

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1882.

ART. I.—BIBLE STUDY IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

NO ancient Church writer coloured the Reformation theology so deeply as St. Augustine. Without enlarging on this obvious fact, it may be assumed that the Reformers generally must have been assured that they and the illustrious Bishop of Hippo stood on the same common ground. If the central principle of the Reformation in all countries was that of our Sixth Article, the absolute and sole authority of Holy Scripture in all matters of faith, it must have been felt that St. Augustine's voice was in unison with that dominant note. Otherwise, no occasional agreement on points of detail, no mere sympathy with his doctrines of predestination, or other favourite dogma, could have made him the great teacher, which he undoubtedly was, in the eyes of the Reformers. To read his treatise, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, is to have this fact brought before us in the most vivid manner. His critical methods may often be crude, his knowledge of science imperfect or incorrect, but he is absolutely at one with the great schools of Protestant theology as to the duty of all Christians to search the Scriptures. He knows no bondage in its interpretation but the restraint of its own analogies and harmonies, and bids his disciples search freely into the critical history of the individual books for a full assurance that each of them is of divine origin, and belongs to the genuine Canon.

If this be so, it follows that St. Augustine is on the Protestant side of the great dividing line which intersects the Church. Beneath all controversies must lie the yet deeper question of the authority which is to decide them. Among Christians who have a dogmatic system only two such authorities are known. They may be confused by unskillful or artful handling, but Church authority and Bible authority are the two rival powers. The

one is Romanism, the other is Protestantism. We need not be ashamed of the results of three centuries of Bible study. It may have produced some strange vagaries occasionally; but the great Protestant Schools from Luther downwards have been marvellously steadfast, while the Schools of Authority have developed the strange monstrosities of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility.

The second and third books of the treatise of St. Augustine, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, contain his instructions on the Study of Holy Scripture. In reviewing those books two main points of view will continually present themselves. First, his attitude towards Scripture; second, his technical methods of interpretation. With regard to these last mentioned his position is more akin to our own than that of his great contemporary Chrysostom. For his mother-tongue was Latin. The book he usually read, and from which he discoursed was, therefore, a Latin translation. The original tongues were to him foreign, and could only be a subject of study, even as they are to ourselves.

If there is one thing more satisfactory than another in the history of all ancient Churches, it is their care to provide their people with the Word of God, "in their own tongue, wherein they were born." Where, for at least 500 years, can we find a Church without a translation, or even several translations, of Holy Scripture? This fact meets St. Augustine at the commencement of this part of his subject (v. 6):—

Holy Scripture, written at first in one language, had been translated into various tongues, had been spread far and wide, and thus became known to the nations for their salvation. In reading it men seek to discover the mind and will of those by whom it was written, and through these to know the will of God, in accordance with which we believe them to have spoken.

Obviously, nothing short of the free translation and circulation of the Word of God, as the life of missionary effort, is present to the mind of Augustine. Moreover, we begin with the distinct recognition of the fundamental principle already stated. The will of God is set forth in Holy Scripture. To discover that will we must study the meaning of the Sacred writers, who spoke under divine guidance.

But the principle, thus broadly and without hesitation set forth, brings us at once to the perplexities of varied interpretations. While we may demur to the critical accuracy of some of Augustine's methods and solutions, nothing can be more instructive than his absolute fearlessness about consequences. Unbelief and misbelief were as prevalent in that age as in any other.

Heathen, Manichee, Pelagian, or ignorant believers, might

reject or misapply, or diversely understand many things; Augustine none the more flies to some traditional prescription, or some infallible interpreter. The Word of God is to him a garden, within whose enclosed space flowers and fruits are abundantly growing. The very diversity which it presents to different minds only fills him with the more admiration. Hence (c. vi. 7) he suggests reasons for the "manifold obscurities and ambiguities" of Holy Scripture. Pride must be lowered by discovering what labour is needed for unfolding the deep things of God, while the mind is aroused to put forth all its powers to discover what has been invitingly hidden. Thus the spiritual search meets with continual reward, and no satiety can be felt in a pursuit which presents everchanging interest. The illustration given of this peculiar delight may seem to many to be drawn from a grotesque interpretation. It is the following. We may rejoice to be told in plain prose of a true servant of Christ, coming from the baptismal font, filled with the twofold love of God and man, and thenceforward useful in the deliverance of others from the bondage of superstition and vice. But with a peculiar charm do the words of the Song of Songs (iv. 2) come home to us when we read the same meaning there. "Thy teeth are like a shorn flock which came up from the washing; whereof every one bears twins, and none is barren among them." The shorn fleece is the worldly burden which the converts have laid aside. They come up from baptism bearing the twin commandments of love, and "none is barren in that holy fruit." Then they become the teeth of the Church, biting men away from their errors, and transferring them softened into her body. Whatever we may think of the interpretation, we can sympathize with the pious ardour with which the mind of God is thus sought, and with the admiration of that higher wisdom with which "the Holy Spirit has so ordered the Holy Scriptures that the plainer passages obviate hunger, while the more obscure stimulate the appetite."

Who, then, shall be the most skilful searcher of the Sacred writings? There is no hesitation in the reply, no apparent consciousness that any different answer could be given. He it is, "who has read them all, and holds them in his knowledge, not all perhaps with understanding, but who has at least read them." Could the Bible be thrown open more absolutely for the study of the simplest soul?

But this answer leads to another question (c. viii. 12). How shall we know what books justly claim the august title of the Word of God? Is this great divine of the Fifth Century in possession of any key to this question other than we possess? Is there any Church decree, any authoritative decision of older tribunals, any contemporary utterance to which he refers us?

There is none. The student must gather his information for himself, and form his own judgment. He is advised to pursue his investigation into the Canonicity of the books which claim to be Scripture in the following manner. Those books which are received by all Catholic Churches he must prefer to those which some of them do not receive. With regard to those which fall short of this unanimous reception, he must both weigh and count the testimony of the Churches which accept them. There may be on one side Churches more in number and of weightier authority. Especially there may be some of apostolic origin, honoured with the reception of Epistles. On the other side there may be Churches fewer in number and of minor authority. In such a case the decision is obvious. Should, however, the improbable case occur, that a numerical majority of the Churches be on one side, and a minority of the higher authority on the other, the result must be held to be equally balanced.

To some, who have been taught that THE CHURCH somehow, and at some ascertained time, gave the Bible to her children, this frank uncertainty of the Fifth Century will be startling and disturbing. To the intelligent reader of the Bible it will present nothing new. He will at least have asked some simple questions, why (for example) he rejects the Book of Wisdom, and receives the Epistle to the Hebrews in his Canon of Scripture. The answer on which he will have relied may not be worded exactly as Augustine put it, but it comes to the same thing. It is simply because the vast preponderance of testimony requires such a decision.

While reading such sentiments as these we must feel to be, as in fact we are, removed by centuries from the modern conception of the papacy, and from the dogmatic arrogance of Trent, which requires a license for the possession or use of a Bible by private persons, and forbids even an unpublished interpretation of Scripture against the unanimous consent of the Holy Fathers.

When we turn to the prolegomena of Alford, or whatever other *apparatus criticus* we may be in the habit of using, what else do we find than the very process which Augustine recommends? How can we learn the verdict of these many Churches, but through their literary representatives? What else do those lists of quotations from ancient writers mean in dissertations on the canon of Scripture? What is the purpose for which the words of Clement, of Justin Martyr, of Irenæus, and all the other venerable names are cited but to prove how far within their knowledge this or that book was deemed Canonical?

Apart from details, it thus appears that the idea of Canonicity in the mind of Augustine was the same as our own. Was the

result of investigation the same? In the New Testament it is precisely identical, and it is noticeable that he attributes to St. Paul the Epistle to the Hebrews. But in the Old Testament he includes a considerable portion of the Apocrypha—Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Maccabees. How strongly Augustine was influenced by the authority of the Septuagint in this matter will be seen further on. His great critical contemporary, Jerome, came to a different conclusion, and pronounced those very books to be Apocryphal.

Our object, however, is not to investigate the Canon; it is to illustrate the ideas and the liberty of the Fifth Century. Having pronounced upon the Canonical books, Augustine repeats his admonition to search the Scripture (c. ix. 14):—

In all these books the pious reader seeks to know the will of God. He must know these books. Even if he does not understand them, he must read them, he must commit them to memory—anyhow, they must not remain unknown. The more he discovers, whether of the rule of life or of faith, the more will he find his understanding to open. As he becomes more familiar with the language of Scripture, he will be enabled to use the clearer passages to throw light on those which are more obscure. But this process requires a retentive memory well stored with Scripture. Failing this, such a fruitful work cannot be accomplished.

It may be permitted to pause for the instructive contrast of a modern utterance. "If the Bible is to be read in school without note or comment, it had much better be read in Hebrew." We need not search far to find other examples of such painful distrust of the Word of God, too freely uttered of late.

Augustine has, on the other hand, a quiet confidence in the Word of his Father, that it cannot mislead, and that to know it and store it in the memory will before long bring light into the soul.

But if the Christian is thus led to the study of the Word, and if it contains figurative expressions and dark utterances, what special learning may come to his aid most effectually? To Augustine, as to ourselves, the original languages of Scripture were foreign tongues. Hence the acquirement of Greek and Hebrew is placed first as essential to the right understanding of Holy Scripture. That was an age of revision as well as ours, and with far more need. There was no authorized invariable Latin Bible. The transcribers of the Latin text were often acquainted with Greek, and introduced arbitrary emendations from the Septuagint as they wrote, so that the variations, says Augustine, were numberless. It is characteristic of his acute and fertile rather than exact mind, that he endeavours to point out benefits which may arise out of this very diversity. Still

he discerns that, in many cases, if we would know the very thoughts of the writer, we must be acquainted with his language, or at least make use of very literal translations, in order to judge of the probable meaning by the comparison of the varied renderings of words.

Otherwise he would prefer a more free translation, since the genius of one language is violated by forcing into it too literally the idiomatic peculiarities of another. But we need not dwell on the solecisms and ambiguities which Augustine found in the Latin versions current in his time.

One curious note we find which shows that a certain kind of conservatism was as rooted in the fifth century in Africa, as in the seventeenth in England. Ps. cxxxii. 13, ran thus, *Super ipsum autem floriet sanctificatio mea*. The more learned hearer would prefer the correct *florabit*, nor was there anything in the way of the correction excepting *consuetudo cantantium*. The "habit of the choirs" could retain the less perfect version of the Psalms then as now. From prejudice of this kind Augustine was wholly free, and insists strongly (c. xiv. 21) on the importance of a thoroughly emended text.

The disadvantages of a Bible Student in those days come out very clearly. The reader has met with words or idioms strange to him. What can he do? If they belong to foreign tongues, he must consult men who know those languages, or he must himself acquire them, or at least compare different translations. This involved committing to memory the doubtful word or phrase. He will meet with some one having the needful learning, or with some passage which may clear up the difficulty. He must read, remember, ponder, and wait. The solution will come some day. We should turn to our shelves. We should refer to our dictionaries, our concordances, our commentaries. Only, we observe again, here is no bondage of any kind to authority other than that of the Word itself. Full, free, patient investigation, is the rule of the Fifth Century.

Augustine's own power of textual criticism cannot be rated very highly. His knowledge of Greek seems to have been somewhat limited, and of Hebrew he was entirely ignorant. Hence he gives to the Septuagint an authority which almost places it on a level with the Hebrew text (c. xv. 22). He intimates that he is more than inclined to believe the story of the several translators of that famous version being enclosed in separate cells, and yet producing an identical translation. He may well ask—"If this be so, who would dare to compare, much less to prefer, anything to so great an authority?" Hence he thinks that the Holy Spirit may have so guided the translators as to have taught them that one rendering which would be most suitable to the Gentiles who should afterwards believe in

the Lord. Consequently, if the Hebrew text should suggest a different meaning, a devout Christian will hardly prefer it to that which the LXX. have taught him. Augustine will not find many followers amongst ourselves in this opinion. Nevertheless we may take shame to ourselves that we of the Church of England have fallen so far behind other Churches in this matter. The German or the Scottish minister feels himself bound to consult "the Hebrew verity" to a degree quite unknown in England. The criticism of the Hebrew text, with the parallel collation of the LXX. in its most suggestive testimony to very ancient varied readings, has found little encouragement, and remains almost to be commenced from the beginning. We shall not be real students of the Old Testament until all this is changed.

Passing to the interpretation of the figurative language of Holy Scripture we come to very debateable ground. There has always existed great difference of opinion as to the degree in which secondary, or typical, or spiritual meanings, may lie under the inspired language. Augustine, in common with all writers of his age, carried this to a dangerous extent. Lax and arbitrary interpretation of the Word of God led to much the same result as its neglect. The edge of the sword of the Spirit was turned as effectually by the interposition of the comment of human fancy as by unbelief itself. "Lord here be two swords," was warrant enough for coercive ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the mediæval mind. The Reformation may be truly enough described, in one important phase of its appearance, as a return to grammar and common sense in reading the Scriptures. So one regarded it to whom the English race owes more than tongue can tell. William Tyndale, in his "Obedience of a Christian Man," sweeps away at one stroke the figurative encumbrance. "They divide the Scripture," says he, "into four senses, the literal, tropological, allegorical, and anagogical."

Thou shalt understand that the Scripture hath but one sense, which is the literal sense. And that literal sense is the root and ground of all, and the anchor that never faileth, whereunto if thou cleave, thou canst never err or go out of the way. And if thou leave the literal sense, thou canst not but go out of the way. Nevertheless the Scripture useth proverbs, similitudes, riddles, or allegories, as all other speeches do; but that which the proverb, similitude, riddle, or allegory signifieth is ever the literal sense, which thou must seek out diligently. . . . This blindness, wherein we now are, sprang first of allegories. For Origen and the doctors of his time drew all the Scripture unto allegories; whose ensample they that came after followed so long, till they at last forgot the order and process of the text, supposing the Scripture served but to feign allegories upon; in-somuch that twenty doctors expound one text twenty ways. . . . Yea,

they are come unto such blindness, that they not only say the literal sense profiteth not, but also that it is hurtful and noisome and killeth the soul. . . . God is a Spirit and all his words are spiritual. His literal sense is spiritual, and all his words are spiritual. When thou readest (Matt. i.), "She shall bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for He shall save his people from their sins;" this literal sense is spiritual, and everlasting life to as many as believe it. . . . Finally, all God's words are spiritual, if thou have eyes of God to see the right meaning of the text, and whereunto the Scripture pertaineth, and the final end and cause thereof. . . . There is no story nor gest, seem it never so simple or so vile unto the world, but that thou shalt find spirit and life and edifying in the literal sense: for it is God's Scripture, written for their learning and comfort. There is no clout or rag there that hath not precious relics wrapt therein of faith, hope, patience and long-suffering, and of the truth of God, and also of His righteousness.

But in applying the Word Tyndale allows full, yet measured liberty. "When we have found out the literal sense of the Scripture by the process of the text," he says, "or by a like text of another place, then we borrow similitudes or allegories of the Scripture and apply them to our purposes: *which allegories are no sense of the Scripture, but free things besides the Scripture, and altogether in the liberty of the spirit*; which allegories I may not make at all the wild adventures, but must keep me within the compass of the faith, and ever apply mine allegory to Christ and unto the faith."

The modern use of the term *literal* may tend to obscure the words of the venerable translator. He does not speak of the bare grammatical meaning in its most meagre significance. He would enforce the direct absolute message of the pure words of Scripture. It may be that our age needs the repetition of the warning. Commentaries again appear laden with patristic fancies, which may or may not be in harmony with the true proportion of the faith. They may influence the minds of many; but even if substantially correct they must lack the vigour of the confident announcement, "Thus saith the Lord."

If Augustine himself was able to distinguish between the application which his own fancy brought into Scripture and the actual meaning which the Holy Ghost intended, it is certain that the ages which followed him lost the distinction, as Tyndale so vigorously declared. But we must return to the Bishop of Hippo. Whatever we may think of particular interpretations, there is generally breadth in his principles. He perceives that all knowledge may illustrate the Bible. Natural history may contribute from its stores.

The Lord says, Be ye wise as serpents. The serpent to protect its head will offer its whole body to its assailants. So for our Head, which

is Christ, we should willingly offer our body to the persecutors. Or, again, to free itself from its old skin, the serpent draws itself through a narrow hole, so shall we also "put off the old man," by entering through "the strait gate."

In like manner note that the carbuncle shines in darkness and some metaphors of Scripture become clear. Observe that the hyssop cleanses the lungs, and pierces rocks with its roots, and we may understand why it is said, Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean.

The reader may smile at the simple confidence with which such interpretations are hazarded. We fear, however, that he may be able without much difficulty to call to mind some equally startling Scripture elucidations which the pulpit or the religious press of this nineteenth century has poured into the startled ear of the more scientific auditor. "Verify your quotations," was the admonition of the veteran Oxford scholar. "Verify your supposed facts," should be the admonition to him who presumes to extract a meaning from the Bible with the aid of some scraps of natural science. Be sure the Bible is accurate. Be equally sure that science, even of the best, is often inaccurate; and that the second-hand science of the ill-informed is more mistaken still.

We shall not dwell upon succeeding chapters (c. xvi. 25). The mystic language of numbers is treated as equally clear with the multiplication-table to him who has mastered its inner significance. *Four* marks creation existing in *time*; for morning, noon, evening, and night embrace the day, while spring, summer, autumn, and winter compose the year. *Three* is the number of the Holy Trinity. *Seven* indicates the creature, because the life is threefold, including heart, soul, and mind wherewith God is to be loved; and the body is compounded of the four elements. Thus we understand why the number 40 is the period of fasting, since it is four times ten; and the true life that is in the knowledge of God has no delight in the things of time. How music may in like manner lend its aid, and how the fallacies of astrology and other Gentile vanities of false learning are to be put away, we need not here discuss. Nor need we show how with true discernment the use of history or the mechanical arts is assigned its place in reference to the interpretation of Scripture. Augustine is more at home when he discusses (c. xxxi. 48, &c.) the place of logical science in Bible interpretation. We recognize with some amusement the old teacher of rhetoric bringing out some of the examples of logical fallacies which he had no doubt used as illustrations in his lectures at Carthage and at Rome. He reminds us (c. xxxv. 53) that the science of definition, division, and arrangement is no invention of man. It is inherent in the reason. It is evolved from the mind, as it discourses on the things which God has

made. Like the science of numbers, it is discovered, not created by man. No man can vary the immutable truth that three times three are nine. Order, then, arrangement, definition must have their place in discussing the Word which comes from the same Eternal Mind.

Finally, on this part of the subject Augustine (c. xxxviii. 57) warns the disciple to make all things redound to the praise and love of God alone, otherwise "he may seem to be learned, but wise he cannot be."

But how (c. xl. 60) shall we regard the philosophy of the ancients? If they have spoken anything that is true and in harmony with the faith we may seize it as from unlawful possessors. The Egyptians had not only their bondage and their idols, but precious things. Israel, abandoning Egypt, left its abominations but carried away its treasures. So Gentile philosophy amidst its vanities possesses fragments of truth, gold and silver, dug (so to speak) from the mines of an ever-present Providence. These the Christian may appropriate and dedicate to God. So came forth from Egypt Cyprian, most delightful of teachers, and blessed martyr. So came Lactantius, Victorinus, Hilary, and Greeks beyond number. So came forth Moses, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians."

Thus furnished—

The student of Holy Scripture may enter on his investigations, but must ever remember that knowledge puffeth up, charity edifieth. And so, whatever riches of Egypt he may bring with him, unless he has kept the Passover, he cannot be saved. Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us, and to all the toilers in Egypt He gives the invitation, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." After all, what was the store which Israel brought out of Egypt in comparison of the wealth accumulated in Jerusalem under King Solomon? What are the resources of heathen learning compared to the knowledge of Holy Scripture? There may be found whatever really useful has been read elsewhere; and there in greater abundance may be seen what can nowhere else be learned, save in the wonderful elevation, and the wonderful lowliness of the Scriptures.

Such, in brief outline, is the second book of Augustine on Christian Learning. If Europe, in succeeding ages had followed these precepts, instead of petrifying his doctrines, it is not too much to say that the history of Christendom would have been totally changed. The free, the full, the bold,—but the patient, the modest, the reverential, and submissive study of the Word of their Father, must be the portion of the Children. The appliances of scholarship, of history, of science, which the simplest scholar of our days enjoys, are manifestly far beyond anything which this great Father could command. Nor have

we discovered any advantage of traditional knowledge, or interpretative authority, which was his portion rather than ours. The Empire which he saw in its decay has vanished. The tongue in which he discoursed is no longer articulate among men. "But the Word of the Lord endureth for ever." The future of England, and of the English Church, is wrapped up in its submissive treatment of that Eternal Word.

T. P. BOULTBEE.

ART. II.—JESUS LANE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

THE Jesus Lane Sunday School owes its name to the fact that for the first six or seven years of its existence it was held in a small building known as the Friends' Meeting House, situate in Jesus Lane, on the left-hand side as you approach Jesus College from Sidney Street. To what use this building was put from the year 1833, when the Jesus Lane Sunday School was moved into rooms in King Street, placed at the disposal of the Committee by the Governors of the Old Schools of Cambridge, until 1862, we know not; but in the latter year, this first home of the Gownsmen's Sunday School became the Sunday Schoolroom of the parish of the Holy Sepulchre, the Church of which was in those days largely attended by undergraduates, who valued the ministry first of the Rev. F. J. Jameson, so early called to his rest, and then of the Rev. T. T. Perowne, now Archdeacon of Norwich.

When the Jesus Lane Sunday School was first moved into King Street in the year 1833, it was only allowed to make use of the lower schoolroom; subsequently, through the influence of the Rev. W. Carus, the whole building was made available, the school having outgrown the accommodation provided.

The Jesus Lane Sunday School is now held in handsome buildings of its own situate in Paradise Street, a quiet street running parallel with, and at no great distance from, the north side of Parker's Piece, but still retains its early name. It was during the superintendency of Mr. Pelly, 1861-63, that efforts were first made to obtain for the school this home of its own.

When in 1865 Mr. Leeke accepted the office of superintendent, he was charged by the Committee to take immediate steps to carry out the building project. A Building Committee was formed, on which the present Bishop of Durham, who acted as chairman, the Rev. T. T. Perowne, the Rev. G. W. Weldon, then Vicar of Christ Church, and other influential members of the University, consented to serve, and in October, 1867, the school

moved into its new quarters. The building contains one large schoolroom, and a number of smaller classrooms, and every appliance that can be desired for conducting an efficient Sunday School; the cost was about £2,300. We may infer how completely by that time the school had gained the confidence of the University authorities, when we find that the opening meeting was presided over by the Vice-Chancellor, and was attended by other heads of colleges and by one of the Proctors.

The Vice-Chancellor in his address said he knew of nothing so likely to draw out the higher and better instincts of a body of undergraduates than to be engaged in imparting religious instruction to young children. On the following morning, All Saints' Day, 1867, a sermon in connexion with the opening services was preached in St. Michael's Church by Professor Lightfoot, from Matt. xviii. 14. "Even so, it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish."

Not every Sunday School has a history worth recording, but as most of our readers know, the Jesus Lane Sunday School has features peculiar to itself. It is entirely supported and managed by members of the University of Cambridge; until recent years by undergraduate members only, or at any rate by undergraduates with the aid of a few Bachelors of Arts, remaining for a term or two after taking their degree. But since the year 1865, the superintendent and one or two other officers have been resident Fellows, able therefore to give more time to the work, and doubtless to exercise a more powerful influence than their predecessors over the tone and management of the school.

The teachers in this Sunday School are all young men of good social position, most of them preparing for the sacred ministry, some few for other professions, coming to their work with all the freshness and ardour, and we must add also the inexperience, of youth, and resigning their classes to others after two or three years of active work. Such a Sunday School occupies a unique position in the Church of England, and must exercise a powerful influence, not only upon the 40 or 50 young men of each year engaged in the work, but also indirectly upon the University at large. In the case of most Sunday Schools we think chiefly of the good work done in behalf of the children, although, as is often pointed out, there is a reflex benefit to the teacher; in the case of the Jesus Lane Sunday School, while hoping and believing that at least equal good is effected, we think rather of the influence exercised by the school and its work upon those who pass through it as teachers, not as taught.

We propose now to give our readers a few particulars of the past history, and the present position of this school.

It was established late in the year 1826, or early in 1827, by

a few earnest spiritually-minded undergraduates, principally members of Queen's College. When some 20 years ago a short account of the school up to that date was published,¹ a sharp controversy arose upon the question, with whom did the idea of the school originate? Who took the first and most active steps in its foundation? Was it the Rev. W. Leeke, at that time Perpetual Curate of Holbrooke, Derby (the father of the Rev. Chancellor Leeke, Superintendent 1865-69)? Or was it the Rev. James Wright, then Perpetual Curate of Latchford, Cheshire? Or, in fact, was any one man entitled to be called the "Father of the School?"

Into the merits of this controversy we do not propose now to enter. Each has been called to his rest since the discussion arose, and so also has the Rev. J. W. Harden, Vicar of Con Dover, another of the first founders, who argued warmly and forcibly in favour of the claims of Mr. Wright.

Few documents would be more interesting to Jesus Lane Teachers than the account of the school for the first 12 years of its existence. That its early history was committed to writing is evident from a letter written by the Rev. W. Molson, June 22nd, 1864, in which he says:—

I was fourth superintendent, and received from Meller when I succeeded him, and handed over to Gowring when he succeeded me in 1832, the RECORDS of the school, carefully kept from the beginning, a quarto volume, about 9 inches square and 1½ inch thick. This volume must be in existence somewhere, no one would destroy it. Hose, Meller, and Gowring must all remember the book well.

Since 1838, minutes of the proceedings of the Committee have been written, and are carefully preserved. Truly grateful would the writer of this paper be for any earlier records, or to be allowed to read any letters which may have been preserved, giving details of the early work.

As far as we know only two of those who took an active part in the earliest days of the school now survive; Mr. Higgins of Turvey Abbey, Bedford, and the Rev. F. Hose of Dunstable. The latter was present at the Jubilee Celebration in 1877, and spoke at the breakfast with a hearty vigour, which seemed to show that, like the school he loved, his powers of body and mind, though he was nearly four score years of age, had suffered no decay during fifty years. The early founders of the school were all regular attendants upon the ministry of Mr. Simeon, and to the influence thus exercised by him at Cambridge, may be indirectly traced this, as well as so many other good works.

The school in early days received kindness and support from

¹ See "A History of the Jesus Lane Sunday School." By the Rev. C. A. Jones. Revised (1877) with additional chapters and new Appendix, by the Rev. B. Appleton. Thomas Dixon, Cambridge.

Professor Scholefield and Professor Farish. One of the earliest teachers, writing in 1859, said he well remembered an interview with the latter. "The kind good old man received us," he says, "with his wonted courtesy, and while he rejoiced in the thought of the men devising such a scheme, he demurred as to its practicability, and considered it very improbable that it would be long sustained when the originators of it were removed. He little thought, as indeed did any of us, whereunto the thing would grow, nor 'how great a plan with that day's incident began.'"

Like every other successful institution, the Jesus Lane Sunday School passed through many a struggle before it reached its present condition of assured prosperity.

"I have," says another teacher of that period, "hazy recollections of squabbles with Dr. Geldhart (then Incumbent of Barnwell) as to our visiting and poaching in his parish; of our being turned out of St. Peter's Church, and taking refuge in Little St. Mary's for the boys, and in St. Michael's for the girls:" the latter being at that time the Church of Professor Scholefield.

For many years the Jesus Lane Sunday School was a non-parochial school, drawing its children principally, but not exclusively, from the parish of St. Andrew the Less, better known as Barnwell; but when the new church of Barnwell (Christ Church) was consecrated, the Incumbent, Mr. Boodle, was asked to afford his superintendence, and an entry in the minutes of June, 1839, states that, at the beginning of the Long Vacation, "the school became one of the Sunday Schools of Barnwell." When the school was actually removed into the parish, in the autumn of 1867, it became necessary more accurately to define its position with regard to the Incumbent, and after much discussion, and many divisions, the following clauses were inserted in the trust deed of the new building:—

(1) The Incumbent of the Parish of St. Andrew the Less shall be *ex-officio* President of the school, and chairman of the general meetings of teachers.

(2) The President shall not interfere with the general management of the school, but if for grave reasons he shall be dissatisfied with the proceedings of the committee or superintendent, he shall have power to summon a Special general meeting of the teachers of the school, whose decision on the matter submitted to them shall be final, provided always that such meeting be held in full term time.

Since that date, the relations of the school with successive Incumbents have been most friendly, no "Special Meeting" has ever been summoned, but the Vicar has from time to time taken his place as chairman of the General Teachers' Meeting, and his advice has been sought upon all points of importance which have arisen; his connexion, however, with the school, necessarily

differs widely from that which generally holds between a clergyman and his Sunday School. It sometime happens that a lad will attend a class at Jesus Lane Sunday School who will *not* go elsewhere, but no children are now admitted from other parishes, "except under special circumstances, and by the wish of their clergy."

The school continues now, what it has been from the first, a *mixed* school; but arrangements are made for the transference of all girls to a Bible class, or to one of the parochial schools, within six months of their attaining the age of twelve years.

The subject is one over which many warm battles have been fought, and higher and lower limits of age urged, but the present rule, which seems to work well, has been quietly in operation for many years.

The Parochial difficulty having been thus happily solved, and the objections at one time entertained to the teaching of girls by undergraduates having been removed by the regulation just referred to, there remained the Vacation difficulty, and the difficulties caused by the too frequent change in the officers of the school. Both of these appear to be now completely surmounted.

How great at first sight the *Vacation* difficulty seems, may be gathered from the fact that it is no uncommon thing for a hundred teachers to be present one Sunday, and not more than ten the next Sunday.

In the "*Long*" Vacation, *substitutes* are easily found from amongst University men who are willing to take charge of a class for a few weeks, but who at first shrink from becoming regular teachers, though after this first experience they are often led to do so.

In the *June* Vacation the school is closed for two Sundays, while during the other vacations, arrangements have been made whereby all difficulties are surmounted, partly by means of a few extra Church services, partly by a system of block lessons, and principally by utilizing as teachers some of the elder boys, members of the Bible classes in connexion with the school, who are thus gradually trained to become, in many cases, teachers in the parochial schools of the town. Doubtless these young men appreciate the confidence thus reposed in them, and not improbably are all the more regular in their attendance at the Bible class, because they are thus periodically transferred from the ranks of the taught to those of the teachers. There are we know many Sunday Schools, especially in London, where at certain seasons of the year, difficulties arise through the absence of regular teachers: perhaps the Cambridge arrangement may prove suggestive in these cases.

Years ago the school suffered sadly from the short tenure of the superintendency and other important offices. This diffi-

culty, too, has lately been overcome; in fact, the large development of the work of the school which recent years has witnessed, has made it quite impossible that the office of superintendent could be held by one who had not more leisure than belongs generally to undergraduates. Between November 7, 1839, when the appointment of a superintendent is first entered on the minutes, and December 7, 1852, we find no less than fifteen superintendents; and between that date and June 5, 1865, twelve others. But between June 5, 1865, and Mr. Appleton's resignation, in the early part of this year, after more than eight years of service, there were only *three* superintendents. The two others were the Rev. E. T. Leeke (now Chancellor of Lincoln), and the Rev. A. E. Humphreys (now Vicar of St. Matthew's, Cambridge), each of whom held office for four years. These three were all Fellows and Assistant Tutors of Trinity College, and superintended the school until seven, six, and nine years respectively, after taking their B.A. degree.

We have spoken of the great development of the work of the school; this has been in the direction of the Choristers' Branch and the Bible classes, rather than in the actual number of children.

In 1864, when the history of the school was first published, the numbers were:—boys, 162; girls, 97; infants, 120. In 1877, the Jubilee year, these numbers were:—220, 130, 120. Since then there seems to have been an actual diminution, as in 1880 we find the numbers given as 218, 120, and 89. In October, 1881, 190, 108, 73. It is, of course, possible that these diminished numbers may be due to a more vigorous erasure of the names of children on the books, but not in actual attendance.

The number of classes in 1863 was:—boys, 17; girls, 11. In 1881, 26 and 18; so that the number of children in each class is much less than it was.

In 1863 there were 43 class-teachers; in 1881, 78. The Infant School had in 1863 two teachers; in 1881, five.

In the Bible Class Section there has been a marked extension of the work. In 1863 there were two Bible classes, one for boys, and one, conducted by a lady, for the girls who left in accordance with the rules. This latter class has been dropped, but there are no less than six flourishing classes for elder boys and young men, containing fifty members, and taught by eight teachers. The number was somewhat larger in 1877. The report of 1878 tells us that a decrease in that year was largely due to a draft from the Bible classes to become teachers in the parochial schools of the town.

"Every Easter," we are told, "in the ordinary course of things a new class is formed, mainly from the new confirmees;

and we have not found that the older classes dissolve at the same rate." This was written in 1877. It would seem, however, that since then the power of accretion and dropping off have nearly balanced each other.

Some, perhaps, may ask, are undergraduates, who are probably gaining their first experience as Sunday School teachers at Cambridge, qualified to undertake these Bible classes? Experience proves that by judicious selection, such may be found, and moreover, it is increasingly common for graduates to remain a year or two in residence to read for the theological or other tripos: the establishment of Ridley Hall, where candidates for Holy Orders can obtain such valuable help in their theological studies, will, we expect, still further increase their number.

The following passage shows that judicious efforts are made to solve that most difficult of problems—how to retain hold upon elder lads.¹

Three or four years ago we formed the first six classes of boys below the Bible classes into a separate group under the name of the "First Division;" we adopted with them a somewhat more manly and confidential tone, and strove to make their connexion with the teachers a more personal matter, giving them at the same time some slight distinguishing privileges. A few very simple artifices have indicated the position in which we desire them to feel themselves; their classes are called by the teachers' names in lieu of numbers. Magazines are lent to them from one Sunday to the next; and latterly we have been able to place these classes in a room by themselves, with rather different hours of attendance from the rest—one of their teachers being sectional superintendent of them. Thus they are tolerably well marked off (and are fully conscious of it) from the Bible classes on the one hand, and from the lower part of the school on the other. I may add that we are well satisfied with the results obtained. The boys have stayed with us far more uniformly, and attended with greater regularity, and are marked by a higher tone and appreciativeness than before. The classes below the First Division are attached to us by the prospect of the rise in position; the First Division classes look forward to the Bible classes. Still more the somewhat closer connexion with the teachers, and the greater individual sympathy possible and natural with them is a valuable support against the peculiar temptations of that age, and an important aid to thoughts about Confirmation. Confirmation itself is usually the boundary line between the First Division and the Bible class.

The other extension of work which recent years has witnessed is the Choristers' Branch, which was established in the Mid-

¹ See a paper read at the Church of England Sunday School Institute Conference in 1874 by the Rev. A. E. Humphreys.

summer term of 1867, and now numbers over 100 boys, drawn from the choirs of every college, except King's, where they are provided with religious instruction in the College. Morning chapel in all the Colleges being over before twelve o'clock, classes are held for an hour at midday in the large hall of the Young Men's Christian Association, in Post Office Place.

While no portion of the work requires or receives more anxious thought and careful judgment, about no branch have the annual reports been more bright and hopeful. The young choristers, instead of running about the streets after morning chapel, are gaining definite religious instruction and real help in the temptations and difficulties of their life, and much spiritual good has been the result of this new venture. The Choristers' Branch has a *sectional* superintendent, and the memory of the second of these (W. Amherst Hayne, of Trinity College, who held the office till his death) is much cherished by those who knew him. He was a nephew of the South Indian missionary, the Rev. H. W. Fox, and of the Rev. G. T. Fox, of Durham, who perpetuated his memory by a donation of £4,000 to the Church Missionary Society. The Crosse University Scholarship and the Jeremic Septuagint Prize showed him to be a man of great promise; and his contemporaries speak of his earnest Christian zeal, and of the influence exercised by him over those around him. He was, while in residence, an active member of the Committee of the Cambridge University Prayer Union, and an earnest labourer in the cause of the Church Missionary Society. It ought to be mentioned that Mr. Maxwell, a member of King's College, was the originator of the Choristers' Branch. He had already held in his own room a small class for some of the choristers, and the success of this class led him to apply to the Committee of the Jesus Lane Sunday School to take up and organize the movement. He was himself the first superintending teacher, and afterwards became a medical missionary at Kashmir under the Church Missionary Society.

The work of Maxwell and of Hayne has caused us to refer to the Church Missionary Society. We believe that the Jesus Lane Sunday School has done a great deal to advance the interests of that Society in Cambridge.

In the year 1859 the Society published a list of Cambridge University men at work in the mission-fields under its auspices. One half were old Jesus Lane Sunday School teachers, and since that date many more have gone out under the same society to preach the Gospel to the heathen.

Archdeacon Pratt of Calcutta, Bishops Vidal and Cheetnam of Sierra Leone, Ragland, Robert Clark of the Punjaub, Roger Clark of Peshawur, Paley of Abbeokuta, Bishop Moule and F. F. Gough of China, Bishop Royston of the Mauritius,

Bishop Speechley of South India, Meadows, and Shackell, were all Jesus Lane Sunday School teachers. Many of these missionaries visited the school when on a visit home to this country; others wrote letters to the children, and so maintained in their old school an interest in the work of the society.

The missionary zeal of Jesus Lane teachers was greatly stimulated by Bishop Titcomb, whose compulsory resignation of the See of Rangoon in consequence of his fearful accident on the Karen Hills caused genuine regret, not only among his many personal friends, but also among the Jesus Lane Sunday School teachers of the years 1850-1860, who so well remember his kindly dealings with them, and his unrivalled monthly sermons to the children. "There are," he wrote in 1864, "missionaries now in China and India, in Africa and New Zealand, who gained their first experience in public speaking in the parish schoolroom of Barnwell."

We earnestly hope that this close connexion between the Church Missionary Society and the Jesus Lane Sunday School, hallowed by so many touching memories and holy deaths, may be long maintained to the advantage of both associations and the highest interests of the Church of England.

Many S. P. G. missionaries have also been connected with the school—*e.g.*, A. R. Hubbard of Caius, who was murdered at Delhi in the Indian Mutiny, and men so well known in connexion with their foreign work as Bishop Cotton of Calcutta, Mackenzie, the first missionary bishop to Central Africa, Bishop Suter of Nelson, and Bishop Sweatman of Toronto. The last named deserves more than a passing notice. No superintendent was ever more loved and respected by his own generation of teachers; none more painstaking and self-denying. He held office from 1856 to 1859, and it was doubtless due in no small degree to the experience gained at Cambridge in organization, and in dealing with men, that he owes the confidence reposed in him by the Canadian Church. Moreover, it was his love for boys, and his knowledge of their characters and needs, which led him, in conjunction with his friend Mr. Tabrum, to establish the Youths' Institute at Islington upon the model of which so many similarly useful institutions have since been founded.

Of this Youths' Institute at Islington, which has been called "a very centre of Christian life and culture," one of the fruits is the "Albert Institute," at Cambridge, held in the buildings belonging to the Jesus Lane Sunday School. Here on week-day evenings the lads and young men find a reading-room, supplied with newspapers and periodicals of a pure tone; indoor games, such as chess, draughts, and the like; a lending library, carefully selected; educational classes, lectures, and entertainments; while a hand-bell company, a glee society, a cricket

club, a rowing club, and similar institutions have here their headquarters. Those best able to judge speak most confidently of the good results obtained.

The question has often been asked whether Sunday School teaching does or does not interfere with a man's proper work while a student at the University. Each man must judge for himself: his first duty is to the studies of the place, and not even Sunday School teaching should be allowed to interfere with these. Doubtless there are young men of anxious temperament, or delicate health, who should make the Sunday a day of absolute rest. But most of those who have taken part in the work would say that the change of scene and occupation, and the interest felt in the welfare of others, have been a real help and refreshment to them.

Senior Classics like Dean Vaughan, Canon Westcott, Regius Professor of Divinity, and the present Head Masters of Westminster and Harrow, distinguished scholars like Canons Barry and Farrar, successful theological students who are now doing good work for the Church in training others for the sacred ministry, like Dr. Maclear and Canon Saumarez Smith, gained, probably, their first experience in teaching others in Jesus Lane Sunday School; and all found that the careful preparation of their Sunday lesson was not inconsistent with a subsequent brilliant degree.

Henry Goulburn, who was second Wrangler, Senior Classic, second Smith's Prizeman, and first Chancellor's Medallist (perhaps the most brilliant degree ever taken at Cambridge) was a Sunday School teacher, and when the new buildings were opened in 1867, the Master of St. Catherine's stated that he had found, after accurate investigation, that out of 243 Jesus Lane teachers, who in a certain period had graduated in honours, 102 were in the first class in one or other of the triposes; in other words, about five-twelfths, when the natural proportion would have been one in three. In the ten years, 1851-1861, of the very large proportion of teachers who had graduated in honours, there were a Senior Wrangler, a second Wrangler, a Senior Classic; and in one year the Maitland, the Burney, the Carus, the Scholefield, and the Le Bas prizes were carried off by Jesus Lane men.

We have not been able to make an analysis of the teachers of the last twenty years, but a rapid glance at the list shows that similar statements might be made, and that, as a general rule, Sunday School teaching rather helps forward than retards a man's academical work. May we not see in this a fulfilment of the promise "them that honour Me I will honour."

Though we have already named many who have been connected with the school in the past, many more well known names may be added. To mention only a few: in the first

fifteen years of the school's history, we have, besides those named above, Professor Birks, Archdeacon Cooper of Kendal, Bishop Cotterill of Edinburgh, the Rev. M. Gibbs, and Wm. Bruce of Bristol, Canon Conway, Conybeare, and Dean Howson, Spencer Thornton, who was superintendent from 1834 to 1836, Thomas Whytehead of New Zealand; later on, Professor Adams, Archdeacon Perowne, Archdeacon Dealtry of Madras, John Macgregor, "Rob Roy," E. J. Routh, Canon Long of Bishop Auckland, the Rev. F. E. Wigram, the hon. secretary of the Church Missionary Society; and to come to recent times, Canon Kirkpatrick, the new Hebrew Professor, J. E. Sandys, the Public Orator, George Warrington, and Professor Balfour, whose sad death upon the Swiss mountains, in July last, will be fresh in the memory of our readers. The list might be largely extended, for since its foundation over 1,250 teachers have passed through the school.

Few more interesting gatherings have ever been held than that at the Jubilee of the school. It brought together teachers of every period; it showed that during a half century of University life there never was a period of spiritual deadness; it showed a "continuity of zealous effort and deep interest" in the school, and that while at Cambridge, more rapidly than elsewhere, "one generation passes away and another cometh," one generation passes on to another the flame of Christian piety and zeal.

The reports which have been issued since that jubilee are before us: they show the same earnest loving spirit, and give much ground for hope as regards the future of the University in these days of constant and rapid change.

In the report for 1879 we have the following suggestive passage:—

Let me urge that influence over individual scholars can come in general from the teacher alone. He and he only can watch the progress of each child, and act or speak as is required at particular moments. The long absence of many of us from our classes tends to create the impression that we come into the school only from term to term as subordinate workers. But this cannot be so. The general directors of the school can only deal with scholars in the mass, or with individuals partially and occasionally; the teacher within his limited area must be, as far as the school is concerned, the one watchful helper of each child. He must be their first mover in all, the suggesting friend at the home, the ready encourager in all improvement, the constant intercessor for the weaknesses and temptations of the daily life of all his scholars. With him it lies to strive that one and all shall live lives of faithful service, and reach at length the "joy of the Lord."

The following passages from the last report issued in 1881 will give some indication of the deep debt which the

school owes to the last superintendent, the Rev. R. Appleton, who held office for eight and a half years, more than double the length of time of any of his predecessors :

Teachers have gained some advantage, I hope, from a weekly social gathering in my rooms, which has given opportunities for informal introductions and conversation. A plan of the same nature has been very successful with the first division of our boys, those at the critical age 13 to 15. In the winter months we have opened two class-rooms for them once a week, from 8 to 9.30. The first hour has been devoted to games, papers, &c., the last half-hour to a reading or lecture by one of the teachers. The periodic catechizing of sections of the school has been continued with good results as regards the scholars. We have not, however, been able to rouse the parents as a body to show interest by being present; teachers may with profit work for this.

A Bible class has been formed for young men who have left college choirs, and whom their vicars find it advisable to entrust to our care. The members have been few in number, but give encouragement by their interest and regular attendance. The Choristers' Branch has made solid progress in all ways under the new superintendent.

Our last discussion opened up the questions of our scholars' prayers and Bible reading. It is our great privilege and opportunity that we are able to assist the parents in inducing *habits* in our scholars while they are young and impressible. It was suggested that each teacher may form his class into a union to read over week by week the lesson of the next Sunday afternoon, or some other passages. We desire to see our scholars not alone "firmly rooted once for all in Him," but also "built up higher in Him day by day," and "growing ever stronger and stronger through their faith."

We have said nothing about the Children's and Mission Church of St. John, erected in 1873, at an expense of £1,200, in which the services for all the Sunday Schools of the parish have since been held, nor of the lending library by which 5,249 volumes were circulated last year; but it is time we should conclude.

We welcome the existence and continued prosperity of the Jesus Lane Sunday School, because it affords to young men a field of unobtrusive but useful labour for the glory of God and the cause of Christ; it tends to diminish the selfishness and self-indulgence inseparable from University life, and brings undergraduates into contact with people of a different class and different age from their own; it gives some happy and useful employment for the hours of the Lord's Day; it leads to the earnest and prayerful study of God's word, and to supplications for others at a throne of grace; it gives to our future clergy an interest in Sunday Schools, and an insight into their working.

The Jesus Lane Sunday School undoubtedly owed its origin to the Evangelical section of our Church, but is evidently not

now so exclusively attached to it as once it was ; it seems rather to reflect somewhat the prevailing idea among young men at Cambridge that it is not well that they should make a formal adherence to any school of thought. If, however, it is to continue to do good work it must be conducted in the spirit of its founders, and rest upon that strength which has hitherto sustained it, and given it such a remarkable development. It was founded in humble dependence upon the blessing of the Holy Spirit. "It was commenced," says one of the earliest teachers, "with much prayer:" "we knelt down and prayed together for a blessing on the work in which we were about to engage," writes another: in the same spirit it is, we are sure, still conducted.

There are dangers in popularity and prosperity against which the Committee of Management will do well to guard, and we cannot do better than conclude with the wise words of Bishop Titcomb who, as will be most readily admitted, both in Delahay Street and Salisbury Square, showed no narrow or exclusive spirit in his dealings with others.¹

In a work like that of Sunday School teaching, unless all are agreed in fundamental principles, how is success possible? What uniformity of action, or what union of spirit can there ever be, if some teachers are undoing the work of others? It is worse than useless for the sake of too broad a charity to overlook essential distinctions, and to attempt impossible amalgamations. Let us hope, however, that such dangers are in this case imaginary. The teaching of this school has hitherto preserved the simplicity of evangelical teaching; and I trust it will long continue to do so.

C. ALFRED JONES.

ART. III.—PRESENT ASPECT OF THE CONFLICT WITH ATHEISM.

THE championship of Christianity against unbelief appears to be passing into the hands of the Anglo-Saxon race. France has lately returned, on mature deliberation, to that complete banishment of God from the national life which she had adopted for a brief period only during the fiercest frenzy of her first revolution. In Italy the hatred of religion runs so high that it cannot spare from insult even the ashes of a dead Pope. Not much can be said in favour of Germany while Häckel is a chief authority in science and Strauss in theology. Russia is strug-

¹ See Introduction to the "History of the Jesus Lane Sunday School," published in 1864.

gling in the grasp of a Nihilism, whose creed is the negation of all accepted beliefs. On the Continent, therefore, the outlook, from the point of view not merely of a Christian but of a Theist, cannot be regarded as bright. In England, however, and in North America, whilst the struggle waxes hotter and hotter, there are no signs of defeat. There was never a time, I believe, when the fire of Christianity burnt more clearly, or was more widely spread. The extended and ever-increasing agencies for doing good—good physical, mental, and moral—all of which have their origin and their life in the religious motive, are in themselves a sufficient evidence of this fact. It may be said that Atheism is also advancing, both as to the number and calibre of its adherents. But even granting this to be so, it is clear that these new adherents are mainly recruited, not from the ranks of sincere Christians, but from the vast multitude of the lukewarm and the indifferent. This multitude, standing between the two contending hosts, is, I believe, diminishing rapidly, by inroads both from the side of Christianity and of Atheism. With regard to the former we may well rejoice; and even with regard to the latter we have warrant for holding that no state is so hopeless as that of lukewarmness, and that an open enemy is better than a feigned ally.

Such being the state of the struggle, it seems worth while to inquire what are the chief agencies by which, on the one side and the other, it is being carried on. In the present Article I propose to attempt this very briefly, confining myself entirely to our own country; and having done so, to consider whether the agencies on the side of religion deserve encouragement, and if so, how far the encouragement now afforded them is adequate to the need.

I will begin first with the forces of our opponents. There are in England two active societies existing solely for the propagation of Secularist ideas. The larger of these numbers many thousands of members, and the additions have lately been at the rate of 100 a month. It maintains some eight or ten lecturers, and procured in one year the delivery of over 1,000 lectures, and spent nearly £4,000 in propagandism. It issues three weekly publications, which have a large circulation, besides a deluge of pamphlets, tracts, and leaflets. Bundles of these latter are distributed gratis in factories and elsewhere; and the papers are issued to public reading-rooms. The other society is less energetic and influential, but still issues a weekly paper, and promotes the circulation of literature, which it recommends as being of the most destructive character possible. Such are some of the agencies at work for the spread of Atheism amongst the masses. With regard to the upper classes, there is not, of course, the same organization, and the missiles, so to

speak, are far fewer; but they are more powerful in at least the ratio of cannon-balls to rifle bullets. Scarcely a month passes but that one or other of the leading magazines contains an article of a distinctly anti-Christian character; and no one able to read between the lines can fail to see that the downfall of religion is an object dear to the editors of at least a large proportion of our daily and weekly journals.

The advocacy of one or two eminent men of science is a potent factor in the case; and probably not a day passes in which Professor Huxley's Agnosticism is not somewhere quoted triumphantly as a convincing proof that Christianity is a falsehood.

We will now pass on to the agencies existing on the Christian side. Amongst these the first place is fairly due to the Christian Evidence Society, which claims for itself to be the only Society whose sole and specific work it is to endeavour to check the spread of popular infidelity—the only organized missionary agency to Secularism. It was founded in 1870, has the Archbishop of Canterbury for President, and numbers amongst its Council such men as the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Gloucester and Peterborough, Lord Carnarvon, Lord Shaftesbury, &c. Its main work has been the giving of lectures, especially in London. It has had the courage to grapple face to face with the great Propaganda of Secularism, described in the last paragraph. On several occasions the Society has taken for a course of lectures the Hall of Science, at Clerkenwell, which was built by Mr. Bradlaugh and his followers, and forms their acknowledged headquarters. These lectures have been given by clergymen or laymen chosen by the Society, and at the close of each lecture full discussion is allowed. This generally means that some one popular champion, put forward by the Secularists, engages in a kind of duel with the lecturer, each delivering alternate speeches of ten minutes' length, and each attacking his opponent's position and defending his own. Lectures under similar conditions are continually got up by the Society in different parts of London and the suburbs.

Speaking from some personal experience, I must record my belief that such discussions are productive of great good. It is not that many, or perhaps that any, are convinced and converted on the spot. A clever orator—and the Secularists have many such—will always have enough rhetoric on his own side of the question, to dazzle minds generally incapable of cool reasoning. Mr. Bradlaugh, for instance, has at command an endless flow of metaphysical phrases and fireworks, which have little or no meaning in themselves, but which are as inspiring to his audience as "that blessed word Mesopotamia" was to the old woman of history. What such discussions effect is to show, to

those still open to conviction, that conviction is possible; that Christianity has not merely authority but also evidence on its side; that its claims can be argued; and that its supporters are willing to come out and argue them in fair field, and are able at least to hold their own, even against the best champions of "free thought." Seed is thus sown, by which, through God's blessing, men may be and have been brought back from error to a sincere acceptance of truth.

A less attractive, but, I believe, equally important work, is done by the Christian Evidence Society in providing lecturers to meet the open air propaganda of the Secularists. In many open spaces of the east and north of London, Secularists regularly assemble every Sunday, and give lectures on their favourite topics to all who will listen to them. The arguments used at such times, as might be expected, are far more coarse, violent, and blasphemous than in their more formal meetings, but their effect is probably to the full as mischievous. The Society combats these by employing Christian lecturers to give addresses at the same time and place as those advertised by our opponents. These lecturers are laymen, chiefly clerks or tradesmen, and are thoroughly acquainted with the classes with whom they have to deal. Their task is a difficult one; it needs besides sound thinking and the power of clear expression, very decided gifts of temper, tact, and in many cases personal courage. Their chief temptation is to follow their opponents in descending to blacken the characters of the opposing leaders—a line of conduct which, though not without some justification, is not to be encouraged.

Hitherto we have spoken of work in London alone. The Society, however, does its best to carry out similar work in the provinces, especially in the manufacturing districts; and although it is difficult to obtain local assistance in the getting up of such lectures, yet a considerable number are delivered every year. Another department of their work consists in holding classes, and arranging examinations on the subjects of Christian evidence. The number of persons offering themselves to such examination is not large, but about 130 certificates were issued in 1881. Lastly, the Society endeavours, in some degree, to meet the want of publications on the question, which may be readily and cheaply obtained. Many of the lectures given at the Hall of Science, and elsewhere, have been collected into volumes and published, and these volumes have passed through several editions. Tracts are also widely distributed, and grants of books are made under special circumstances. No works aimed specially at the forms of unbelief current among the more cultivated classes have been published; but the Society has

lately promoted the writing of a volume on Christian Evidences, by Professor Redford, of New College, London.

An association, called the Guild of St. Matthew, has lately undertaken, at the East End of London, a work similar in aim, though very different in method from that of the Christian Evidence Society. In addition to lectures and discussions, held on neutral ground, the members of the Guild read papers before the Secularist Societies themselves. They all profess advanced and even socialistic views in political matters; and strive to recommend themselves to unbelievers by testifying their full accord with them in questions outside religion. They seem to say:—"We will go the whole way with you in your Radicalism and Socialism: will you not go a little way with us in our Christianity?" There will be various opinions as to the prospects of success from this method; clearly it must be left in the hands of the peculiar school who have originated it.

Of a widely different character is the Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain, founded in 1866, "to investigate fully and impartially the most important questions of Philosophy and Science, but more especially those which bear upon the great truths revealed in Holy Scripture, with the view of reconciling any apparent discrepancies between Christianity and Science." This is its first avowed object, which it endeavours to carry out by the reading of papers at stated times, and their subsequent publication; and none could be named more interesting or more important. The Society owed its origin, I believe, to the stir excited by the publication of Mr. Darwin's theory of evolution. Unfortunately, instead of regarding this as an hypothesis to be investigated, the founders of the Society seem to have looked upon it rather as a heresy to be written down. As a natural result, the Society has, to some extent, failed to obtain, in the eyes of men of science, full credit for that strict impartiality which with them is the first requisite for successful research.

The above are all the agencies upon which it is needful to dwell. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge has, indeed, a Committee for Christian Evidence; but for some time past their publications have been few, and seem now to have ceased altogether. The Religious Tract Society are publishing a new series, some of which will be of an evidential character; but it is too early to say anything definite as to their value. There are, I believe, but two publications, weekly or monthly, which are devoted to this question—namely, the "Shield of Faith" and the "Champion of the Faith;" the latter of these especially seems to be doing good work; but neither of them has any outside support or means of attaining a wide circulation.

There are, of course, theological reviews, such as the *Expositor*, but they do not reach, and are not meant to reach, any who are not already believers.

Such is a brief sketch of the agencies which exist in England for the defence of truth and the combating of error. Our next step is to inquire whether it is desirable that they should exist at all. Probably there is scarcely any one who will answer this directly in the negative; but practically I am certain that many feel in their hearts a decided objection to any such undertakings. This feeling is, I believe, specially common amongst the clergy, and accounts in great measure for the lack of sympathy which they as a body unquestionably evince in this matter. The feeling itself springs no doubt from natural and, to some extent, praiseworthy ground. They shrink from dragging what to them are the highest and holiest of verities into the arena of coarse and violent controversy. They hold that we should convert the world, not by argument, but by example; that Christianity should win its way by the force due to the virtues and purity of its adherents. Mixed with this is perhaps a natural impatience with those who demand a reason for their faith, and will not accept it implicitly and thankfully from the lips of their appointed guides.

But whatever we may think of these motives, it is not hard to see that the conclusion is a false one. Its upholders have the whole history of Christianity against them. The Founder of our faith bade the Jews judge righteous judgment, and search the Scriptures which testified of Him. He rested His claim on the evidence of His words and works, and not upon His character, although to us that character has become an important part of the evidence. His followers did the like. What are the speeches of St. Paul? What were the daily disputings in the school of Tyrannus? but so many lectures on Christian evidence, given in the face of ridicule, opposition, and contempt.¹ The early Christians changed the religion of the world, not only by exhibiting patterns of virtue, but far more by preaching the Word, in season and out of season, throughout all the regions of the earth. St. Boniface converted the Germans, St. Augustine the Saxons, by going among them and preaching to them the truth as it is in Jesus. It may be said that the Church does the like now in her missionary enterprises to heathen lands. But it is a strange way of maintaining an empire, to be straining after foreign conquests while you refuse to check rebellion at home. Why are the enemies of the faith in East London less worthy of attention than those in India? The former, it may

¹ The speech at Athens may well be regarded as a model for such lectures.

be said, have Christianity in their midst. They can enter the churches and chapels, they can admire the good works and the virtues of Christian teachers. The same might have been said in later Roman times, wherever Christianity had obtained a definite footing. But this did not prevent the ceaseless and successful efforts of the Church to defend the faith and to convert the pagans. I do not for a moment dispute that almost all the good work done in England for the bodies and minds of men, as well as for their souls, is done under the influence of the religious principle, and would shrivel to nothing if that principle were withdrawn. Nor do I deny that the effect of this fact, in predisposing persons to accept Christianity, may be considerable; but to have any effect it must be realized, and it can only be realized either by those who aid in such works, or those who reap the benefits of them. Now the great mass of the shop-keeping and artisan classes in this country neither dispense nor receive charity. The work done amongst the poor has little interest for them, and they have no means of knowing by whom it is administered. They are, no doubt, aware that the clergy take a great part in such works; but this, as it appears to them, is only what they are paid to do. On such, therefore, the great mass of Christian work makes but little impression, and it is precisely from such that the ranks of Atheism are recruited. Just as Christians must go out from home to the heathen, and preach to them in their own streets and in a way suited to their own needs, so they must leave their churches and chapels to preach to these home-heathen, and must address them in a way suited to their needs—viz., the way of fair argument and direct persuasion, to which, and to which alone, they will listen.

There is another point to be mentioned which prevents the spectacle of Christian virtue and Christian charity from having its full effect in turning the masses to the faith. This is the unhappy state of disunion and dissension which exists among Christians themselves. To one who stands apart from the conflict, it is somewhat perplexing to watch the keen and breathless interest with which the clergy of all parties follow every phase of the conflict between the reformed Churches and Rome; and to contrast this with the apparent indifference and even dislike with which they approach the struggle between Christianity and Atheism. A nation which spends much of its energies in internal quarrel cannot be said to show such a front as will make a lively impression upon the enemies who are without.

If, then, we grant that the direct warfare against infidelity should be maintained, we may pass on to inquire whether the means of doing so are adequate. On this head there can be no doubt whatever. The organization is less than deficient; the

resources less than scanty. The Christian Evidence Society is supported by Christians of all denominations; but its income from subscriptions, donations, and collections, was last year but £1,500, and of this about £500 was due to a special movement for provincial lectures, inaugurated and supported by a single wealthy layman. In the report for 1880 the income from the above sources was £1,009 19s. 1d., and out of nearly 400 subscribers making up this amount I find that ninety-three only were clergymen, and that the sum of their contributions reached the total of £112. This seems but a small pittance for the clergy of all denominations to contribute towards the carrying on the struggle against Atheism. The income of the Guild of St. Matthew is less than £50, so that their contribution is not, from the financial point of view, important. The Victoria Institute have about the same income as the Christian Evidence Society; this again is chiefly derived from laymen, and can only be said partly to be given to theological as distinguished from scientific work.

It is natural that, with so scanty a supply of the sinews of war, the arrangements for carrying on that war should be deficient. The Christian Evidence Society has done good work in combating the propaganda of Secularism among the lower classes; but it has not attempted to deal in any special way with the cultivated infidelity which meets us in the columns of newspapers and the pages of magazines. Moreover, its chief mode of operation, by lectures, is open to the objection that it necessarily reaches but a very limited audience. At one time the Society published a journal, the sale of which, though at first promising, gradually fell off. It was in consequence discontinued, and a movement lately made to replace it was vetoed on the ground of expense.

Those who call attention to a want are always expected to propound a remedy; and though this is no part of my plan, I will not shrink from making one or two passing suggestions. One has, in fact, been alluded to already—viz., the establishment of a high-class journal, issued in a popular form, which shall make the presentation of Christian Evidences and the meeting of Atheistic doubts at least one prominent feature of its arrangements. If it also had another side—such, for instance, as the advancement of popular science—this would be no harm, but rather an advantage. It is said such a journal could not make a profit. I do not believe it. Those who make the assertion know little of the interest which is felt on such topics by the intelligent laymen of our middle and lower classes. But granting it to be true, there are many religious journals which private persons or societies are content to carry on at a loss, for the sake of influencing men towards some particular party or sect. Are there

none such who will risk money for the sake of influencing men (and those the most difficult to reach by any other means) towards the living way of the Gospel of Christ ?

There is another suggestion I cannot help making, though I have little hope of its meeting with favour. I allude to the establishment of a Society for the scientific study of theology. In all departments of knowledge except this, it is recognized that some encouragement is needed for original research. To put the matter boldly, original research does not pay. A well constructed handbook, or a brilliant popular exposition of science, may obtain readers enough to give a direct return to publisher and author ; but a piece of original work, such as really advances the science, cannot hope to do so unless written by one who has already obtained a high reputation with the general public. In all departments of science this is fully recognized ; and the best means of overcoming the difficulty is found to be the formation of special societies. Those who are interested in the science join the Society as subscribing members ; its most eminent cultivators form the governing body, and the funds defray the expense of preparing and publishing original papers, which have been read and discussed at the meetings. Such associations are often very flourishing bodies. The Geographical Society and the Institution of Civil Engineers count their members by thousands ; while the Geological Society, the Chemical Society, the Zoological Society, &c., are the recognized organs by which these several sciences are nourished and advanced. Theology alone has nothing of the kind. There is no body before which a student, whether of evidential or devotional divinity, can bring the result of his labours for examination and discussion ; or which, if it is approved, might enable him to publish it to the world. To appeal to the bookselling trade is as hopeless for him as for any other student. He will be told (and here I speak of what I know) that theological works never pay, unless they are written by men of established reputation, or deal with some subject which for the moment has taken hold of the popular mind. There can be no doubt, I think, that if Butler were now an unknown young man, and were now to write the "Analogy," he would have to print it at his own expense if he printed it at all.

Is it too much to hope that this void might be supplied ? It might, perhaps, be said that the differences between theologians are too deep to admit of their thus working in concert. It is a miserable confession, if it be true ; but is it true ? No doubt in the extreme parties of the Church the heat of theological controversy is as intense as ever ; but there are, it appears to me, an increasing number of moderate and enlightened men (well represented among the dignitaries, as well as the rank and file

of the clergy), who are quite capable of discussing points of difference in a spirit of candour and charity. And nothing, I can say with confidence, tends more to foster this spirit than such free and fair discussion. Those who have debated theological questions, even with Secularists of the most violent type, will I am sure bear me out in this view.

The last and most important point which I wish to urge is the advantage that would result from a closer union between the clergy and laity on this matter. For want of such union the idea (entirely unfounded as regards England) has arisen that scientific laymen are, as a rule, disbelievers in Christianity, their studies leading them to see that its doctrines cannot be maintained. I firmly believe that this idea has more influence in promoting infidelity, whether amongst the higher or lower classes, than all the sceptical writings and preachings put together. As a matter of fact, the idea is altogether the reverse of the truth. I could fill pages of this magazine with a list of names, all of acknowledged eminence in some department of science, whose owners I myself know to be sincerely religious men. It would not, however, be right thus to mark out the living; but it may be allowed to speak of the dead. Three eminent names were lately lost from the scientific roll of England, Professor Clerk Maxwell, Professor Rolleston, and Sir Wyville Thomson. Now, all these three were men whose devotion to Christianity was perfectly well known to their friends, and was even mentioned in the Memoirs published after their deaths. I cannot but think it an enduring calamity for the Church that three such men should have been suffered to pass away without recording their several testimony on her behalf. Why this should have been is obvious enough. Men of such calibre are ever slow to speak on subjects beyond their special studies; and no impulse or encouragement from the religious world could ever have reached them.

For the last two or three years it has been my endeavour to bring the testimony of Christian men of science to bear on the religious controversies of the day. In this work I have met with the fullest sympathy and the most active assistance from laymen of all shades of opinion, and eminent in most departments of science. With them the interest in the subject is as keen as their insight into Nature is profound. From a few individual clergymen, some of them holding the very highest positions in the Church, I have also received aid beyond what I could have claimed or expected. There is no doubt as to their appreciating the full importance of the question. On the other hand, I have failed to meet with the slightest encouragement from what may be called the clerical world, as represented by religious societies and similar organizations. One example will suffice.

Among various publications which have been placed in my hands with a view to increase their circulation there were two of special note. One of them was written by the first surgeon in Europe; the other by the first botanist in America. I do not know why I should refrain from mentioning the names of Sir James Paget and Dr. Asa Gray. Both of them are men distinguished for brilliant qualities outside the special departments in which they stand supreme. Both their works were specially marked by such qualities, combined with a reverence of tone and full acceptance of the faith, such as might content the most conservative of theologians. If the Secularists could produce on their side (they cannot) two works of such import, and written by such men, they would cry them at the corners of the streets, they would disseminate them by thousands, and shower them upon the counters of every bookseller that would take them, in every town of the kingdom. But after much effort, I have failed in finding any society, or set of Christians, who were willing to spend a solitary shilling in making these works better known to their fellow-men.

The case, as it appears to me, may be stated very briefly. The main attacks upon Christianity at the present day are admitted to proceed from what professes to be science, whether the science of Physics, of Geology, of Biology, of Criticism, or of History. Such attacks must be met, therefore, by men who know what science is, as well as what theology is. Clergymen, however, with a very few brilliant exceptions, do not concern themselves with science, and are, therefore, incapacitated from the task—a fact which, no doubt, does much to account for their dislike of the subject. On the other hand, the many laymen who are at once scientific men and believers, shrink from posing as theologians. In point of fact, however, the difficulties of the present day have little or nothing to do with theology, if we restrict that term to ecclesiastical dogma and the literature written upon it. Agnosticism and Secularism will not be defeated by any extracts from patristic or modern divinity, or any writings founded upon such, valuable as these may be in their place. A master of science, who is simply conversant with the main principles of divinity, is therefore fully competent to undertake this noble and necessary task. Such volunteers exist by the score: is it not worth the Church's while to enrol them under her banner, and lead them into the battle?

Meanwhile—and I wish I could urge this with a force proportionate to my own conviction—the case for Christianity is going by default. The Church resembles a man who, accused of fraud in a difficult and important matter, refuses to plead, points to his character and his virtues, and declares that these should answer for him. Such a man has no right to complain

should he find himself condemned, even though his judges be very different from the half-educated masses who have to decide on Christianity. And if such a course be possibly permissible, where only the man's own character is concerned, can it be so with a Church, whose condemnation means eternal ruin to souls committed to her charge?

To show that I am upholding no mere fancy of my own, I will quote one of the latest testimonies of Agnosticism. The following passage occurs in the *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1882:—

To turn to the Church for enlightenment in this dilemma is vain. It has no clear and certain teaching to offer regarding the true place of science in the economy of things; and the laity must themselves carve or shape out a new philosophy of life, which will harmonize and give consistency to conduct.

The writer of the above is a Mr. J. H. Clapperton. Of his position in science I know nothing. I do know that there are hundreds of scientific men, certainly more eminent than he, who have perfectly clear views regarding the true place of science in the economy of things, both material and immaterial; and who find "a standard of conduct and a harmonizer of knowledge" in that old philosophy of life which was set forth nearly 1,900 years ago on the hillsides of Galilee. But they are passing from us year by year: and if their place is taken by men of other views and another spirit; if culture and Christianity are divorced in England, as they have been divorced in Italy and in France; then I make bold to say it will not be the fault of science or her followers, but of a Church, who, shrinking from the conflict herself, will have refused the aid of those able and willing to wage it for her.

WALTER R. BROWNE.

ART. IV.—BUDDHISM.

THIS article is the substance of a lecture given at Sion College on the 22nd of June last, at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, in consequence of the assertions of Infidels and Secularists to the effect that Buddhism may be considered as equal if not superior to Christianity in its moral teaching and influence over the lives of its adherents. The authority with which such allegations are usually supported is, *as far as it goes*, unimpeachable; it is a portion of the Buddhist Scriptures, but it is only a portion. The remainder, which is neither inconsider-

able nor insignificant, is ignored for an obvious reason, namely, that its contents furnish a complete refutation of such statements.

Our sources of information on Buddhism are the Buddhist Scriptures, which are divided into three parts called *Pitakas* or Caskets; the *Vinaya*, the *Sutta*, and the *Abhidhamma Pitakas*, which are accepted by all Buddhists as the *ipsissima verba* of the founder of their religion. It is to the *Sutta Pitaka* that Secularists in England triumphantly point as affording proof of the equal excellence of Buddhism to that of Christianity. In what then does this excellence consist? Simply the inculcation of kindness to all animates, the subjugation of all desires, and annihilation. And this is what entitles Buddhism to be placed on a footing of equality with Christianity!

But this article is intended to supply the convenient omissions of the Secularists, and will take up and examine the other division of the Buddhist Scriptures, the *Vinaya Pitaka*, which deals with discipline, and is therefore of a more practical nature. Before entering on this task, however, it is necessary to a clearer understanding of Buddhism to give a short sketch of Buddha and his times.

The founder of this religion was an Indian prince named Siddhartha, the son of Suddodhana, the King of Māgadha, who reigned in Kapilavastu about B.C. 600. He is generally known as Gotama Buddha, the former name being the family appellation, the latter his official designation, signifying the *Omniscient Being*. This title, however, was assumed at the commencement of his career as a religious teacher. On his way to Benares in quest of disciples he was met by an *ascetic*, who asked him the name of his Superior and Teacher. To this he replied:—

“I am the Universal Subjugator and Omniscient,
 Uncorrupt in all Doctrines.
 I have forsaken all: I am free from all desire.
 I may declare what I have learned by myself.
 I have no teacher: there is none like me:
 Even in the divine world there is not my equal.
 I am the Rahat in the world, I am the unanswerable Teacher.
 I am the perfect Omniscient Being, and reside
 in the cool state Rahatship.”

He then proceeded on his way, and proclaimed to five Bhikkhus or Mendicants the discoveries he had made, and a method of emancipation from the ills of existence. His views were embraced with enthusiasm, and thus was inaugurated that system of religion which has numbered among its adherents untold millions of the human race. Its spread was very rapid; and at no great interval the new religion was adopted by all classes, from the king to the meanest subject in Māgadha: nor was it

confined to the domains of a single potentate, but on the contrary, it extended far and wide amidst the neighbouring principalities.

The student of the history of that period and country cannot but attribute the rise and rapid development of Buddhism to the long-continued existence of *caste*. The fundamental rules of this system of caste determined the superiority of the Brahman over men of all other castes, who were called Kshattriya, Vaiçya or Kshuddra, according to their respective births in the governing, mercantile or menial families of the community. Buddha, at the commencement of his career, declared the necessity of disregarding all distinctions of caste, and accordingly received disciples from all castes into his religion on terms of equality; yet such was the esteem in which he held his own caste that he, not unfrequently, claimed for it superiority over the Brahman. For amongst the innumerable definitions found in the Buddhist Scriptures, we read the following with respect to caste:—"Jāti lesa nāma:" "Khattiyo dittho hoti—Brahmano dittho hoti." "Vesso dittho hoti—Suddho dittho hoti." "The meaning of race distinctions—there is the Kshattriya to be seen—the Brahman, the Vaiçya and the Kshuddra." Again, "Yāti: Khattiyī vā, Brahmanī va, Vessī va, Suddī va." "Any one (feminine) means, a Kshattriya, Brahman, Vaiçya or Kshuddra woman."

Such a movement as this could not fail to excite the sympathies of the lay-castes against the pretensions of the Brahmans; the result was that multitudes soon embraced this religion and entered the ministry of the new Kshattriya Teacher, who declared that birth was no bar to virtue, nor to the possession of the highest attainable position in the domain of religion and morality.

Buddhism is by no means exclusive. It admits the possibility of good existing in any religion, and even of good independent of religion, but it claims superiority over others, inasmuch as it professes to stand alone in pointing out a method of escape from all kinds of evil for all animates. It is recorded that Gotama, after a long and careful study of the religious systems of his age and country, expressed himself dissatisfied with them on account of the impermanency of the rewards they promised.

On the vexed question of the primary cause of matter and life he was content to remain an agnostic, hence we find that love and obedience to the ruler of the universe are unknown in Buddhism. Its worship is therefore simply an act performed in memory of Buddha, who *was* but now *is not*, and prayer is non-existent; for the mood of the verb in worship is not precative but indicative, thus, *Buddham saranam gacchāmi* means "I go to the refuge of Buddha."

It may be well now to give a short account of the Sutta Piṭaka, that part of the Buddhist Scriptures which Secularists tell us propounds a scheme of religion equal, at any rate, in excellence to that of Christianity. In this division Gotama Buddha appears in the character he delighted to assume: *Ahamasmim tilogoru*, "I am the teacher of the three worlds;" and enumerates his discoveries in ethics, morals, physics, and metaphysics. Here he enunciates what is the distinguishing feature of his religion, *Kamma* the result of action, as the *fons et origo* of all existence, with its attendant pleasure and pain, joy and suffering. According to this theory the *present* is the product of *the past*, and the germ of *the future*, and every creature in the universe by every act of his is welding the weal or woe of the generations which follow; and moreover, each individual is his own god or *genius*, and the life to come must depend solely on the actions here.

The Abhidhamma Piṭaka, or third division of the Scriptures, is of subsequent origin, and of less value than the Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas. The subject treated of is similar to that of the two others, only amplified and more abstruse. Originally, only two divisions of the Buddhist Scriptures were known, the Dhamma and the Vinaya, which were collected, revised, and fixed, at the so-called second Council at Vaisāli, 383 or 443 B.C., *i.e.*, about 100 years after the death of Buddha. The Buddhists themselves assert that this was done immediately after his death at the first Council of Rājagaha; but whatever the time of compilation may have been, we doubtless have in them the doctrines and commandments of Buddhism, as they were known anterior to the Christian era. They are accepted by all Buddhists as the repositories of the Faith, and infallible sources of authority on all matters connected with their religion. It is quite possible that when these writings have been subjected to further European investigation and learned criticism, fresh attempts will be made to separate the *ipsissima verba* of Buddha from those which probably have originated from his followers; but the absence of very ancient manuscripts will render certainty an impossibility, and we shall doubtless have many conjectures totally at variance with one another. With regard to the Pāti Mokkha or Manual of Disciplinary Confession, which must be recited twice each lunar month, we have the *dicta* of Messrs. Rhys Davids and Oldenburg, in direct opposition. The former is of opinion that it was a subsequent compilation, an abridgment of the laws of the Vinaya Piṭaka; while the latter confidently affirms that this Pāti Mokkha was the original disciplinary code of Buddha, and that the Vinaya Piṭaka was a later—probably much later, emendation and debased commentary. And with regard to *Nirvāna*, the *summum bonum* of

Buddhism, the nature of which has engaged the attention of many oriental scholars, but hitherto with only this result, "*quot homines, tot sententiæ*," it is doubtful whether we shall ever arrive at a certainty, because many of Buddha's assertions on the matter of Nirvāna are contradictory, as are those on the higher nature of man. The belief in Atta or permanent personality had been declared by him to be heterodoxy; yet he has repeatedly asserted his own former existence in his Jātakas, or books of the former births. We have thus irreconcilable differences of opinion about the soul or spirit of man; Nirvāna, therefore, the final goal of the Rahat, is indeterminable.

Now we know fairly well what Buddhism is—theoretically; what are the teachings of the *Sutta Piṭaka*, in which Buddha is simply the teacher and exemplar? We know that he professes to have discovered the causes of the present orders of life with their attendant ills, and the means whereby they might be removed. We know that he asserts that he successfully applied them to himself, and that he announced them to the world in the hope that the most learned and best of mankind would adopt them, and by their unassisted efforts realize their fulfilment. We know also that he declared that Kamma was the unfailing Arbiter of all states of existence, and that there was no escape from this Nemesis but by the complete subjugation of all cleaving to life, which, when done, would introduce the successful aspirant to the calm state of Rahatship. As this is the portico of Nirvāna, it is sometimes called the Savupādisesa nibbāna, or the Nirvāna of *parts*, in contradistinction to the great eternal, Nirupādisesa nibbāna, the Nirvāna, of *no parts*, which immediately follows the death of that individual.

But when we look at Buddha, as he appears in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, we see him under a new aspect, as the hierarch, ruler, and judge of his body of clerics, who, under the appellation of Bhikkhus, have renounced the world and entered on a state in which the reproduction of the species, and the acquisition of property beyond what is barely necessary for the preservation of life, are inadmissible. It is a state of Ascetism and Seclusion, without any of the elements of corporeal torture, which commonly distinguished the devotees of other religions in those countries. It was considered the best possible aid to the efforts of the individual who longed for release from the sorrows inseparable from every state of existence. Impossible it was not, but nevertheless incalculably more difficult for the Layman to accomplish this deliverance, on account of the claims which the outer world made through his senses; and without doubt the aims of Buddhism would be attained if all the world were to become celibates, and subject to the *Vinaya*, as well as the *Sutta Piṭakas*; and also if all other animates were to cease

from producing their own species, because all known phases of life are undesirable, for they originate in ignorance, they continue inseparably connected with sorrow and pain, and each one ends only to be repeated under similar circumstances. For this reason the man or woman who becomes a Bhikkhu is immeasurably superior to the rest of mankind, because such a one has entered on a course of discipline which will prove a material help in working out the longed-for self-emancipation.

All the laws of the Vinaya were Buddha's own, which were promulgated as occasion required; and it is remarkable that he who posed as the great Censor of the taking of life should have frequently used the verb *Nāseti*, to kill, to indicate that an irrevocable decree of excommunication should be pronounced on a Bhikkhu who had been guilty of one of the four greatest possible breaches of discipline.¹ It was not the custom of Buddha to make regulations for the conduct of his followers until the necessity arose, so that his first disciples—both lay and cleric—were at first without any directions as to the manner in which they should spend their time.

In the Mahā Vagga we are told that other religionists observed the Lunar Festivals, or the days of the Full or New Moon, with those of the other quarters, thus having what nearly amounts to the weekly sabbath, but Buddha's disciples did nothing of the kind until he was exhorted to issue commands to this effect by one of the most famous of his adherents, Bimbisāra, King of Rājagaha, who thought that other systems would prosper, while Buddha's failed by reason of his lack of festivals. Buddha readily complied, and ordered assemblies to be convened on the quarter days of the Lunar Month. The assemblies met, but there was no religious service, because none had been authorized. This gave offence to the laity, who called the clerics *dumb pigs*, and Buddha then commanded the Pātimokkha, or the Confessional Service, to be recited on these occasions. In this service the various breaches of discipline are enumerated, defined, and explained, with their several degrees of punishment, suspension, and absolution. Numberless regulations are given with regard to the time, place, and manner of these services; regulations which were rendered necessary by reason of the persistent determination of some of the clerics to evade every command, or prohibition, if a method of doing it without breaking the letter of the law could be discovered.

Buddha established two orders of disciples, Lay and Cleric. The former are called *Upāsaka* lay devotee, the latter Pabbajito ascetic, or Bhikkhu mendicant. The lay devotee is a person who

¹ These four are called Pārājikā offences, and relate to cohabitation, theft, murder, and the false assumption of superhuman powers. *Vide infra*.

has betaken himself to the three refuges, Buddha, the Law and the Church, and resolves to observe the first five commandments which prohibit killing, theft, impurity, lying, and the use of alcoholic drinks; but the cleric, or Bhikkhu, is one who has separated himself from the world on account of Buddha and his doctrines, in order to imitate him in the complete subjugation of the cleaving to existence, and thus eventually arrive at Nirvāna. There are two orders of clerics in the Buddhist Church, Sāmanero and Upasampadā, corresponding closely to the Deacon and Priest in the Episcopal Church. The first mentioned, the Sāmanero, must be old enough to scare away crows—*i.e.*, about eight years of age—to receive the first ordination; all his hair must be shaven off, he must put on the orange-coloured robes in the prescribed manner, and falling at the feet of the duly qualified Bhikkhus, thrice declare his acceptance of the Three Refuges. He is then a Sāmanero cleric, and must be attached to some Upasampadā Bhikkhu, to whom he must stand in the relation of son and servant. He must observe the ten commandments, five of which are binding on the Upāsaka, and the other five relate to prohibitions of the eating of food after mid-day, attendance at balls, concerts, and public shows, the use of perfumes and sweet unguents, sitting on high and great seats, and the receiving of silver and gold. If he transgress any of the first five, or revile Buddha, his law or his church, entertain heterodox views, or cohabit with a female Bhikkhu, he must be destroyed—*i.e.*, excommunicated.

In order to be admitted into the second order, the Upasampadā, a chapter of duly qualified clerics must be convened, and an Upasampadā mendicant, who has authority to do so, must thrice request the assembly to admit the candidate to this order of the priesthood. The candidate also must thrice for himself request the same thing, and when by their silence he understands that there is no objection, he must submit to an examination as to his qualifications for the office. If this prove satisfactory, the chapter must be requested thrice that he may be admitted to the second order of the Priesthood by a certain Superior.

When a number of mendicants live together, one of their number must be elected as their Upajjhā, or superior, and to him the others must pay a respectful obedience, as if they were his children, while he must have the status of parent towards them.

On the Uposatha Festival, the day of the New or Full Moon, the assembly must be convened in the prescribed manner, and the Pāti Mokka or manual of confession read. If any Bhikkhu finds that he has been guilty of any breach of discipline, he must confess it and submit to the penalties prescribed, and at the expiration of the punishment request and obtain reinstatement.

Another important season in the Buddhist Church is the *Vas*, which lasts three or four months during the rainy season, from June to October. Throughout this season the *Bhikkhus* may not travel to collect alms, but must remain in a fixed temporary hut, and instruct the people who come to them and bring them the food they require. At the end of this season it is customary to furnish the *Bhikkhus* with the robes they require for the ensuing year.

We now come to the regulations passed by Buddha of a disciplinary character as we find them recorded at great length in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*.

There are 227 rules and prohibitions affecting the male *Bhikkhus*, divided into eight classes, according to the magnitude of the offence committed, or the importance of the subject embraced. They are the four *Pārājikās* or irremediable breaches of discipline; the thirteen *Samghādisesa* offences which although serious are expiable: the two *Aniyata*, or indeterminate faults: the thirty *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* breaches of discipline which necessitate confession and forfeiture: the ninety-two *Pāṭidesaniya* offences of less degree than the preceding, but requiring confession: the seventy-five *Sekhiyas*, irregularities relating to dress, deportment, food, the monastery, &c., and the seven rules to be adopted in settling questions. As thus indicated, the gradation in the above-mentioned classes of offences is from the greatest to the least, and the most heinous offences are included under the first name *Pārājikā*, which means defeat, and implies permanent exclusion from the order of clerics. This, according to the custom of Buddha, is emphasized by well known and opposite similes—viz., It is impossible to rejoin a severed human head to its trunk and thus restore life; to reunite a withered fallen leaf to its stem and make it green: to unite a broken rock: and the *Palmyra*, whose head has been cut off, cannot again bear fruit, so the *Bhikkhu* who has been guilty of either of the four *Pārājikā* faults can never be reinstated as a member of that order.

I. *Pārājikā*. The subjects treated of under these four Rules are cohabitation, theft, murder, and false assertion of the possession of virtues and superhuman powers.¹

¹With regard to the first—cohabitation, a long account in the *Pārājikā* book is given of the venerable *Sudinno*, the only child of a banker, who, in opposition to the wishes of his parents and young wife, renounced the *Lay* state and donned the orange-coloured robes of the *Bhikkhus*. After many entreaties from his parents and wife he consented to cohabit with her in order to preserve the family name; and on being reproved by Buddha, justified his conduct on the ground that no prohibition to this effect had been issued. The latter told him that he was without excuse, because he had acted contrary to the principles of

(1) About twenty pages of the Pārājikā book are filled with details of fearful vices which display the state of society in the time of Buddha, and the appalling results that attended his efforts to run counter to the laws of Nature.

It is often said that these sins of the Bhikkhus are not chargeable to Buddha; admitting this, what can be said of the legislation which makes vices almost inconceivably abominable, of less degree in guilt than actions which result in the reproduction of the species?

(2) The second Pārājikā regulation, which relates to theft, was first proclaimed and defined by Buddha on his hearing complaints that one of his Bhikkhus had taken Government timber to build a hut without having obtained permission. Accordingly, it was proclaimed that as a thief would be subjected by the king to death, or imprisonment or banishment, so the Bhikkhu who, had been convicted of this kind of theft, was guilty of a Pārājikā offence, and, consequently, excommunicated.

The Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus, who were most troublesome to Buddha and famous for their ingenuity in discovering methods of evading his prohibitions, then went to the washermen's gardens and stole the cloths they found there, and when told that this was prohibited by the above-mentioned law, replied that the inhibition related only to property in the jungle, whereas these cloths were stolen in the village. Buddha then included village-property in this regulation. He also defined the value of the thing stolen, declaring that it must be either five māsakas or more to make the offence a Pārājikā fault (a māśaka is stated to be a small coin of $4\frac{1}{2}$ grains of either gold or silver). Numerous instances are then given of attempts made by Bhikkhus to steal beyond the limits of the prohibition, and as with the first Pārājikā offence, they eventually succeeded. In some cases

the Order, which enjoined the complete subjugation of all carnal desires. Buddha then issued his first disciplinary prohibition, and declared that henceforth if any member of the order of Bhikkhus cohabited with a woman he was guilty of a Pārājikā offence, and was permanently excluded from that body. Immediately following this, we meet with details of attempts made to evade this prohibition, and every subsequent enlargement of it, too vile for publication and displaying a state of corruption almost inconceivable. Thus, after the promulgation of the above mentioned law, the record proceeds to tell of bestiality. Then all female creatures were included in the prohibition. Some clerics in every possible way exercised their ingenuity to satisfy their brutish lusts on the living, and, when Buddha's prohibitions followed them there, they turned to dead and inanimate matter with the hope of escaping the extreme penalty. Their efforts were futile, but eventually were crowned with success, for we find full descriptions given of horrible sins which Buddha has declared not Pārājikā, but Samghādisesa, Thullaccaya, or Dukkata—i.e., breaches of discipline, remediable after suspension and penance, or evil actions to which no penal consequences appear to have been attached.

a Bhikkhu desirous of obtaining the property of another, would ask a brother cleric to steal it for him ; if he consented, and took the thing specified, both were guilty of a Pārājikā offence ; but if the agent stole a different object, the originator of the theft was not guilty.¹

(3) When Buddha on a special occasion had delivered a most impressive address to the Bhikkhus in the Vesali on the ills and sorrows of life, they were so influenced by his speech that they desired immediate death, and requested a priest, Migalandiko, to kill them. He complied with their wishes, and then went to the Vaggamuda river to wash the blood from his sword. While there, he was overcome with remorse ; but a god of the chase knowing his thoughts assured him that he was quite mistaken, that the deed he had performed was meritorious, and exhorted him to persevere in the same beneficent course of action. He then went from monastery to monastery offering to carry to the other shore all who had not reached it. This went on till the number of his victims amounted to sixty a day. When this was reported to Buddha he convened an assembly, reproved the offender, and enacted the following law—namely, that if any person knowingly take the life of a human being, he is guilty of a Pārājikā offence and excommunicated.

The Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus, who had become attached to the wife of a lay devotee, who was sick, pictured out to him the pleasures of heaven, and told him that in consequence of his blameless life he was certain to arrive there. He therefore refused to take nourishment and died. Buddha, on hearing of this, expanded the above inhibition to make it include this kind of action.

Many devices were resorted to as before to evade this prohibition, by employing others to commit the murder. Instigation itself was an "evil act." If the murder were perpetrated as the prompter intended, both the perpetrator and prompter were guilty of a Pārājikā offence ; if otherwise, the prompter was not guilty of any breach of discipline.²

(4) On a certain occasion, when some Bhikkhus had met together to observe the Vas season on the banks of the Vaggamuda river, there was a famine in the land, and they thought that in consequence they would find great difficulty in procuring food, unless they resorted to some device to make the people willing to give. Accordingly, they resolved to make it known that they were Bhikkhus distinguished for their possession of the noblest

¹ About twenty pages are filled with the account of attempts thus made by the Bhikkhus to steal, and of Buddha's decisions as to the degree of culpability or innocence of the person concerned.

² Many pages are occupied with the record of cases of administering medicine to women with criminal intent.

virtues attainable by their order, virtues which would certainly enable them to reach Nirvāna; and that some of them actually possessed superhuman powers. The people believed them, and furnished them with abundant supplies of food. At the end of three months these Bhikkhus, according to custom, returned to present themselves to Buddha, who asked how it was that they were so fat and sleek, while the rest, on account of the famine, were weak and emaciated. They confessed that they had duped the laity with the assertion of their possession of certain virtues and powers, and met with a severe reproof from Buddha, who now passed his Fourth Pārājikā Enactment, forbidding the false assertion of the possession of the highest virtues and powers attainable by the aspirant to Nirvāna. This regulation also the Bhikkhus attempted to evade in many ways, and occasionally with success.

II. The second class of breaches of discipline—Samghādisesa offences—are so called because a complete chapter of Bhikkhus must carry out the punishment and restoration connected with these faults. There are thirteen divisions of offences so named, the first five of which may be denominated sins of self-defilement and approaches to adultery, or actions which are not breaches of the first Pārājikā rule, because, although their tendency lay in that direction, they stopped short of the actual commission of cohabitation. Under each head many varieties of these vices are recorded, each of which was a Samghādisesa offence, or, in some cases, an offence of less importance. It may be doubted whether any other religion in the world has in its authoritative Scriptures such a disgusting record of fearful vices indulged in by the priests of that religion, and declared by its founder to be minor breaches of discipline and easily remediable. If the accuracy of this assertion be challenged, a perusal of the account of the above-mentioned five rules must be made, and a darker picture sought elsewhere. Nor should it be overlooked that although Buddha cannot be held as responsible for the abominable practices of his clerics, yet the fact is undeniable, as we have said, that he classed these vices among the *minor* offences, and declared that any one who had been guilty of any of them might remain a member of the order of Bhikkhus.

The remainder of the Samghādisesa offences relate to the taking of property, suborning false witnesses, rape or adultery innuendos, attempts at schism, abuse, and the participation in games and public amusements.¹

¹ After the commission of a Samghādisesa offence a Bhikkhu's duty was to confess it immediately, in order that a chapter of the qualified members of his order might be convened, and the punishment be determined and pronounced. If there had been no delay in confessing, the preliminary suspension called Parivāsa was shortened; if otherwise, this first disci-

III. The two Aniyata—undefinable breaches of discipline—are so called because it might not be possible at the time to say to which class—Pārājikā, Samghādisesa or Pācittiya—they belonged. From the illustrations given they appear to signify association with a female in private, in such a friendly manner as to give rise to suspicions that a serious breach of discipline has been committed or contemplated; and if after inquiry it was discovered that such was the case, the offenders were punished according to their degree of guilt.

IV. The next order of offences is denominated Pācittiya, and is divided into two classes—Nissaggiya Pācittiya and simply Pācittiya. They are respectively thirty and ninety-two in number, and the former relate to offences against property, in atonement for which the Bhikkhu must repent and forfeit what he has acquired; for the offences contained in the latter class he must submit to censure and show penitence.

Most of the Nissaggiya Pācittiyas were connected with the robes, cloths, bowls, comforts for the sick, the receipt of money, and the abuse of lawful privileges. In every case the offender was obliged to restore his stolen possessions and show sorrow for his misconduct. Here also acts of filthiness and indecency are described, but no further censure of them is intimated than that implied in the forfeiture of the robes which have been thus defiled.

The ninety-two Pācittiyas relate to lying, ridicule, mischief-making, evil associations, whisperings, backbitings, tale-bearing, giving pain to animals, familiarity with female Bhikkhus, misuse of the furniture, &c., of the monastery, and similar matters, many of which belong rather to the laws of etiquette and good manners than to morality.

plinary state was imposed for a time equal to that which had elapsed between the commission of the sin and its confession. In some cases it was necessary for other members of the fraternity who were not offenders to take the initiative, and perform several acts preliminary to that of suspension, but this must be done in the prescribed manner. The culprit was then charged with his offence, reproved, reduced to a state of submission, separated from his companions, and temporarily subjected to a sentence of exclusion. While under Parivāsa-suspension he had no rights of fellowship with the innocent Bhikkhus, and could perform none of the official acts which were part and parcel of their privileges. If while under this Parivāsa-suspension the offender were found guilty of a similar fault or remembered having committed one, he was obliged to submit again from the beginning to this state of discipline.

The second stage of punishment was called Mānatta, a state of exclusion from the society of the Bhikkhus for six nights. The disabilities under which he laboured at this time were much the same as those of the Parivāsa-stage; and if in this interval he were guilty of a like offence, he was forced to renew his penance. At the end of this stage the Abbhāna ceremony, that of restoration to all the privileges of his order—was performed by a Chapter of the Assembly in the prescribed manner.

There does not appear to have been any penance imposed nor separation enforced on account of these acts; but when the offender was conscious of any of them, he was required to confess his fault, repent, and promise to amend.

V. The four Pāṭidesaniya rules relate to irregularities about food, and, as the name implies, it was necessary that the breach of discipline should be confessed, and similar actions for the future avoided.

VI. The seventy-five Sekhiya regulations are about dress, deportment, food, &c., of the most trifling character, which, like some of the preceding, were rendered necessary by the almost incredible stupidity and lethargy of many of the Bhikkhus. As an illustration of the extent to which this legislation was carried we find it recorded that, on *permission* being accorded by Buddha, the Bhikkhus caused houses or sheds to be erected for their own use, and that when these houses were flooded in the rainy season, on account of the lowness of the floors, the poor Bhikkhus would not exert themselves to keep out the water until *permission* had been gained from Buddha by the enactment of a law *permitting* raised floors. These were now made, but yet more terrible calamities were in store for the wretched Bhikkhus. Some of their body were constantly falling off these raised floors for the want of a railing to keep them in. This inconvenience, however, was not remedied till *permission* by law had been granted to surround the raised floors with railings. Their troubles did not end here. For considerable difficulty was experienced in mounting the floors, but no Bhikkhu dreamed of making steps to the floors until *permission* was gained from a law made for that purpose by Buddha himself; and even then some Bhikkhus fell down these law-granted steps because they had no law-granted hand-rail.¹

This review of Buddhism must now draw to a close. It has necessarily been but partial on account of the wide field it covers. It has been a review of the disciplinary laws of Buddha and the causes which led to them. From these we learn how

¹ It may be briefly stated that similar disciplinary laws were issued for the female Bhikkhus in consequence of their criminal irregularities. This order was most unwillingly founded by Buddha after the earnest solicitation of his foster-mother and his favourite disciple Ananda. The female Bhikkhus were separated from the world, and subjected to almost all the laws affecting male Bhikkhus, to whom they were subjected and inferior. Numerous regulations are given about the relative duties of the male and female Bhikkhus to prevent familiarity and association except for certain well-defined public religious duties. In every case the nun, or female Bhikkhu, was inferior to the male cleric. Thus the female Bhikkhu who may have been 100 years in the Upasampadā order is bound to be submissive and respectful to a male Bhikkhu who may have had but one day's service.

he endeavoured to regulate the actions of his clerics and punish their misdeeds. It is, indeed, a wearisome and painful task to wade through the mass of revolting and frivolous details of the crimes, follies, peccadillos, and innumerable irregularities of Buddha's mendicants, and the laws he made accusing or else excusing them, but this is what must be done to obtain a comprehensive and true view of his religion and character. Hitherto he has been presented to the European reader and student as he appears in the Sutta Piṭaka, in the character of the Discoverer and Preacher of Dhamma and Kamma, Law and Result; but we must also look on his portrait in the Vinaya Piṭaka where we see in him a legislator and ruler of a body of clerics.

If this be done, there can be but one result. If thus put in the balance and weighed he will be found wanting; and although we cannot but admire many of his utterances relating to virtue and kindness to all creatures, yet we are disappointed to find that his greatest doctrines and highest rewards are all negative. He was an agnostic about the origin of life and matter, and the King of Pessimists. He declared that Nirvāna, or the cessation of change, thought, and, according to his own views of man's higher nature, even of life itself, was the *summum bonum*, only attained after infinite exertions and countless lives spent in joy and suffering.

It is desirable that his character and religion should be fully known, so far as the laws of decency and propriety will admit of details being given, from his own Scriptures, and the verdict will certainly then be just. He will be acknowledged as one of the greatest reformers of hoar antiquity, who in several countries and in the various stages of the early development of civilization endeavoured according to the lights they had to improve their fellow men and make them obedient to moral law. But they all failed because they could not remove the sins already committed, nor implant a new Nature in man which could engender in the heart a love of virtue for its own sake, and still more a love of God the Author and Giver of all good. This has been done by Jesus of Nazareth, whose religion has in it all the elements of good, and is sufficient for all the requirements of humanity. He is the bright Sun of Righteousness still rising with Healing in His wings, and appears as such to all who fear and love Him whether as nations or as individuals. His rays are now lighting up Eastern and Southern Asia, and the light of Buddhism is waning and paling as do the stars in the incomparably superior glory of the rising orb of day.

S. COLES.

ART. V.—OUR SUPPORT OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
IN 1881.

ENGLAND'S liberality in supporting Foreign Missions was fairly maintained during the year 1881; but no advance was made.

Delayed Reports of several Societies being at length issued, in September, 1882, the financial results of 1881 are now fully marshalled for review. To make such a review, year after year, would have been one of the most useful and most legitimate of the duties of a general Board of Missions, if such a body had been called into existence. As, however, this lack has been supplied during the past eleven years, by the labours of a private individual, there is now less need than ever for creating such a Board.

Upon minute inspection, we find that though the muster-roll of British Contributions is scarcely so large as it was in 1880, it nevertheless shows a grand total of £1,093,569. This sum is less, by £15,381, than the previous year's total (the largest ever raised for Foreign Missions); but it considerably exceeds those of 1878 and 1879.

The statistics of Britain's Missionary efforts during recent years, when examined *en bloc*, bear cheering and incontestable witness to the existence of increasing progress, activity, and life. This progress may be all the more satisfactory from the close resemblance of its method to that of a calmly flowing tide. On the margin of an ocean the wavelets recede for a brief interval before and after each forward movement; the tide's onward power and progress are nevertheless sure and certain. We observe that the crest of the wave of contributions reached onward, and still onward, in 1873, in 1877, and in 1880.¹ Very decided and well marked was the progress made in those years. Though the wavelets recede slightly during intervening periods the tide is nevertheless flowing still; *Laus Deo*.

The broad channels into which the tributary streams of British contribution flowed, during the year 1881, may be cited as five in number:—

¹ Summary of British Contributions to Foreign Missions for eleven years:—

	£			£
1871	855,742	...	1876	1,048,472
1872	882,886	...	1877	1,100,793
1873	1,032,176	...	1878	1,071,944
1874	1,009,199	...	1879	1,086,678
1875	1,048,408	...	1880	1,108,950
	1881		£1,093,569.

		£
I.	23 Societies of the Church of England	460,395
II.	13 Bible, Tract, Education, and Missionary Societies, supported jointly by Churchmen and Nonconformists	} 153,320
III.	16 Nonconformist Societies (English and Welsh)	} 313,177
IV.	23 Presbyterian Societies, Scottish (16), and Irish (7)	} 155,767
Total Protestant Contributions		1,082,659
V.	2 Roman Catholic Societies	} 10,910
Total voluntarily contributed in the British Isles during 1881-2		£ 1,093,569

Attention may be drawn, *en passant*, to the last item. The collections of the Roman Propaganda are always quoted in *francs*; and, in that form, its totals have an imposing sound. Thus, in 1881, France figures in the list as contributing 4½ millions—of francs. Stated in a similar way, the British contributions to the Roman Propaganda are written in the imposing figures 218,895*l.* 8*o.*, which mean nothing more than £8,686. The popular adage that “extremes meet,” is remarkably illustrated by the coincidence that three very different religious bodies, in the British Isles, gathered each in the year 1881 their *maximum* income for Foreign Missions. The Reports which proclaim this fact, with becoming jubilation and thanksgiving, are those of the FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, the WELSH CALVINISTIC METHODISTS, and the ROMAN CATHOLIC PROPAGANDA.¹

The fruitful interest in Foreign Mission work, which can sometimes be incited among the lower stratum of the middle classes, is well illustrated in the Missionary Report of the WELSH CALVINISTIC METHODISTS. It states that contributions, far above the average of those usually given by wealthy persons, came from members of that Society who are in very ordinary circumstances; not above the position of working men. One residing in Liverpool contributed £30; another, who

¹ As the statement is in this case of historical importance, it may be useful to many of our readers to have the exact words of the announcement. “The year 1881 has been a truly blessed one for our Association. Owing chiefly to the additional Jubilee offerings, our receipts have risen to the sum total of 6,906,058*l.* 19*s.*, exceeding by 886,018*l.* 53*s.* those of 1880. This is the greatest harvest of alms that we have yet received, and the . . . comparative table will show, that in every part of the globe the Sovereign Pontiff’s voice has been obeyed.”—*Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, May, 1882, p. 111.

dwells at Dowlais, gave £24. That Society, following the example of the WESLEYAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY, encourages a band of juvenile collectors by giving to them prizes of books. Collecting cards are issued to Sunday Scholars a few weeks before Christmas. Keen competition then ensues among the children of each school to obtain the largest collection of the year. A small prize is given to each collector; but those who obtain the largest sums receive books of value. These are called "Christmas rewards," a term which might puzzle uninitiated readers of the Wesleyan Society's cash account.

Far more satisfactory is a system now utilized on behalf of the CAMBRIDGE DELHI MISSION, the UNIVERSITY CENTRAL AFRICAN MISSION, the MELANESIAN MISSION and others. Children in our Public Schools, and in Church Sunday Schools, are incited by collections made among them to take an interest in Foreign Mission Work. Thus, Eton has for several years largely assisted the work in Melanesia, and other Schools now do likewise. From the chapels, or houses, of Tunbridge School, the Surrey County School, Highgate School, and the Leeds Clergy School, nearly £50 was received for the CAMBRIDGE DELHI MISSION, during 1881. More than thirty African teachers and scholars are supported, in schools of the CENTRAL AFRICAN MISSION, each by a separate Church Sunday School in England. For this purpose, each School must contribute at least £7 per annum. It is cheering to see that as many as thirty Sunday Schools achieve this, on behalf of one Society alone. The custom now happily obtains amongst the supporters of various Missionary Societies, and must have a beneficial effect upon English school children.

Vast improvement has been effected in the method of setting forth the financial affairs of Missionary Societies, in their Reports, since the present writer commenced his annual analysis and summary of their receipts. In England the SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL has always been pre-eminent for the lucidity and comprehensiveness of its financial statements. In the CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY'S Report for 1881, several changes of method may be noted, and each is an improvement. The addition of an alphabetical index of the names of all parishes from which contributions come, is a decided boon to that SOCIETY'S members.

In the WESLEYAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY'S Report for 1881 there is one novel feature of interest and importance. A summary has been made of all the local expenses of collection, which had been deducted from the British contributions before they reached head-quarters:—the Mission House in London. This summary appears upon the General Statement of Receipts and Expenditure for the year, and is very instructive. It

shows that from a total sum of £108,815, contributed in various districts, expenses amounting to £6,180 were deducted before the money was forwarded to London. That is to say, local expenses of collection consumed $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the general contributions, before they were subjected to any deduction for the cost of the Society's staff at head-quarters.

This Society seems to maintain mission work at its various foreign stations, without curtailment, even when the needful funds are not contributed at home. Consequently, debt and interest thereon become heavy charges. The deficiencies of three years last past burden the Society with a present deficit of £33,308; and the interest paid last year, for borrowed money, amounted to £2,763, or more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the total sum collected in Great Britain. Happy is the Society which has good reason to believe that its supporters will ultimately relieve such deficiencies by means of a "Thanksgiving Fund."

It is worthy of notice, that by showing upon its Annual Statement the entire sums collected, together with a summary of the amounts deducted in the local districts, for expenses, the Wesleyan Society enables its supporters to know exactly how much of their contributions will go to real mission work. The majority of Societies¹ bring into account only the amounts actually received at head-quarters; they render no summary account of the local expenses.

Notwithstanding that the Wesleyan Society thus charges itself with all local expenses and with heavy interest on a deficit, its total home expenses are less than 17 per cent. of its receipts. It thus compares well with many other societies which, ignoring altogether the local expenses, nevertheless expend upon home machinery and appliances 16 per cent. of their receipts (like the CHURCH OF ENGLAND ZENANA MISSION); or 18 per cent. (like the GENERAL BAPTIST, the EVANGELICAL CONTINENTAL, and the SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE CHURCH AID SOCIETIES); or 19 per cent. (like the LONDON SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE JEWS); or 21 per cent. (like the COLONIAL AND CONTINENTAL CHURCH SOCIETY); or 24 per cent. (like the FOREIGN AID SOCIETY); or 27 per cent. (like the COLONIAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY); or 28 per cent. (like the BRITISH SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL AMONG THE JEWS); or 31 per cent. (like the SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY); or even 39

¹ We need not except from this statement the Reports of the PRIMITIVE METHODIST MISSIONARY SOCIETY and the UNITED METHODIST FREE CHURCHES MISSIONS, which specify all the local expenses in tabular district summaries. They do not bring them into the general account of expenditure. The local expenses tabulated by these Societies as being deducted before the collections reach head-quarters amount to 10 per cent. of the sums contributed.

per cent. (like the TURKISH MISSIONS AID SOCIETY). Small societies must always of necessity be, in proportion, more expensive than large ones.

The actual head-quarter expenses of the WESLEYAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY bear about the same percentage to the total receipts as do those of the SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL, the CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY, and other large Societies—*i.e.*, between 10 and 11 per cent.

W. A. SCOTT ROBERTSON.

ANALYSIS OF THE RECEIPTS OF SOCIETIES FOR 1881-2.

I. *Societies of the Church of England.*

	From abroad and other sources.	From Invest- ments.	British Contribu- tions.
	£	£	£
1. Church Missionary Society	8,977	9,618	202,541
2. Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (in addition to £14,328 received through Societies mentioned below)	2,193	11,827	106,631
3. London Society for Promoting Chris- tianity among the Jews	298	2,910	34,741
4. Colonial and Continental Church Society	22,140	173	19,529
5. Church of England Zenana Missionary Society	164	49	18,041
6. Society for Promoting Christian Know- ledge, sum paid in aid of Foreign Missions, about	12,000
7. Central African Mission of the Universities	361	282	11,311
8. South American Missionary Society	2,729	157	8,667
9. Moosonee Diocesan Funds	6,300
10. Spanish, Portuguese, and Mexican Churches Aid Society	71	...	5,853
11. British Syrian Schools	110	134	4,936
12. Missionary Leaves Association, aiding native clergy of the Church Missionary Society	4	4,077
13. "The Net's" collections, for Mackenzie Memorial, £995, and other missions	2,278
14. Melanesian Mission	2,181
15. St. Augustine's Missionary College, Canterbury (in addition to its perma- nent endowment)	731	2,155
16. Capetown Bishop's Aid Association	1,963
17. St. Boniface Mission House, Warminster	1,400
18. Foreign Aid Society for France, Belgium, Italy, and Spain	3	1,355
19. Columbia Mission	30	...	1,299
20. Coral Fund to Aid Schools and Churches of the Church Missionary Society	21	1,099
21. Colonial Bishopricks Fund	2,093	10,490	936

	From abroad and other sources.	From Invest- ments.	British Contribu- tions.
	£	£	£
22. Cambridge Mission to Delhi	47	693
23. Delhi Female Medical Mission	409
24. Christian Faith Society for the West Indies	...	2,176	...
<i>Estimated Value of other Contributions</i>			
unreported, and of Gifts sent to Mission	10,000
Stations			
<i>Total of Donations, Legacies, and Annual Subscriptions</i>			} £460,395
<i>from the British Isles.</i>			

II. Joint Societies of Churchmen and Nonconformists.

25. British and Foreign Bible Society, devoted } to Foreign Mission Work, about	73,000
26. Religious Tract Society	564	18,163
27. China Inland Mission	9,550
28. Indian Female Normal School Society	3	...	6,939
29. Moravian (Episcopal) Missions of the } United Brethren	12,923	758	6,115
30. Society for Promoting Female Education } in the East	1,012	560	6,080
31. Livingstone Inland Congo Mission	4,969
32. East London Institute for Training } Missionaries, proportion for Foreign } Missions, about	4,408
33. Christian Vernacular Education Society } for India	6,085	139	4,363
34. Waldensian Missions Aid Fund	3,663
35. Turkish Missions (American) Aid Society	2,181
36. Trinitarian Bible Society	1,889
<i>Estimated Value of other Gifts and Con- } tributions unreported</i>	12,000
<i>Total of Donations, Legacies, and Annual Subscriptions</i>			} £153,320
<i>from the British Isles</i>			

III. Nonconformist Societies (English and Welsh).

37. Wesleyan Missionary Society (including } £6,260 spent on Missions in Ireland) }	147,113	4,505	121,635
38. London Missionary Society	26,339	4,849	81,299
39. Baptist Missionary Society	10,049	2,062	46,624
40. English Presbyterian Foreign Missions	189	117	12,607
41. British Society for the Propagation of the } Gospel among the Jews	6,839
42. United Methodist Free Churches Foreign } and Colonial Missions	7,584	...	5,839
43. "Friends" Foreign Mission Association	89	373	5,163
44. Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Missions	116	473	5,077
45. General Baptist Missionary Society	3,389	...	4,727
46. Primitive Methodist Colonial Missions	3,691
47. Methodist New Connexion Missionary } Society	980	...	3,111

	From abroad and other sources.	From Invest- ments.	British Contribu- tions.
	£	£	£
48. Evangelical Continental Society	2,848
49. Wesleyan Ladies Auxiliary for Female Education	45	2,547
50. Colonial Missionary Society	140	76	2,143
51. "Friends" Mission in Syria and Palestine	730	44	2,143
52. Primitive Methodist African Missions	1,884
<i>Estimated Value of work sent to Mission Stations and other Contributions un- reported</i>	5,000
Total British Contributions through English and Welsh Nonconformist Societies			<u>£313,177</u>

IV. Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Societies.

Free Church of Scotland Missions.

53. Foreign Missions	27,989	2,975	31,764
54. Jews Conversion Fund	335	7,428
55. Colonial Mission	63	4,259
56. Ladies Society for Female Education	3,825
57. Continental Fund	95	3,763
58. United Presbyterian Missions (Foreign, Colonial and Continental)	724	185	35,529

Church of Scotland Mission Boards.

59. Foreign Missions	8,888	342	13,623
60. Colonial and Continental Missions	6,019
61. Jewish Mission	4,508
62. Ladies Association for Female Missions	3,343
63. Ladies Association for Educating Jew- ish Females	407
64. National Bible Society of Scotland	1,103	15,587
65. Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society	937	76	4,742
66. Waldensian Missions Aid Fund, about	2,587
67. Lebanon Schools	864
68. Original Secession Church Indian Mission. <i>Estimated Value of other Scottish Con- tributions</i>	786 2,500

Total, through Scotch Presbyterian Societies £141,534

Irish Presbyterian Missions.

69. Foreign Mission	1,848	286	4,566
70. Jewish Mission	4,369
71. Colonial Mission	100	...	1,890
72. Ladies Female Missionary Society	1,557
73. Continental Mission	17	523
74. Gujarat Orphanage Fund	119	...	328
75. Mrs. Magee's Indian Education Fund	1,281	...
<i>Estimated Value of other Irish Contribu- tions</i>	1,000

Total Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Contributions £155,767

V. *Missions of British Roman Catholics.*

	From abroad and other sources.	From Invest- ments.	British Contribu- tions.
	£	£	£
76. Society for the Propagation of the Faith	8,686
77. St. Joseph's Missionary Society and Col- lege of the Sacred Heart (Mill Hill, Hendon)	2,224
Total Roman Catholic Contributions			£10,910



ART. VI.—MR. GARDINER'S CHARLES THE FIRST.¹

MR. GARDINER is well known to all historical students as the writer who has made the period of the first two Stuarts upon the English throne his special province. As the reader refers to Freeman for all that appertains to the Norman Conquest, to Stubbs for a knowledge of our early constitutional charters, to Froude for the period of the Reformation, to Macaulay for the incidents in the lives of James the Second and William the Deliverer, or to Stanhope for the deeds of the House of Hanover; so does he who desires to make himself familiar with the latest revelations as to James the First, as to Charles the First and Buckingham, and as to the personal government of the "martyr monarch," study the volumes of Professor Gardiner. Our author is a believer in original research, and does not content himself with second-hand references. Busying himself amid the mine of wealth contained in our national archives, he has consulted the State Papers to no little purpose, and has produced historical works which are models for accuracy and sound judgment. Mr. Gardiner lacks the picturesque style of several of his contemporaries, but we feel as we peruse his volumes that we are in the hands of an earnest, a painstaking, and in the main an unprejudiced historian, and these gifts are sufficient to cover any defects as to style that may be apparent in his narrative. The work before us is a continuation of the volumes dealing with the personal government of Charles the First. Here we quit Prerogative for Parliament.

The causes which led to the fall of the monarchy of our first Charles are not difficult to discover. In the summer of the year

¹ "The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I." By S. Rawson Gardiner L.L.D. Two Volumes. Longmans. 1882.

1637, the date from which the events recorded in these volumes begin, more than eight years had passed away since a Parliament had met at Westminster. During those years, in spite of threats of war which Charles had neither the nerve nor the means to carry out, peace had been maintained, and with the maintenance of peace, in spite of the despotic acts of the Sovereign, the material prosperity of the country had been largely on the increase. But the higher aspirations of the nation remained unsatisfied. England had been without a Government, in the best sense of the word, as truly as she had been without a Parliament. The events of this period divide themselves under three heads: the ecclesiastical policy of Laud, the fiscal policy of the King, and the resolute conduct of Strafford.

The character of Laud is well known. He was an arrogant, petulant, and fussily-active leader of the sacerdotal party, a bitter politician, a trusted and determined counsellor. Like many men whose talents are not conspicuous for their breadth or brilliancy, he was incessant in the labours he set before him. His energy, says a contemporary, was "miraculous." He would come fresh from the composition of a State Paper to discuss with the dons at Oxford the best means of putting down the irregularities of undergraduates. At one moment he would be sitting as presiding judge in the Star Chamber or High Commission Court, and the next he would be keenly tracking out the disobedient Nonconformists. "We took another conventicle of separatists," he writes to his secretary, with all the glee of a successful sportsman, "in Newington Woods, on Sunday last, in the very brake where the King's stag should have been lodged for his hunting the next morning." Now, he would busy himself with suppressing wakes, or making suggestions for the embellishment of his favourite Oxford; and then he would be hard at work meddling with the churches of the English residents in Holland, with the affairs of Protestant refugees in England, or with the national worship north of the Tweed. "Nothing was too lofty, too distant, or too mean to escape his regulating hand." The chief feature in his policy, however, was his harsh and narrow conduct as an ecclesiastical reformer. He was determined to put down, at all costs, legally or by arbitrary methods, the "puritanical" element which was then leavening the Church of England. He gave orders for the removal of the holy table from the centre of the aisle, that it might be placed as an altar at the east end of the church. He had no favour for the clergyman who refused to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to uphold the Apostolical Succession; and his punishment for the violation of a ceremonial rubric was severe. He was equally strict in regard to the congregations, exacting—and for this none can blame him—reverent behaviour during

the hours of divine worship : men were not to laugh or talk, or to wear their hats during the prayers, or to receive the consecrated elements non-kneeling. Worshippers were to bend their heads canonically, and to turn to the East at the proper moments.¹ Among the State Papers is a document which certainly deserves attention. It is alluded to by Mr. Gardiner, but not so fully as our readers might desire. Sir Nathaniel Brent, the vicar-general, was commissioned by Laud to furnish a report of the result of the visitations he had made throughout the dioceses of Norwich, Peterborough, Lichfield, Worcester, Gloucester, Winchester, and Chichester. Sir Nathaniel's report gives us an insight into the condition of the country, and of the Church; the offences complained of, and the punishments inflicted, are of the most curious interest. At Norwich we read that "the cathedral church is much out of order, the hangings of the choir are naught, the pavement not good, the spire of the steeple is quite down, the copes are fair, but want mending;" that "many ministers appeared without priests' cloaks, and some of them are suspected of nonconformity, but they carried themselves so warily that nothing could be proved against them;" and that the mayor and his brethren were "convented" for "walking indecently in the cathedral church every Sunday in prayer time before the sermon." At Lynn the report states that the three churches were exceeding fair and well kept, but that "there were 'divers Papists' who spoke scandalously of the Scriptures and of our religion," "they are already presented for it," says Sir Nathaniel, "and I have given order that they shall be brought into the High Commission Court." At Bungay, Mr. Fairfax, a curate, was "charged with divers points of nonconformity," but he renounced all upon his oath, and "faithfully promised to read the King's declaration for lawful sports." Mr. Daines, lecturer of Beccles, "a man of more than seventy years of age did never wear the surplice nor use the cross in baptism." At Ipswich, "I suspended one Mr. Cave, a precise minister of St. Helen's, for giving the sacrament of the Eucharist to non-kneelants." At St. Edmund's Bury, which was "formerly infected with Puritanism, but now is well reformed," the licence of a young curate was taken away "in regard to his great ignorance, being not able to tell me what *ecclesia* did signify." At Stamford "the ministers were generally in priests' cloaks, and they, with the laity, were all the time of Divine service uncovered, and still bowed at the pronouncing of the blessed name of Jesus." At Oundle a canonical admonition was given to the schoolmaster "for expounding the ten commandments out of the writings of

¹ The feeling of irritation against Laud's meddlesome interference with habitual usage, says Mr. Gardiner, was almost universal.

a silenced minister." In the town of Derby several of the clergy were suspended for drunkenness, and for "making very many foul clandestine marriages to the great offence of the country." At Worcester complaint was made of the state of the cathedral, and of the much walking about during the hours of divine service. The vicar of Stratford-upon-Avon was suspended "for suffering his poultry to roost, and his hogs to lodge in the church, for walking in the church to con his sermon in time of divine service," and other misdeeds. At Gloucester it was complained people were "much given to straggle from their own parishes to hear strangers." Thus, in the pages of this report, we see Laud not only zealous in rebuking irreverence and disorderly proceedings, but in encouraging the proper repair of churches and cathedrals. So far so good; but the Archbishop did not stay his hand at irreverence and building frailties; he was resolved to crush evangelicism of all kinds, and to force both clergy and laity to adopt the narrow and intolerant Anglicanism which he was pleased to call the "Catholic" religion. How he carried his views into effect we have but to study the prosecutions he instituted against Peter Smart, Alexander Leighton, Henry Sherfield, William Prynne, and others; which are common facts of history, and which are carefully related by Mr. Gardiner in his volumes upon this period. We think, however, his accounts of these prosecutions would have been more complete had he made more use of the original minute books of the proceedings of the High Court of Commission to be found among the State Papers. In the pages of these minute books occur many curious charges. For example, we read how certain vestrymen were fined ten pounds for their misconduct in publishing a new table of church fees; how one Nathaniel Barnard was fined the sum of one thousand pounds for seditious preaching at Cambridge; how the Lady Eleanor Touchet was fined three thousand pounds for publishing fanatical pamphlets; how John Laverock, clerk, was imprisoned in Bridewell, for preaching in London without a licence. We read further of the punishments inflicted upon men guilty of contempt of court; of preaching after deposition and degradation; of building houses upon consecrated land: we read of cock-fighting taking place before a crowd in church; of persons circulating Popish tracts, and the like. It must be admitted that many of the ecclesiastical reforms which Laud effected were beneficial, but the people saw that the spirit which prompted the Reformer and the Judge was not so much the remedying of abuses, as the right of asserting sacerdotal interference, and the desire to reduce the laity to that state of clerical bondage from which the Reformation had emancipated them. The nation rebelled; and ecclesiastical grievances, complained of but not redressed, were one of

the chief causes which led to the overthrow of the monarchy of Charles.¹

As was the clerical policy of the bigoted Archbishop of Canterbury, so was the financial policy of the Sovereign. In the one instance the Church was to be supreme, in the other so was the prerogative. Obstinate, narrow-minded, but sincere, Charles resolved to render himself independent of all control. The counsels of his own resolve—of Laud and of Strafford—should be his Parliament, and he needed no other. He would fill his empty Exchequer by a system of direct taxation proceeding from the Crown. He dwarfed all his other exactions by the issue of his memorable writs for ship-money. The servile judges silenced opposition by giving their verdict in favour of the Crown. Crawley declared that it was a royal prerogative “to impose taxes without common consent of Parliament.” “The law,” said Berkeley, “recognized no king-yoking policy; the law is of itself an old and trusty servant of the king’s—it is his instrument and means which he useth to govern the people by. I never read nor heard that *lex* was *rex*, but it is common and most true that *rex* is *lex*, for he is *lex loquens*, a living, a speaking, an acting law.” This bias of the bench did not, however, convince the nation. Voices were raised on every side declaring that ship-money was utterly illegal; it was a tax, and the ancient customs of the realm, recently embodied in the Petition of Rights, had announced with no doubtful tone that a tax could only be levied by consent of Parliament. If the king could raise ship-money without consent of Parliament he need not, it was said, ever summon a Parliament again. The question thus became narrowed to this issue:—Did Parliament form an integral part of the Constitution, or did it not? The nation asserted that it did, and their belief on this point was the second cause which ushered in the fall of the monarchy. The legality which Englishmen then cherished was the legality of a nation which had hitherto preserved unbroken the traditions of self-government. Spoken or unspoken—beneath all the technicalities of the lawyers, beneath all the records of the antiquaries, there remained an under-tone of reliance upon the nation itself. Parliaments had been established to gather into a focus the national resolve. It was a new thing that a

¹ Mr Gardiner writes:—“The notion that Laud and Strafford were leagued together in a conspiracy to lay England at the feet of the Pope is so entirely in contradiction with the facts of the case, that a modern reader is tempted at once to treat the charge as a fiction, deliberately invented to serve the ends of a political party. To give way to this temptation would be to commit the greatest injustice. The conviction was shared not merely by Pym and Hampden, who afterwards opposed the King, but by Falkland and Capel, who afterwards supported him, and its existence, as a conscientious belief, can alone explain the vehemence of anger which it produced.”

king should treat the policy and religion of the nation as if they concerned himself alone. If Englishmen opposed such a sentiment because it was strange, they opposed it still more because it was degrading.

And now a new difficulty arose. By his arbitrary interference in religious matters, his illegal impositions, his unconstitutional courts of law, Charles had aroused a dangerous spirit of disloyalty in the nation. Worked upon by the mischievous suggestions of Laud, the king had resolved to carry out the ecclesiastical policy in Scotland which his father before him endeavoured to establish. He would crush the independence of Presbyterianism north of the Tweed, and force every kirk and assembly from Wick to Berwick to accept the hated Five Articles which James had drawn up. And now, in July, 1637, an order was issued from the Privy Council that an English liturgy was henceforth to be used in all churches and cathedrals of Scotland. The storm of indignation with which the order was received is well known. The congregations refused to listen to the formal words of prayer, and in such places where the minister insisted upon using them he was mobbed and his church half wrecked by the angry assembly. At the cathedral church of St. Giles', in Edinburgh, the dean ascended the pulpit to read prayers; shouts of disapprobation from the women drowned his voice. "The mass," cried one, "is entered among us." "Baal is in the Church," said another. Opprobrious epithets were applied to the dean. Then the Bishop of Edinburgh rose up to still the tumult; he begged the noisy zealots to desist from their profanation of holy ground, but his words conveyed an idea which was utterly abhorrent to the Puritan mind, and the clamour waxed all the louder under the ill-judged exhortation. A stool was aimed at his head, and grazed the shoulders of the dean who sat behind him. At this final insult the magistrates were called upon to clear the church of the rioters, and it was with difficulty the building was emptied. What happened in Edinburgh happened in every town in the northern kingdom. Riots everywhere ensued, and the people, led by the aristocracy and their chief ministers, banded themselves together, and openly opposed the hated innovation. The clauses of the Covenant were framed, and eagerly subscribed to. Resistance so determined created considerable consternation in the Council Chamber at Whitehall. Charles was ready to make concessions, but the stern Covenanters declined to enter into any compromise. They assumed the aggressive. "We are busy here," writes a Mr. Craig, from Edinburgh, to Lord Stewart, "preaching, praying, and drilling; and if his majesty and his subjects of England come hither they will find a harder welcome than before unless we be made quit of the

bishops." To conquer this insubordination Charles, in March, 1639, marched the forces he had collected against the "traitorous Scots." On arriving at Berwick, however, the king thought it more prudent to come to terms with his foes. The treaty of Berwick was signed, but its terms were regarded as null and void by the Covenanters. The Scots refused to obey its clauses, to dismantle their forts, to dismiss their unlawful meetings, or to recognize the royal authority over their proceedings.

The king now applied for counsel to one whose advice was seldom given in vain; he wrote to Wentworth. He wished, he said, to consult the Lord Deputy touching the army; "but I have much more," he added, "and indeed too much, to desire your counsel and attendance for some time, which I think not fit to express by letter more than this—the Scots Covenant begins to spread too far." Across St. George's Channel, Wentworth had ruled the people as they had never been ruled before. He quelled all opposition by the vigour of his punishments; he re-organized the army; he freed commerce from the pirates that had infested the Irish coasts, he levied fines, he raised taxes, he established monopolies, he planted new districts, he introduced the general cultivation of flax; he raised the fortunes of the Emerald Isle to a high pitch of prosperity. Within four years the produce of the customs rose from £12,000 a year to £40,000, and in the fifth year of his power he wrote home that the annual revenue would exceed the expenditure by 60,000 pounds.

My lord deputy of Ireland [writes Sir Thomas Roe to the Queen of Bohemia] doth great wonders, and governs like a king, and hath taught that kingdom to show us an example of envy by having parliaments, and knowing wisely how to use them.

Wentworth, in November, 1639, arrived in London, after a stormy passage across the St. George's Channel, and at once became the most prominent member of that secret Council, composed of Charles, Laud, and the Marquis of Hamilton, which now managed the affairs of the nation. He had been opposed to the first campaign against the Scots, but when the conduct of the Covenanters, subsequent to the Treaty of Berwick, was laid before him he declared for war. His assistance was no lukewarm aid. He advised the king to assemble a parliament; he pledged himself to bring over a large subsidy from Ireland; he proposed a loan in England, and subscribed to it by way of example the enormous sum of 20,000 pounds, equal to £100,000 of our present money. These promises, as Earl of Strafford, he carried out, but Nemesis was swiftly weaving her toils, and soon the king and his mischievous advisers were to fall victims to her vindictive wiles. Parliament met—known in

history as the "Short Parliament"—and was soon dismissed. The House of Commons demanded redress for the grievances it had sustained at the hands of the king; Charles demanded twelve subsidies, and declined to comply with the wishes of the popular Chamber; in return the Commons refused to grant the necessary supplies; and in a hasty fit of passion the king dissolved the Houses. The Short Parliament sat for three weeks, and, so far as actual results were concerned, it accomplished nothing at all. Yet its work was as memorable as that of any parliament in our history, for what it proposed was nothing short of a complete change in the relations between the king and the nation; it announced that Parliament was the soul of the Commonwealth, and asserted what the Revolution of 1688 afterwards carried out, that the House of Commons was the central force of the State. Raising funds as best he could Charles pushed on the war with Scotland; Strafford went north as lieutenant-general, but on reaching Durham he heard of the rout of a detachment of the king's troops at Newburn, and was forced to fall back upon York. Then the end came; a peace was entered into with the victorious Scots; the nation was indignant with the excesses and failures of the prerogative, and the famous Long Parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster.

Upon the subject of the illegal taxation introduced by Charles the volumes of Mr. Gardiner, who is more favourable to the Cavalier cause than several of our modern historians, throws much new light. The outcry against ship-money was undoubtedly one of the main reasons which led to the Civil War. Yet, says Mr. Gardiner, "no unprejudiced person can deny that the existence of a powerful fleet was indispensable to England's safety." The sum demanded by Charles for the equipment of the Royal Navy was no more than the case required; and the charge which "has so frequently been brought against him of spending the money thus levied on objects unconnected with its ostensible purpose is without a shadow of foundation." It is perfectly certain that though the grant of tonnage and poundage was originally made in order to provide the Crown with the means of guarding the seas, the expenses of government had so far increased that if tonnage and poundage had been applied to that purpose on the scale that had then become necessary, the exchequer would soon have been in a condition of bankruptcy. But the question of the hour, as we have remarked, was not whether ship-money was necessary or not, but whether the king had the right, of his own mere motion, to levy the tax. If he had, then the right assumed by him was fatal to the parliamentary constitution of England. The royalists asserted that he had; Hampden and his followers maintained the contrary; and hence the discontent which terminated in civil war. Ship-

money was peculiarly adapted, says Mr. Gardiner, to bring into a focus all the political dissatisfaction which existed in England. The incidence of the tax was felt by all but the very poorest, and the question at issue was capable of being summed up in a few terse words, which would fix themselves on the dullest understanding. As was however to be expected, the grievance of ship-money did not stand alone. "Other complaints," writes our author, "were heard of mischiefs inflicted for the most part on special classes or special localities which were each of them separately of less importance than that caused by the ship-money, but which, taken together, were sufficient to cause a considerable amount of irritation." And these "mischiefs" were as numerous as they were harassing. Ever since 1634 the Forest Courts had been unusually active in punishing those persons who it was alleged had offended against the law by infringing upon the royal forests. The fines set were enormous, and in many cases the boundaries of the forests had been greatly enlarged. The bounds of Rockingham Forest had been reckoned as measuring six miles in circumference; they were now to measure sixty. It was true that the fines paid into the Exchequer were small when compared with the original demands; but they were large enough to cause considerable discontent in the minds of those who believed themselves to be buying off on compulsion a purely imaginary claim. The spirit of monopoly was also everywhere vigorous. The Privy Council of Charles not only believed itself empowered by law to establish new corporations with the sole right of trade, but to regulate trade in every possible way. The making of bricks, the shipping of coal, the manufacture of soap, the production of salt, the building of houses, the business of the brewers and maltsters, vintners and starch-makers, were all in the hands of the few, with the inevitable consequence that the articles, in the absence of healthy competition, were both expensive and inferior. The King, however, received a heavy tax on all production, and he was content.

Mr. Gardiner deals kindly with the character of Charles, and with his estimate of the ill-starred Sovereign, since it is always wise to hear both sides of the question, we conclude our criticism of the volumes before us:—

From whatever side Charles's conduct is approached [writes Mr. Gardiner] the result is the same. He failed because morally, intellectually and politically he was isolated in the midst of his generation. He had no wish to erect a despotism, to do injustice or to heap up wealth at the expense of his subjects. If he had confidence in his own judgment, his confidence was not entirely without justification. He was a shrewd critic of other men's mistakes, and usually succeeded in

hitting the weak point of an enemy's argument, though it often happened that, taken as a whole, the argument of his opponents was far stronger than his own. Especially on theological questions he was able to hold his own against trained disputants. On all matters relating to art he was an acknowledged master. His collection of pictures was the finest and most complete in Europe. He had that technical knowledge which enabled him instinctively to distinguish between the work of one painter and another. He was never happier than when he was conversing with musicians, painters, sculptors and architects. He treated Rubens and Vandyke as his personal friends. But the brain which could test an argument or a picture could never test a man. Nothing could ever convince him of the unworthiness of those with whom he had been in the long habit of familiar intercourse. Nothing could ever persuade him of the worthiness of those who were conscientiously opposed to his Government. There was no gradation either in his enmity or his friendship. An Eliot or a Pym was to him just the same virulent slanderer as a Leighton or a Bastwick. A Wentworth and a Holland were held in equal favour: and some who were ready to sacrifice their lives in his cause were constantly finding obstacles thrown in their path through the king's soft-heartedness to gratify the prayers of some needy courtier. In his unwarranted self-reliance Charles enormously under-estimated the difficulties of government, and especially of a Government such as his. He would have nothing to say to "thorough," because he could not understand that thoroughness was absolutely essential. He would not get rid of slothful or incompetent officials, would not set aside private interests for great public ends, would not give himself the trouble to master the details of the business on which he was engaged. He thought that he had done everything in ridding himself of Parliaments, though in reality he had done but little. He did not see that parliaments had roots in the local organizations of the country, and that as long as these organizations remained intact they would be ready to blossom into parliaments again at the first favourable opportunity.



Short Notices.

The Church Quarterly Review. No. 29. October, 1882.
Spottiswoode & Co.

IN this number appear some ably-written articles; all are worth reading, as we think, though here and there, while we read, we are constrained to make a private protest. The article on Mozley's "Reminiscences" would seem to be the work of an eminent ecclesiastical layman, known as well in the House of Commons as on Church Congress platforms. "The Social and Religious Condition of Wales" contains some striking quotations; and those of our readers who were interested in the articles by Canon Powell Jones on the proposed Educational legislation for the Principality may be glad to read this *Quarterly* paper. In regard to the new Greek text, the *Church Quarterly* replies to Canon Cook's volume

lately reviewed in the *CHURCHMAN*; but the reply, it strikes us, is feeble. We quote the following from an article on ants:—

Some ants, we are told, exhibit a more wonderful instinct than the mere storage of grain. They are true farmers. They cultivate their own crops. The *Pogonomyrma barbatus*, a species inhabiting Texas, is said to extirpate from the ground to a distance of five or six feet from their nests all other species of plants except *Aristida oligantha*, the grains of which they carefully stow away in their barns, and which is consequently called ant rice. Sir John Lubbock corroborates this statement in some measure by the remark that he has himself "observed in Algeria that certain species of plants are allowed by the ants to grow on their nests." That in the actual process of harvesting their grain the ants have learnt the use of division of labour was observed by some very ancient naturalists. Ælian describes how one party perform the operation of reaping, and another that of carrying, the former severing and throwing down the spikelets of corn "to the people below," τῶ δῆμῳ τῶ κάτω. This statement has been corroborated by Mr. Moggridge, who has seen "ants engaged in cutting the capsules of certain plants, drop them, and allow their companions below to carry them away."

The English ants do not store up grain, but they show an equally remarkable proof of foresight, or of what would be foresight if it were not, as we believe, the result of an instinct, and involving no knowledge of the consequences. It is well known that different species of aphides provides food for ants. The aphides secrete a sticky sweet juice, which they emit on being stroked by the antennæ of the ant, and which the latter instantly devours. Sir John Lubbock has added to our previous knowledge of the singular relations between the ants and their domestic animals—their "cows," as they have been called—by showing that ants collect the autumn-laid eggs of aphides and carry them into the shelter of their nests, where they tend them with the greatest care through the long winter months. In March the young aphides are brought out and placed on the young shoots of the plant which serves as their natural habitat as well as their food. In the case observed the ant was no other than the common English yellow meadow ant (*Lasius flavus*), and the plant from which the eggs were removed, and on which the young live stock were deposited, was no other than the common daisy.

Botany and Religion. Illustrations of the Works of God in the Structure, Functions, Arrangement, and General Distribution of Plants. Fourth Edition. By J. H. BALFOUR, A.M., M.D. Pp. 420. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier. 1882.

The first edition of this excellent work, dedicated to the Rev. D. T. K. Drummond, appeared several years ago. For some time the pious and learned Professor's book was out of print. The present edition, which we heartily recommend, has been revised and enlarged. In his preface Dr. Balfour says:—

The number of woodcuts has also been increased. It is hoped that this work will thus be both fitted for the purpose of serving as a popular introduction to Botany, and at the same time for directing attention to some of the wonderful adaptations in the vegetable kingdom.

Alone in Crowds. By ANNETTE LYSTER. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Stories by Annette Lyster, these last two years, have been widely read. With many gifts for writing Tales, not the least of which is a light and graceful touch, this young author has done good work; her writings;

are attractive and wholesome, with an elevating element, and realness of tone. "Alone in Crowds" relates experiences on a lonely island, in Ireland, and in the English Borderland: some of the incidents are improbable.

Sermons preached in Toronto. By GEORGE WHITAKER, M.A., Rector of Newton Toney, Wilts. Rivingtons.

Mr. Whitaker was formerly Provost of Trinity College, Toronto, and Archdeacon of York, in the diocese of Toronto; and most of these sermons were preached in the chapel of Trinity College. Many pages of the ex-Archdeacon's book we have read with pleasure; and we may quote as a specimen passage an extract from the sermon on *Guarding the Deposit*:—

Once more, brethren, let me present to you that which appears to many a further and most cogent reason for unflinching steadfastness and faithfulness to our high trust. I refer to the remarkable position in which the Church of England has stood ever since the Reformation, in respect of all other Christian bodies throughout the world; and more than ever at this day stands, by virtue of her own wide extension and of her intercommunion with other branches of the Church Catholic, holding the same faith and observing the same order with herself. George Herbert, in the seventeenth century, gave beautiful expression to his profound sense of her strangely unique position; while the hopes and responsibilities attaching to this position have been recognized, in very striking terms, by the Romanist, Joseph de Maistre, in the early part of this century. The note of warning and encouragement, the invitation to trembling hope and expectation, to patient abiding in the place where God has set us, humbly preparing ourselves to do His bidding, and careful, above all things, not to forfeit, by any act of impatience or self-will, that vantage ground which has been so wonderfully assigned to us—this note, I say, has been again sounded, a few months since, in England, by a distinguished prelate of our Church. His words are: "If there be any guiding hand in the progress of history, if there be any Supreme Providence in the control of events, if there be any Divine Presence and any Divine call—then the position of England, as the mother of so many colonies and dependencies, the heart and centre of the world's commerce and manufacture, and the position of the English Church, standing midway between extremes in theological teaching and ecclesiastical order, point to the Church of this nation, with the very finger of God Himself, as called by Him to the lofty task of reconciling a distracted Christendom and healing the wounds of the nations."¹

For the sake, then, of this inspiring hope, under the sense of this overwhelming responsibility, let us as members of that vast communion, whose worship ascends to God from well-nigh every portion of our globe, resolve by His help to "guard and deposit" which He has committed to our trust, and to stand stiff in the safe paths of duty and obedience, if haply our eyes or our children's eyes may be blessed by seeing this great "salvation of God."

Studies on the Old Testament. By F. GODET, D.D. Edited by W. H. LYTTLETON, M.A., Rector of Hagley, an. Canon of Gloucester, Pp. 343. Second Edition. Hodder & Stoughton, 1882.

Professor Godet's writings are so well known that few words are necessary in noticing a second edition of his "Studies," whether on the Old Testament or the New. Dr. Godet is a learned eloquent expositor, suggestive and spiritual. The work of translating, by the Hon. Mrs. Lyttelton, has been remarkably well done. A single paragraph may be quoted on Isaiah liii. The Professor writes:—

All the rationalistic subterfuges by which this description is applied to the Jewish nation suffering for the heathen, or to the company of the prophets suf-

¹ Sermon of the Bishop of Durham, on the opening of the S.P.C.K. rooms, Northumberland Avenue, November 3, 1879.

fering for the nation, are overthrown by this single word the *Man of sorrows*, which can only be applied to a person. M. Renan, from whom we have borrowed a part of this translation, evidently feels this. Accordingly, he applies this passage to some one of those unknown righteous men whose blood crimsoned the streets of Jerusalem at the taking of that city. Read and judge. The sin of the world expiated, the designs of God accomplished, eternal intercession made by — some righteous man put to death by Nebuchadnezzar! This interpretation is the note of despair.

Griffin Ahoy! A Yacht Cruise to the Levant, and Wanderings in Egypt, Syria, the Holy Land, Greece, and Italy, in 1881. By General E. H. MAXWELL, C.B. Pp. 326. Hurst & Blackett, 1882.

This is a very readable book, and from almost every portion of it one could give an interesting extract. General Maxwell set sail from Falmouth with a party of friends, in the yacht *Griffin*, January, 1881. A fine barque-rigged yacht of 315 tons, with auxiliary screw, the *Griffin*, is built as strong as a gunboat, and is very fast: the crew, says our author, were captain, first and second mate, and seven able-bodied seamen, as fine a set of fellows as you could meet anywhere. The engineer had three men under him in his department; there were cook, steward, and other servants, male and female, with the owner's gamekeeper, M'Gregor, whose bagpipes were often heard on the wide Atlantic Ocean.

A Pilgrimage to the Shrine of our Lady of Loreto. By GEORGE FALKNER. With Illustrations from Engravings and Photographs. Manchester: J. E. Cornish.

In this most tastefully executed volume Mr. Falkner gives a narrative of his impressions in a recent visit to Loreto, adding the result of some historical inquiries. From an artistic and literary point of view the book deserves hearty praise. Concerning the famous "shrine," with its pious fraud stories, the author's remarks are pertinent; he adds that the evidences of poverty and laziness which present themselves around Loreto do not speak much for its moral or social influence on the people.

A Commentary on the Revised Version. By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D. Pp. 474. Cassell, Petter, Galpin, & Co.

Some such work as this was really needed: and for writing it, probably, no man was better qualified than Prebendary Humphry. He was one of the Company of Revisers, and has long been esteemed a scholarly, judicious, and deeply reverent writer. His expository or explanatory comments we have tested, here and there, with satisfaction; they are suggestive, unprejudiced, and of much ability. The volume will prove exceedingly useful. It is designed chiefly as a companion for the English reader who studies the Revised Version with a view to his edification or instruction; but many students who have a fair knowledge of Latin and Greek will be thankful for Mr. Humphry's aid. To theological students generally, indeed, this commentary will prove an enjoyable companion. We should add that it is admirably printed.

1. *John Huss.* By A. H. WRATISLAW, M.A.
2. *Judea and her Rulers, from Nebuchadnezzar to Vespasian.* By M. BRAMSTON. S.P.C.K.

These two volumes of "The Home Library" of the venerable Church Society, like the other volumes of the series, are well printed in clear type, bound with a neat cloth cover, and cheap. The contents, so far as we have examined, are sound and good. Mr. Wratishlaw gives the gist

of recent publications in Bohemia, Erben (1868), Palacký (1869), and Professor Tomek (1875).

Bright and Fair. A Book for Young Ladies. By the Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, M.A. Nisbet & Co.

This admirable little book is a companion or sequel to "Strong and Free," which we recommended some months ago as the very best book for young men, in its way, so far as our knowledge goes. With "Bright and Fair" we are greatly pleased. The esteemed author is eminently practical, though at the same time he is strongly and staunchly doctrinal; what he writes is sound, and, if we may so say, *sensible*. The little book before us is beautifully printed: it deserves a very large circulation.

Plutarch's Lives. Vol. IV. London. George Bell & Sons, York Street. Covent Garden. 1882.

We have noticed the three preceding volumes of this ably-executed work, and gladly call attention to the volume before us, which completes it, and contains an index. The translation is partly by the late Mr. George Long, and partly by Mr. Aubrey Stewart, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. These four volumes belong to "Bohn's Standard Library."

Be Kind to Your Old Age. S.P.C.K.

In this capital little book (very cheap) we have "a village discussion of the Post-Office aids to thrift." The discussion has enough *story*-thread to make it interesting. The subject is important as regards both artisans and peasants.

The Union Jack. Vol. III. By G. A. HENTY. Sampson Low & Co.

This is a handsome volume, full of stirring tales of adventure by land and sea; a most acceptable present for boys in general. We have thought that in a magazine like the *Union Jack* something beside fiction should appear; and again in noticing vol. ii. we gave a hint to this effect. We notice with pleasure that in the new volume "the programme will be altered," and "a new departure in literature for boys will be taken."

From the Religious Tract Society we have received, too late for worthy notice in our present number, *Sea Pictures*, by Dr. MACAULAY, and the Annual Volumes of the *Boys' Own Paper* and the *Girls' Own Paper*: handsome gift-books, well illustrated, in every way attractive, and wonderfully cheap. We were among the first to welcome the issue of the *Boys' Own Paper*, a magazine undeniably needed; we have watched its progress with interest and satisfaction; it has done, and is doing, great good service. When the monthly number has been read by the boys of the Rectory, it is eagerly welcomed by the elder lads in the parish school; its pages are always bright, wholesome, and informing. With *Sea Pictures*, a companion of the well known volumes, *Swiss Pictures*, and pen and pencil "pictures" in Egypt, Palestine, and other lands, we are greatly pleased.

In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* appears a paper on "Caste in Mission Churches," by the late Rev. JAMES VAUGHAN.—Miss GORDON CUMMING writes in the *Leisure Hour* on "Mysteries of the South Pacific."—*Friendly Greetings* (R.T.S.) is quite up to its usual mark.—In the *Quiver* appears a paper on "Pastor Harms;" and Canon Boyd Carpenter contributes a study on "Cain."—The *Antiquary* (E. Stock),

which well maintains its high reputation, contains several interesting articles.

From Messrs. Hildesheimer & Faulkner (41, Jewin Street, E.C.), we have received specimens of their new Cards—Christmas, New Year, &c. The catalogue of the competitive designs exhibited by this firm at the Suffolk Street Galleries, in August last, will serve to show with what enterprise they began their task for the present season. The judges for the prizes were Mr. Millais, Mr. Marcus Stone, and Mr. G. A. Storey. Of the specimens which we have received it is hardly possible to speak too highly—a reviewer's store of adjectives, in fact, with so many choice cards before him is soon exhausted. To particularize a few:—No. 783, "Memory and Hope" (£75 prize), is a charming picture, as is also No. 785. No. 738 (£100 prize) is an exquisite landscape. No. 728 (£50 prize), "Puppies and Kittens;" No. 800, Christmas Roses, Azaleas, &c.; No. 798 (£100 prize), are really pictures of the highest class of art.

Three attractive and interesting tales, good gift-books, with pretty covers (S.P.C.K.), are *A Brave Fight*, *Out of the Shadows*, and *The Good Ship Barbara*. The last named story is written by Mr. S. W. SADLER, R.N., whose *Slaves and Cruisers* was recommended in the CHURCHMAN a year ago. In that portion of the *Good Ship Barbara*, says Mr. Sadler, "where the scene is laid on the West Coast of Africa, it has been pleasant to recall memories of many years spent in the cruising squadron, during what may be termed the palmy days of the slave trade. . . . It has fallen to the lot of the author to be present at the capture of no less than thirty slavers." Naturally, his descriptions are *real*; and we have a very readable tale, with a good deal of exciting matter. *A Brave Fight* is a story about the Rev. William Lee, of Calverton, near Notting-ham. It is certain that the art of "Frame-work Knitting" was Mr. Lee's invention; but little is known of his life, and nothing of the steps through which this country clergyman was led to the construction of a machine, which, considering the date of invention, 1589, was a marvel of genius and patience. Of Inventor Lee's life there are two versions the one "ending happily," the other sad. Our author, the Rev. E. N. HOARE, M.A., Rector of Acrise (whose *Brave Men of Eyam* we recommended last year), relates that Mr. Lee was "disappointed in love," died a pauper, and was buried in a nameless grave. *Out of the Shadows* may be called "a love story;" it may teach young women many good lessons. We quite agree about having a Rogation service.

Under the fanciful title *Brothers of Pity* (S.P.C.K) appear several cleverly written "Tales of Beasts and Men," by the author of *Mrs. Overthway's Remembrances* and other well-known books. We do not like the "Brothers of Pity" Tale; the ideas to our mind are not harmonious; something, at least, *jars*. Children, no doubt, bury their pet birds and beasts in quiet garden corners, with funeral ceremony, and so forth; and possibly to them this Tale may appear "all right."

From the S.P.C.K. we have received two additional volumes of "Diocesan Histories;" *York* by Canon ORNSBY, and *Oxford* by the Rev. E. MARSHALL, M.A., F.S.A.; both volumes are readable and informing.

A very cheap *Bible Student's Handbook* has been published by Messrs. Ward, Lock & Co. It contains a good deal of matter, and is doctrinally sound.

A Baker's Dozen (S.P.C.K.) is a pleasing and well-written story. Dorothea takes charge of thirteen young folks, children of relatives; her tact, good temper, and self-denial are well brought out; and the boys' scrapes are not only amusing but instructive. The tone is good. Little

Mabel's asking the pompous Sir George to tie up her sister's boot-lace is a charming picture.

A second edition of *Diet for the Sick*, by Dr. RIDGE (J. & A. Churchill), has been called for. It contains many valuable hints. A little book and cheap.

ON "THE CLAIMS OF THE CONVOCATIONS OF
THE CLERGY."

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—Being allowed by your courtesy a few pages in which to examine the learned arguments of Mr. Craig, Q.C., on "The Claims of the Convocations as to the Prayer Book,"¹ I fear I must limit myself to the discussion of his view of the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, the limits of space forbid more.

I will, in the first instance, assume the version given of the proceedings of the Parliament 1 Eliz. to be correct; then test its constitutional character; then show what consequences flow from it. I will then inquire what grounds of historical evidence exist for questioning its correctness. We are told, p. 440:—

It is neither necessary nor constitutional to go back beyond the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity. The great principle of that Act was, that, then and for the future, the nation, by its Parliament, undertook the duty of prescribing the manner, the forms, and the terms, in which the public worship of the Almighty should be conducted, in opposition to the notion of allowing the ecclesiastical servants of the nation . . . to prescribe to the nation how Divine worship should be conducted, and how all other Divine offices should be performed.

We are further told that, "*upon this Elizabethan settlement everything since has depended;*" and an argument is maintained against the necessity of the concurrence of the Convocations to "legislation affecting the order of Divine service, or to the means of enforcing the existing national rights as to the conduct of it," on the ground that this would give them a veto, and that such veto would "practically amount to the whole legislative power;" by which "*the whole Reformation might be undone.*" This is stated with the air of a *reductio ad absurdum*. The italics are not mine in the passages cited.

I. Let me, then, test the character of this alleged "Elizabethan settlement," by comparing it with other documents of unquestionable authority, from the standpoint of constitutional law. Henry VIII. bears generally in our history the character of the most arbitrary of our monarchs since King John. In this arbitrariness he was allowed, or rather invested, with the fullest license by his Parliament, 31 Hen. VIII. c. 3, giving his proclamations the force of Statute; but it never presumed to give them the force of Canons, nor to arm him with any power of encroaching on the spirituality of the realm. A report of the Convocation of the Lower House of Canterbury,² which I shall have occasion further to quote, says of him that:—

He never passed any important Act, or published any important document affecting the religious mind of his people, without, at least, declaring himself in harmony with the clergy in their Convocations, and with the Catholic Church.

¹ Contained in the July, August, and September numbers of THE CHURCHMAN, 1882.

² July, 1879.

I will give a few extracts which show what the royal declarations on this behalf were.

The preamble¹ of 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12, declares that—

the king has full power to give justice in all causes . . . without restraint or appeal to any foreign prince or potentate ; the body spiritual of the realm having power, so that when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, it was declared and interpreted by that part of the body politic called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which hath always been and is for knowledge, integrity and number, sufficient to declare and determine all doubts without the intermeddling of any exterior person.

Now this preamble leaves the Spirituality to determine "causes of the law divine, or of spiritual learning," including, necessarily, those which arise out of the "manner, forms and terms of Divine worship." But if "the nation by its Parliament undertakes the duty of prescribing that manner, &c.," then the right of deciding those causes becomes nugatory, because the Parliament might constantly remodel that "manner, &c.," of the subjects presented for such decisions, and we should reach the absurdity of courts in perpetual conflict with the law which they had to administer. In other words, the acknowledged right of the Spirituality in respect to "causes" is futile and illusory, unless the right be allowed of framing the rules on which those decisions are to proceed. It remains, of course, with the Legislature to give those rules the force of temporal authority.

Further, the Act known as "The Submission of the Clergy," by the concessions which it makes of assembling only by royal writ, and not enacting canons without royal consent (25 Hen. VIII. c. 19) the more clearly establishes what it reserves—viz., the constitutional right of the Spirituality, with such royal writ and consent, to legislate for the Church. The restraints thus imposed on the exercise of the power prove the in-herency of the power itself. King Henry was not such a dotard as to seek to restrain the excesses of a power which was non-existent, or which belonged not to the body which he was restraining, but to a totally different body, external to it. If the power alleged had existed in the Parliament, these Statutes of Henry VIII. were simply the greatest nonsense that ever wasted the time of a deliberative body.

That no such notion as that of investing Parliament with the absolute power of Church legislation was present to the mind of Henry VIII and his advisers, is further manifest from the same Act, sec. 7, which recognizes existing Church law, so far as not contrary to existing statutes or prerogative, as still in force, subject to a Commission of Review then appointed, consisting of thirty-two members, of whom one-half were bishops and clergy. This branch of the Reformation—that of Church law—engaged the labours of those reverend and learned persons during the remaining years of that monarch ; and was, on the express petition of the Lower House of Canterbury, in 1547, resumed under Statute 3 and 4 Edward VI., 11, by a precisely similar commission, acting under the supervision of Archbishop Cranmer. Their labours issued in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, of which Strype says, that it would certainly have become law had King Edward VI.'s life been spared. The whole had originated in the consent of the clergy to the plan of revision of Church law in 1532, was, as I have said, revived by the clergy in 1547—that is, as soon as ever Edward came to the throne, and had thus the full consent and concurrence of the Spirituality. By 1552 the project only

¹ I have somewhat abridged and modernized the phraseology, but with o substantial difference.

waited for the assent of the Crown, for which it has waited ever since. Now if the absolutism of Parliament is a true doctrine, here were twenty years of learned labour, protracted through several successive Convocations and Parliaments, utterly wasted. These Church laws would, with the royal assent, have obtained the force of law at once, and needed no Statute of the realm to confer their proper validity upon them. But if the doctrine which I am controverting be true, the whole proceedings, alike on the part of the Crown, its Commissioners and the Convocation, becomes a tedious absurdity. The facts prove, as plainly as facts can speak, that Parliament then, and up to the end of King Edward's reign, claimed no such power; and that the claim would not have been conceded, had it been made. I pass over the Philip and Mary period, as founding its Acts virtually on the assumption of the Pope's spiritual authority over the realm, and therefore out of the present question.

It remains, then, that the Elizabethan Statute, on which this novel theory is wholly built, was, if enacted without the consent of Convocation, utterly without justification in precedent; and so far from striking the key-note of the constitutional doctrine on the subject, was, if passed under the conditions represented, wholly unconstitutional.

I will cite some other *dicta* of King Henry VIII. on the same subject which confirm the same view. He himself explained to the Convocation of York his own sense of the Supreme Headship of the Church which he claimed, as follows:—

As to spiritual things . . . forasmuch as they be no worldly or temporal things, they have no worldly or temporal head; but only Christ, that did institute them; by whose ordinances they be ministered here by mortal men, elect, chosen and ordained, as God hath willed for that purpose, who be the clergy.

"Spiritual things," then, in this monarch's view, were ministered by the "ordinances" of "the clergy." This is quite consistent with the concurrence of Statute being necessary to give them the force of temporal law, fortified by temporal penalties; but quite inconsistent with the power of Parliament to supersede them and substitute at will its own "ordinances" for theirs. The former is my view, and in the latter, I believe, I have not mis-stated Mr. Craig's.

Again, in propounding to the clergy in their Convocation the question of his divorce from Anne of Cleves, the same monarch says, 1540:—

We who are wont to abide by your judgment in all other weightier matters concerning this Church of England, which affect Ecclesiastical government and religion . . . have thought it meet . . . that explanation and communication should be made to you, . . . so that we may lawfully venture under the authority of our whole Church . . . to do and effect that . . . which you may decree to be lawful according to the laws of God.

According to the view which I impugn, King Henry was wholly wrong in his rule of "abiding by the judgment" of the Spirituality "in weightier matters which affect ecclesiastical government and religion." He ought on that view to have gone straight to Parliament on all such questions, and told the Spirituality that the matter was to be settled there. On the contrary, in the Act for declaring void his marriage with Anne of Cleves, 1540, it is expressly recited that the clergy in "a Synod universal of this Realm" had so decided.¹ Similarly, the "Ten Articles" of 1536, the "Institution

¹ "What is the sacred Synod of this nation?" Mr. Craig asks on p. 441. "This nation," he adds, "has had no such Synod since the days when Papal legates were allowed to hold councils here. The English constitution, since the Papal power in England ceased, knows only one national Synod—namely

of a Christian Man," 1537, and the "Act of the Six Articles" of 1539, bear indelible marks of the action or authority of Convocation. The preamble of this last recites the "consent of the King's Highness," the "assent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and other learned men of the clergy in their Convocation," and the "consent of the Commons in Parliament," as concurring in its enactment. The Act 32 Hen. VIII., c. 26, says that—

All decrees and ordinances, which, according to God's Word and Christ's Gospel, by the king's advice and confirmation by his letters patent, shall be made and ordained by . . . the whole clergy of England, in and upon the matter of Christian Religion and Christian Faith, and the lawful Rites, Ceremonies, and Observations of the same shall be in every point thereof believed, obeyed and performed . . . upon the pains therein comprised ;

with a reservation of anything repugnant to existing Statute. Now, since this right of the Spirituality, here so plainly set forth, remained intact up to 1540, as this Act shows, it is incumbent on the opponent to show when they lost it, so as to create a totally new point of departure in 1559. This has not been done, and I believe cannot be done. And this strong antecedent presumption would suffice to rebut any contrary presumption arising from the later Act of Elizabeth, even if there were nothing to carry the presumption further in the intervening twenty years, and if that Elizabethan Statute were correctly represented. But, on the contrary, the Edwardian Statutes of 1547 (Communion in both kinds) and 1548-9 (c. 1, First Prayer Book, and c. 21, Marriage of Priests) tell precisely the same story. In 1549-50 (Ordinal), a Commission of Bishops and clergy, all members of Convocation, have their acts legalized beforehand. In 1551-2 (Second Prayer Book) the concurrence of Convocation is not expressed, but Heylin ("Hist. Ref.," p. 107) says, they had considered the matter, and Wilkins, iv. 68, states that they were sitting during the debates in Parliament on this Act. In our present Act of Uniformity (14 Car. II. c. 4.) it is recited that the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, which was this same "Second" book, with a few changes (the most important taken from the "First" book), was compiled by the "reverend bishops and clergy;" and the journals of the Convocation of Canterbury, which perished a few years later, were extant when that recital was made. We are therefore entitled to assume its truth.

Now, if instead of the liberties of the Church, those, say of the City of London had been in question, and such a catena of authorities had existed in their favour, I am persuaded that no lawyer would have thought for a moment of disputing the weight of evidence in their favour. It is only that the Church is politically weak, whereas a great city is strong, which opens the door to controversy on the subject. Hallam¹ records that, "In almost every reign (up to the Revolution) the innate tone of arbitrary power had produced more or less of oppression;" but the Church has been oppressed throughout; and, except during the great Civil War, more since the Revolution than before. But throughout the whole of the Reformation struggle, the action of the Crown was arbitrary and oppressive to the Church. Let me notice a few of the graver instances of tyranny. I am not sure that I have the numbers exact; but the following will be found to be a fair approximation to those of the bishops deprived in three successive reigns.

It is more convenient to begin at Elizabeth and work backward. She found fifteen (some say sixteen) bishops in possession of their Sees. All

Parliament." That Papal power ceased in England by the successive Statutes of 1529-34. This was six years later, 1540. Thus Mr. Craig, I take it, flatly contradicts 32 Hen. VIII. c. 25, as cited above.

¹ "Constitutional History," William III. ch. xv.

but one rejected the oath of supremacy, and were ejected. Her sister had previously (including four who were burnt as heretics) deprived fourteen, not reckoning I know not how many who fled to the Continent. Edward VI.'s council had deprived at least four, chiefly on some plea of disobedience to arbitrary power; and each of the Tudor queens reinstated a balance of those ejected by her predecessor.¹ It reminds one of the wanton violence of a child, who, ignorant of the laws of the game, places chessmen on the board only to sweep them off in batches by a literal *coup-de-main*. It should almost seem as if the object of the Executive had been to degrade the episcopal office by putting a direct premium upon time-serving and hypocrisy. Next to setting the office to sale, nothing could more effectually discredit it; and the unhappy results of this violence have left their mark on the Church ever since, in a popular disesteem which the *congé d'élire* perpetuates. And it is one of the results of this violent exercise of the prerogative which is not only claimed as normal, but exalted into an overruling precedent. The Elizabethan Statute was passed when the episcopal bench had been thus wrecked by royal power. The Crown by its own violence deprives the Spirituality of its constituted leaders, and then turns round and takes advantage of its own wrong, by regarding the Spirituality as incompetent to its normal function for want of them; and so procures the passing of a Statute which is doubly invalid; once as a temporal Statute, because it had not the consent of the spiritual peers, and again, because it deals with matter with which it was, by every precedent, unconstitutional to meddle, without the Convocations having previously advised.

Indeed, the more violent the strain of the prerogative which is apparent in any Tudor Act, the better material it seems to furnish to forge an ecclesiastical precedent. The Statute of Elizabeth stands between a long chain of earlier enactments on the one side, and the noteworthy later enactment of 1661 on the other, which alike flatly contradict its alleged principle; and yet we are told that it virtually overrules them both, and is the real corner-stone of the national establishment; and that it is needless to look either behind it or before.

II. I pass on to test the position which I assail by the consequences which practically flow from it. That view is, virtually, the supremacy of Parliament for spiritual purposes; not such a supremacy as was vested of old in the Crown—corrective and visitatorial—but absolute, initiative, and directive. If Parliament has constitutionally done what we are told it has once, it may do it again, and repeat it any number of times. It may enact any new test, or any number of tests, for the spiritual allegiance of its "ecclesiastical servants." It may erect the Lord Mayor of London or the Coroner of Middlesex into a supreme ecclesiastical officer, and when the "ecclesiastical servants" demur to obey, it may cashier and displace them. It may melt down beliefs, liturgy and ritual into a featureless mass, for or against which there is nothing to be said, save that it expresses the popular whim. The sagacious reader will perceive that some of these consequences are extravagant;² but they are, therefore, the better illustrations of an extravagant assumption. The more extreme the divergence from what is traditional and accepted, the better it exemplifies the absolute omnipotence of Parliament. I defy any man to show that such consequences do not follow legitimately

¹ Thus, Bishops Barlow, Coverdale and Scory assisted at the consecration of Archbishop Parker.

² Still, this is distinctly the tendency of our modern Parliament (which is not *repente turpissimus*, any more than an individual) as shown in Mr. Albert Grey's Parish Boards Bill.

from the theory which I impugn, or that any remedy exists by which they may on this theory be averted. On the contrary, the seeming *reductio ad absurdum*, referred to above—that if you give the Spirituality a concurrent voice you give them a veto, which is practically equivalent to the whole legislative power, is obviously incorrect.¹ Had the Crown practically the "whole legislative power," when it vetoed—*i.e.*, refused assent to a Bill presented by Parliament? On any but a religious subject such an argument would never be advanced. Still less admissible is the apparent assumption that by this means "the whole Reformation might be undone." Whenever that is in danger, the Legislature have the remedy in their own hands, by disestablishing the Church. As against the claim which I am controverting, the Church has no remedy whatever if it be once admitted.

III. I must briefly show the real nature of the Act of Elizabeth's Parliament. Fuller states ("Church History," v. p. 188):—

Upon serious consideration it will appear, that there was nothing done in the reformation of religion save what was acted by the clergy in their Convocations or grounded upon some act of theirs precedent to it, with the advice, counsel and consent of the bishops and most eminent Churchmen, confirmed on the post-fact, and not otherwise, by the civil sanction, according to the usage of the best and happiest times of Christianity.

I have already shown that the testimony of 14 Car. II., c. 4, expressly extends this comprehensive statement of Fuller's to the Prayer Book of Elizabeth in particular; and in whatever sense that recital is to be understood it is sufficient for my purpose.

The Rev. J. W. Joyce, to whom I am indebted for the above quotation in his book, "The Sword and the Keys," second edition, p. 25, cites a remarkable confirmation of this view, in a document from the State Paper Office in a known handwriting, which dates it approximately 1608. He says: "If genuine and authentic,"² it "tends directly to corroborate" his position; but suggests no suspicion of its genuineness &c. Some of its terms are:—

The Book of Common Prayer, published primo Eliz^æ . . . was re-examined with some small alterations by the Convocation, consisting of the same bishops (the list of whom is hereinbefore given) and the rest of the clergy in primo Eliz^æ, which being done by the Convocation, and published under the Great Seal of England, there was an Act of Parliament for the same book. . . . Not that the book was ever subjected to the censure of the Parliament, but being agreed upon and published as aforesaid, a law was made by the Parliament, for the inflicting of a penalty upon all such as should refuse to use and observe the same.

Thus, if the statement of the Restoration Parliament is trustworthy, the above-cited view of the Elizabethan Statute falls to the ground. I must leave your readers to judge which of the two they prefer to accept. According to the same view, "nothing could be more honourable than the . . . relations" in which the "ecclesiastical servants" are placed; only I suppose they are to be taught to know their place, and not presume to question the high prerogative of their Parliamentary taskmasters. Magna Carta knows nothing of "ecclesiastical servants." Its first clause is "Ecclesia libera sit;" and I venture the opinion that, on the

¹ So there is a veto, either of the Crown or the Imperial Legislature, on the Legislature of the Dominion of Canada, and perhaps others; but no one could say that such veto was equal to a power of legislation, much less to the whole of that power.

² I understand Mr. Joyce to draw attention by this phrase to an authority, *prima facie* of great weight, not previously adduced; and therefore open to challenge, if any challenge can be sustained against it.

contrary, nothing is more likely to lead to a strike among those ill-used underlings than an attempt to enforce those "relations" as stated on pp. 440-1. The standard of candidates for Holy Orders has lamentably fallen since a time that I can remember; and nothing is so likely as this to accelerate its fall and perpetuate its prostration.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

THE MONTH.

SIR Stafford Northcote has been cordially received in Scotland: he urged that the Egyptian expedition was unnecessary. The Prime Minister at Penmaenmawr argued that the war had been waged from a love of peace; for a military anarchy had been pulled down. This argument Mr. Gibson at a Conservative meeting compared to a man's justification for beating his wife.

The Irish Land League seems to be dying of starvation.

The Bishop of Manchester, without waiting for official intimation that the three years have expired since the monition was first issued, with regard to Mr. Green, has informed Sir Percival Heywood, the patron, that the incumbency of Miles Platting is vacant. Mr. Green's supporters have pledged themselves yet further to resist the law.

At Bristol an address was presented to the Congregational Union, signed by the Dean, and a large number of leading Clergymen and Laymen.

The Rev. G. Arthur Connor, Rector of Newport, Isle of Wight, has been appointed Domestic Chaplain to the Queen, in place of Dean Wellesley, and also Dean of Windsor.

The Rev. John Reeve, Canon of Bristol, has entered into rest. The canonry left vacant has been conferred upon the Rev. J. Percival, President of Trinity College, Oxford, and formerly head master of Clifton College. Another "Liberal" head of a College, Dr. Jowett, has been appointed Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford.

The Rev. Randall T. Davidson, the esteemed and able Chaplain of the Archbishop of Canterbury, writes in the papers concerning the Church Deaconesses Home, conducted under his Grace's sanction at Maidstone. (See the *CHURCHMAN* for August, 1882, p. 393.)

At the Oxford Diocesan Conference, six representatives were elected (with the cumulative vote, we gladly add) for the Central Council, an amendment being rejected by 182 to 109. Mr. Henry Wilson moved that "it appears to this Conference desirable, in the interests of the Church, to promote the dissolution of the Church Association and the English Church Union," which was carried by a large majority.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

The twenty-second meeting of the Church Congress, held at Derby, was in many ways successful. It had nearly 4,000 members. As a rule the meetings were interesting and orderly: many of the speeches and papers were of a high order; and the Bishop made an excellent Chairman.

The subject "Neglect of Public Worship" was opened by the Bishop of Liverpool. In a very valuable paper, read with earnestness and power, his Lordship laid the main lines of the subject with his usual clearness:—

"It is a great fact which, I fear, admits of no dispute, that the working classes of England, as a body, are "conspicuously absent" from the public worship of God on Sundays. Census after census in our large towns has lately brought this painful fact before the public mind.

"This state of things, we must all feel, is eminently unsatisfactory, and deserves the best attention of a congress. But it is much more than unsatisfactory. It endangers the very existence of the Established Church of England. We cannot do without 'the masses.' The Church whose adherents are a minority in the land will not be long allowed to retain her endowments and her connection with the State in this age."

"But the absence of working-men from public worship," continued the Bishop, does not arise "from the spread of systematic infidelity among them." Secondly:—

"I believe it is a complete delusion to suppose that the working classes in England have any inherent dislike to the Established Church, and, if left to themselves, prefer the dissenting chapel. I believe nothing of the kind. I grant that our poorer brethren are very apt to judge the Church by the parson, and if he is not a satisfactory *persona ecclesiæ*, to take a dislike to the body which he represents. If, for instance, he is a thoroughly worldly man, "a Nimrod, a ramrod, or a fishing-rod," who neither does his duty as a preacher or a pastor—or, if he is one who in his zeal for ceremonial does things which they think are Romanism—it is very likely they will forsake the Church and stay at home, or go to chapel."

Thirdly, the old Gospel has not lost its power. The Bishop then made two positive suggestions—(1) More *direct lively preaching*¹ of the Gospel. (2):—"If we want to bring the working classes to Church, *there needs throughout the land a*

¹ The Bishop said:—Our clergymen, as a body, do not pay sufficient attention to the *way of putting things*. They forget that it is not enough to have good tools, if they do not handle those tools in the right way. Will any one tell me that Whitfield last century, or Moody in our own time, would ever have assembled myriads of working men, if they had only read cold, tame, orthodox, theological essays, couched in the first person plural number, full of "we" and "we," and destitute of warmth, vivacity, direct appeal, or fire? I will never believe it. But surely, if their style of address arrests and attracts the working classes, it seems a thousand pities that it is not more generally adopted.

great increase of sympathy and friendly personal dealing with them on the part of the clergy."

In a thoughtful, persuasive paper, the Bishop of Bedford gave some practical suggestions:—

I had no doubt at all [said the Bishop] that much of the neglect of public worship is to be traced to the dull, dry, dreary preaching which has too often prevailed. . . . Speak from your heart to the hearts of your people in language they can understand, and listeners will come. But I want rather to speak of the Prayers—taking the word popularly, of the service which precedes the sermon. I do not think it has always been the great aim to make the service intelligible, reverent, and congregational. Without great care a clergyman very easily lapses into an indistinct, over-rapid, indevout manner of saying words with which he is very familiar.

In a paper on the Harmony of Science and Faith, Professor Stokes (Cambridge)¹ said:—

To those who believe that the order of Nature is in accordance with the will of a Supreme Being, it must be axiomatic that there can be no real opposition between what we learn from the study of Nature

¹ The theory of ancestral derivation and the survival of the fittest is one which from its nature can hardly, if at all, be made a subject of experimental investigation, or even of observation in the records of the past.

The theory, I need hardly say, is highly ingenious; but any variation which we can actually observe goes but an infinitesimal way towards bridging over the interval which separates extreme forms, such, for example, as an elephant and a mollusc. Indeed, Darwin himself, as I am informed, was of opinion at first that we required at least four or five distinct centres to start with.

As to the origin of life itself, it was not intended on this theory to account for it, and the experimental researches of our foremost scientific men are adverse to the supposition of its production by spontaneous generation. Granting the origin of life by a creative act, we are not very closely concerned, theologically speaking, with the mode of creation. . . . But there is one point in which I think theology is more deeply involved, and respecting which it becomes a serious question whether there is any real scientific evidence in opposition to what seems at least to be the teaching of revelation: I allude to the creation of man. . . . Our whole ideas respecting the nature of sin and the character of God are, as it seems to me, profoundly affected according as we take the statement of Scripture straightforwardly, which implies that man was created with special powers and privileges, and in a state of innocence from which he fell, or, as we suppose, that man came to be what he is by degrees, by a vast number of infinitesimal variations from some lower animal, accompanied by a correspondingly continuous variation in his mental and moral condition. . . . The creation of man and his condition at creation are not confined to the account given in Genesis. They are dwelt on at length, in connection with the scheme of redemption, by St. Paul, and are more briefly referred to by our Lord Himself in connection with the institution of marriage.

Now, against these statements so express, so closely bound up with man's highest aspirations, what evidence have we to adduce on the side of science? Why, nothing more than a hypothesis of continuous transmutation, incapable of experimental investigation, and making such demands upon our imagination as to stagger at last the uninitiated.

and what we may be taught by a direct revelation from that Being. We cannot suppose otherwise without impugning the truthfulness of God. Any apparent opposition must therefore arise from some deficiency in the student of science, or in the student of revelation, or in both.

The *Guardian* justly remarks:—

There was in Derby a manifest current of opinion in favour of a more systematic and official incorporation of the laity in Church work and parish administration than has yet found place in our system. . . . That Mr. Albert Grey's Bill will ever pass in its present shape we should think most unlikely. But we have little doubt that the ecclesiastical affairs of our parishes will eventually follow the line of their civil concerns. They will, to a far greater extent than now, be managed by elective bodies; and, under proper conditions and safeguards, we have no doubt at all that such a change would prove both wholesome and conservative.

Mr. Grey's address was admirable; and it produced a marked effect. It is probable that some of the speeches protesting against Church Boards made not a few listeners perceive the need of some such measure as Mr. Grey's.

The Working Men's Meetings were unusually well attended, and the speakers, the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Liverpool and Bedford, and others, were listened to with respectful attention. Large bodies of working men at the Midland Railway Station and in the premises of leading manufacturers were addressed by Bishop Ryle and other dignitaries.

The subject of the Diaconate was ably discussed. An interesting and suggestive paper was read by the Rev. E. R. Bernard. The Dean of Ripon,¹ the Rev. Jackson Mason, Mr. Sydney Gedge, Canon Medd, the Rev. W. O. Purton, Canon Woodhouse, and others urged the institution of an order of permanent deacons.

The question of the Central Council was introduced in an interesting paper by the Hon. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P. Canon Howell Evans (Oswestry) spoke well. The concluding speakers were Archdeacon Emery and the Rev. W. O. Purton, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea. Mr. Purton said that he had followed the Archdeacon at the Leicester Congress, and was glad to be able at Derby to point to the progress of this movement in the last year; the success of it, he added, was, in a great measure, due to the tact, largeheartedness, patience, and ability of the Arch-

¹ The Dean of Ripon said that the Church of England, with all her advantages, was undermanned and underpaid, for we had parishes with seven, eight, ten, or even fifteen thousand souls, committed to the care of one clergyman, with perhaps the assistance of a curate, provided by the Pastoral Aid or the Additional Curates' Society. Mr. Purton dwelt mainly on one point in Mr. Gedge's animated address, the question of money and men. The country he said has the endowments, and the towns have the masses of the people. For the increasing population, clergymen cannot be had.

deacon, whose Diocesan Conference work had been so signally successful.

One meeting at the Congress was stormy. At that meeting the Hon. C. L. Wood, the President of the E. C. U., spoke with plainness. The hon. gentleman pleaded for an optional use of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. Canon Hoare, called on unexpectedly, replied in a spirited and stirring speech. A more effective "bit of debating," to use the *Guardian's* words, no Church Congress has ever heard: "Many who did not agree with the speaker altogether admired the courage and readiness with which he grappled with his antagonist."

¹ The honoured Canon said:—"I wish to say that I think that this debate is a most important one for the Church of England. (Cheers.) I think that the speech of Mr. Wood, to which we have just listened, is one of the most important speeches that I have ever heard delivered at a Church Congress. (Cheers.) We used to be told that we Evangelicals were but poor Churchmen. We used to be told that what was originally called the Tractarian movement, but which has since been called the Ritualistic movement, was an effort of pious and devoted men to rise above our poor Churchmanship, and to bring out in better development the true principles of the Church of England. (Cheers.) We always, with that happiness which accompanies a clear conscience—('Hear, hear,' and laughter)—maintained that we were the true representatives of the Church of England. (Great cheering.) We acted upon the principle and its truth. But we have still borne a certain amount of reproach, and we have not been able to overcome the old prejudices. This day, however, we have been told by Mr. Wood, the President of the English Church Union, that our beautiful English Church Service is meagre: that there is nothing more meagre than our existing Liturgy; that our Holy Communion Service—in which we have taken so much delight—is a mutilated, an inferior, and a defective service. (Cheers, and 'No, no.')

I say 'Yes,' and this great assembly has heard too what Mr. Wood has said. (Cheers.) We have been told to-day that we are to go back to the Liturgy and to the Office of 1549. . . . We have learned something at this Church Congress. (Cheers.) We know where we are. We go home to-day knowing with what a power and an intention it is we have to contend. (Cheers.) We know what Mr. Wood has said. He has told us as plainly as possible that the object is to bring back the Church of England from the Reformed Church of 1552; but to stop just a little by the way in the refreshment room of 1549—(cheers)—and then we are to plunge head-foremost right into the Use of Sarum. (Great cheering, and cries of 'No, no; never, never.')

Now, then, my lord, what shall we say to this? Shall we have, or shall we not have it? (Cries of 'No, no; never, never.')

What, I ask, shall we say to this? Shall we stick by the blessed truths that we have received, and for which our Reformers died? (Cheers, and cries of 'Yes.')

Shall we cling to the dear old Office-book, from which we have hundreds and thousands of times poured out our whole hearts before God? (Cheers.) Shall we unite heart and soul as witnesses for Christ's coming there to His holy table—(cheers, and 'No, no')—and holding there communion with Him? (Cheers.) Shall we begin by half-and-half measures of a retrograde character, until we go right back to Rome? (Cheers, and cries of 'No, no; never, never.')

My lord, I wish now to say no more; but I wish to thank Mr. Wood for having spoken out so plainly on this subject, and for thus having let us know this day what are the real intentions of the English Church Union." (Loud and prolonged cheering.)