. The first is Professor Drummond's "'Natural Law in the Spiritual World;' the second, the Duke of Argyll's "'Unity of Nature:' and the third, Bishop Temple's 'Bampton Lectures.' ". . . Bishop Temple is mainly concerned to meet difficulties arising from "Materialism, to assert the reality of supernatural facts and a spiritual "world, in the face of what has been proved, and much more that has "been assumed, by positive science. His mission, therefore, is to contrast "the moral and the physical, and to show the supremacy of the former. "Professor Drummond, on the other hand, is concerned mostly with the "dangers which arise from the sharp separation of the two worlds; from "the practical Deism which is inherent in much of the modern science, "even when it is not avowedly anti-Christian, and which has too often "been accepted by Christian Apologists. He sees clearly that such a "dualism is no longer possible. His work, then, is to bring the two sepa-"rated spheres together, and he does so by a great assumption, the assump-"tion of the absolute identity of law physical and moral, by which he "imagines that he rescues theology from chaos and lawlessness. Finally, "the Duke of Argyll, by far the most philosophical of the three, sees "ahead the great danger into which English thought is drifting—the "danger of being so carried away by the conviction of the unity of nature "as to lose sight of the lines which Nature herself has drawn; a danger "which in its extreme form we may call Pantheism, though it take the "varying shapes of Eleaticism, or Stoicism, or Spinozism, or Hegelianism, "or Spencerianism, or disguise itself in the ancient robe of Eastern "religions." Many will agree with the *Quarterly* that the Duke of Argyll is by far the most philosophical of the three; and his book, which was reviewed and strongly recommended in the April CHURCHMAN by Prebendary Anderson, will, we trust, be largely read. For our own part, we have from the first regarded Professor Drummond's work as, with all its charms, unsound, and likely to unsettle and perplex. The Professor is indeed, as the *Quarterly* remarks, "involved in the very danger against which the whole of the Duke's argument is directed."

Quoting the Bishop's remark that God impressed His will "*once for all* on His creation," the *Quarterly* observes that in this passage Hume's Deism reappears. Here is the Bishop's sentence:

"It seems in itself something more majestic, something more befitting Him to whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years, thus to impress His will *once for all* on His creation, and provide for all its countless variety by His *one original impress*, than by special acts of creation to be perpetually modifying what He had previously made."

"The latter part of this argument," says the *Quarterly*, "is Hume pure "and simple, and it might be none the worse for that if it were not that, "in the words we have italicized, Hume's Deism reappears. It is one "thing to speak of God as 'declaring the end from the beginning,' it is "another to use language which seems to imply, however little it was "intended, that God withdraws Himself from His creation, and leaves it "to evolve itself, though according to a foreseen and fore-ordered plan. "Yet surely that is no unfair inference from the passage we have quoted, "or from the following paragraph, with which this part of the argument "concludes: 'What conception of foresight and purpose can rise above "that which imagines all history gathered as it were into one original "creative act, from which the infinite variety of the universe has come "and more is coming yet?' It is of the first importance that a Christian

"Apologist should not use language which seems to invest the world with "a power of self-unfolding, for it is this, more than any theory of evolu- "tion, which contradicts the belief in God." The *Quarterly* also regrets that "the Bishop's *rationale* of miracles is so inadequate," and complains (as did an able reviewer in the last *Guardian*) of the Bishop's word "interference." "A miracle, whatever it is, cannot be an 'interference.'"

Other *Quarterly* articles are: "The Age of Progress," "Recent Discoveries in Greece," "The Pioneers and Prospects of English Agriculture," "The Present and Near Future of Ireland," and "England and her Colonies."

We heartily recommend an address to young men, *Young Man—Arise!* a fourteen-paged pamphlet, the substance of which was delivered in the Masonic Hall, Derby, January 2nd, 1885, by W. OGLE, M.A., M.D., President of the Young Men's Christian Association (Bemrose and Sons, Derby; and 23, Old Bailey, London). The pamphlet is published at a penny, and should be sown broadcast. Dr. Ogle's paragraphs are these: (1) "As a Member of this Association, you profess to be a servant and disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to desire to promote the extension of His Kingdom amongst Young Men." (2) "Therefore seek, by your example and influence, to win Young Men to Christ." (3) "Search the Scriptures daily." (4) "Bring Young Men with you to the Meetings." (5) "Further the work of the Association according to your ability." (6) "Be faithful to your duties of Church-membership."

Mr. Elliot Stock, whose *facsimile* enterprise has received so great encouragement, has conferred a boon upon many admirers of the antique, whose means of indulging in a little literary luxury in these hard times are shortened, by publishing three tasteful little books, a *facsimile* reprint of the first edition of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (1678), of George Herbert's *Temple* (1633), and of *The Compleat Angler* (1653). These three reprints, admirably executed, are very cheap at a shilling apiece.

Some additional volumes of the capital stories of the Religious Tract Society, cheap, illustrated, printed in clear type, and "popular," deserve a line of commendation. *The Fisher Village*, for instance, which has "The Landslip" as a frontispiece, is just the style to interest seafaring folk; it has a good chapter about North Sea fishing. *The Cottage and the Grange* is written by EVELYN E. GREEN, author of "Leonore Annandale's Story;" and *Effie Patterson* is a tale of the Covenanters.

A pleasing little book is *Stray Thoughts for every Day in the Year* (Parker and Co.): two or three lines of prose or verse.

From the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge we have received several cheap and useful little books. First, we may recommend *The Athanasian Creed*, by the Rev. J. H. RAWDON, M.A., Vicar of Preston; six expository addresses, given to Church-workers and others: a good deal in small compass.—*Leading Heavenwards*, a very tiny book, may be sent in an envelope; well-chosen and well-arranged texts.—*Simple Lessons for the use of Teachers in Infant Sunday Schools*, following the Church seasons Advent to Trinity, by EDITH E. BAKER, Superintendent of the Infant Sunday School, St. George's, Bloomsbury; lessons "simple" but suggestive.—*The Young Guard of the King's Army*, by Rev. A. N. MALAN, M.A., F.G.S., Head-master of Eagle House School, Wimbledon; addresses to boys, vigorous, and likely to lay hold.—*Bold Jack Blair* is a well-written tract-story of moral courage, by Rev. H. D. PEARSON, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Clapton.

In recommending *The Unpreached Sermon of the late Rev. W. J. Bolton, M.A.* (Bath : M. Wood), we desire to pay a tribute of sincere respect to the memory of a good man and faithful Minister, esteemed for his work's sake in the East of London as well as in Bath. Mr. BOLTON (Vicar of St. James's, Bath) "was to have preached" (as we say) this sermon on Thursday, but on Wednesday the Lord called him.

The Beautiful House and Enchanted Garden is a slight and simple allegory, which may be helpful to many who think of death with somewhat of dismay. The tiny volume has a white cover and a suggestive photograph. (Hatchards.)

In the *National Review* appears a very able article on "City Companies," by Mr. L. T. Dibdin, vigoreus and thoughtful. Mr. Dibdin's literary power is as marked as his research and judgment.—*Blackwood*, a good number, has reminiscences of Sir Herbert Stewart, and "Russia in Search of a Frontier."—The *Church Missionary Intelligencer*, a singularly rich number, gives an account of the opening of the enlarged Church Missionary House, an interesting article by that able writer "K.," on the Bombay Diocesan Conference, the Report of the Ceylon Deputation, and letters on the death of King Mtesa.—In the *Church Sunday School Magazine* the Bishop of Ossory continues his "Echoes of Bible History;" the Dean of Windsor, his "History of the English Bible;" and Archdeacon Murray, his "Great Books of Christendom." Canon Bell contributes "A Eucharistic Hymn."—The notes and comments in *The Church Worker* are, as usual, practical and interesting.—In *Cassell's Family Magazine* the Family Doctor gives one of his readable and suggestive papers.—We have received the quarterly paper of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, and *The Church Builder*.—In the *Churchman's Penny Magazine* the editor, the Rev. E. Boys, gives a chatty and pleasing account of a visit to the South-Eastern College, Ramsgate (S. W. Partridge and Co.).

A notice of the last number of the "Foreign Church Chronicle and Review" (Rivingtons) was by some inadvertence omitted in the April CHURCHMAN. The number is very full and interesting. Here is a quotation from Padre Curci's *Vaticano Regio*, p. 308 :

"Holy celibacy, that especial jewel of the Christian priesthood in the Latin Church, is a thing so arduous, that if it is not hedged in with strong bulwarks and guarded with infinite jealousy, there is risk of its becoming its poison and its reproach. . . . This wound, in some provinces especially, begins to stink; and with all the care that the Vatican uses to hide rather than to heal it, enough is known to be frightful. In this concealment, a work of piety towards those who ought not to know it, but one of treason to those who ought not to be ignorant of it, the Vatican is much aided by the modern civilization which it detests. I think I know enough to be able to affirm that in general, save for the greater reserve which is due to more advanced civilization, things are little better in some provinces than they were in the sixteenth century, before the Tridentine reforms, when the prelates' concubines went about Rome in carriages, with attendants in the liveries of their respective prelates. In the latter years of Pius IX. there was a certain small diocese in the southern provinces, in which for some years there was not a single priest, not the bishop himself, who was not notoriously leading an immoral life in this respect.

THE MONTH.

THE visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales to Ireland has, hitherto (the 20th), been a remarkable success. The reception of their Royal Highnesses has been to a large extent enthusiastic, as in Dublin and in Limerick, and of disagreeable incidents (mainly in the South) there were few.

The Redistribution Bill is slowly making its way through the House of Commons; and in the country preparations are being made for the General Election, on which, as regards the Church of England, and the future of the empire, probably, much will depend.

The congregation of Christ Church, Hampstead, in presenting Dr. Bickersteth with an address, which a large number of Church-folk will read with pleasure, requested their beloved Pastor to accept a cheque for £1,000.

At a remarkable Church Missionary Society meeting, in Exeter Hall, presided over by Earl Cairns, speeches were made by Canon Hoare, Mr. Moule, Principal of Ridley Hall, and others. An overflow meeting, by the kindness of Dr. Wace, was held at King's College.

The Convocations of Canterbury and York agreed last year, as we gladly recorded, that the Day of Intercession for Missions should be held on any day in the week next before Advent, or in the first week of Advent, with preference for the eve of St. Andrew's Day. "To this," says the *Guardian*, "the assent of the Church of America, as well as of the Churches of Australia, South Africa, and other branches of the Anglican Communion, has been obtained."

A letter signed by the Earl of Shaftesbury, the Bishop of Liverpool, Sir E. Baines, Mr. S. Morley, M.P., Mr. Alderman Fowler, M.P., Mr. Robert Baxter, and others, is being widely circulated by the Working Men's Lord's Day Rest Association. In it we read:

"There are various societies in London aiming to open (on the Lord's Day) museums, galleries, public libraries, exhibitions, etc. They seek also to promote Sunday concerts and other secular recreations, and to influence Parliament and town councils to vote in favour of Sunday opening. Should these efforts ever succeed to any considerable extent, the religious life of our country will have received a shock from which it may never recover. Our Sunday-schools and Christian churches will rapidly feel the influence in diminished attendance, and secular recreations on Sundays will to a large extent be substituted for religious duties. The example of Sunday opening and Sunday labour set by ruling and public bodies must necessarily stimulate Sunday opening and Sunday labour in the world of trade and commerce, especially in times of competition and distress."

On Lord Thurlow's motion—we may record the fact—the contents and non-contents were both found to be 64, and according to usage the Lord Chancellor declared it to be rejected. Lord Cairns's speech was masterly.

The General Synod of "The Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland," we are pleased to note, desired officially to call the attention of the Home Secretary, Sir William Harcourt, to the fact that the Parliamentary (as well as historical) title of the Church is "The Church of Ireland."

The news of the death of Earl Cairns came as a sad surprise. It was known, indeed, that he was suffering from a return of congestion of the lungs, but to hear of his decease was to many friends a shock. Throughout the country the *In Memoriam* expressions of feeling have been all that the admirers of the great man could desire. In an early number of THE CHURCHMAN will appear, we trust, a not unworthy sketch of his devoted, honoured, and most useful life.

The Bishop of Liverpool refused to institute Mr. Elcum as Vicar of St. Agnes Church, Liverpool, except upon condition that illegal ceremonies should not be used. A written undertaking was required, and it was given by Mr. Elcum in the presence of the patron, Mr. Horsfall. For his firmness in this matter the Bishop merits the thanks of all loyal Churchmen.

On the 30th of March, General Komaroff, at the head of a Russian army, attacked and defeated the Afghans who were occupying Pendjeh.[1]

The meeting of the Viceroy and the Ameer of Afghanistan at Rawul Pindi is said to have been a success. It is encouraging to remember just now that such a statesman as Lord Dufferin represents England in India.

The progress of the railway at Suakim is steady. Our forces, British, Indian, and Australian, have cheerfully endured the hardships of desert warfare.

The preliminaries of peace between France and China were signed, it turns out, before the Chamber was asked for supplies to carry on the war. The dismissal of M. Ferry was a blunder. M. Brisson succeeds as Prime Minister.

The death of the Lord Mayor (Alderman Nottage) has called forth due tributes of regret.

Prince Bismarck's seventieth birthday has been kept with immense enthusiasm at Berlin.

[1] The telegram from our Special Correspondent in Sir Peter Lumsden's Camp (says the *Standard* of April 21st) dispels all doubt as to the character of the recent conflict at Penjdeh. The Russian onslaught, it is now clear, was, as Mr. Gladstone first described it, an act of deliberate, unprovoked aggression. There is not the slightest proof that the Afghans were to blame in the matter.