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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XI.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1884.

ART. I.—CANON WESTCOTT ON 1 JOHN I. 7.

IN a Commentary on St. John's Epistles lately published, Canon Westcott has a note on chap. i., ver. 7, of the first Epistle, in which he has propounded a remarkable theory. That he attaches some importance to it appears from his having transferred this note to another still more recent work, "The Historic Faith." If we understand his view aright, it is as follows: It is a mistake to suppose that in Scripture the expression "blood of Christ" signifies merely expiation or atonement; on the contrary, the idea of life is to be connected with it. In the Jewish sacrifices the victim was first slain by the offerer, not necessarily a priest, and so far the transaction conveyed the notion of an expiatory death. But the blood which was abstracted from the victim, and borne by the High Priest into the Holy of holies, carried with it the life of the victim, and by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat this life (in what sense is not explained) was imparted to the Jewish worshippers. So as regards the antitype; the death of Christ on the Cross was expiatory, but in the expression "blood of Christ" the additional idea of life is involved, the life of Christ; and further, of this life as imparted to the Church for the purposes of quickening and sanctification.

If we have misrepresented the author's view we are open to correction; but we can attach no other meaning to such statements as the following: "It must be observed that by the outpouring of the blood [in the Jewish sacrifices] the life which was in it was not destroyed, though it was separated from the organism which it had before quickened." "The blood already shed is distinctly treated as living. When it is sprinkled on the altar, it makes atonement in virtue of the life which is in it." "In accordance with the typical teaching of the Levitical ordinances, the blood of Christ represents

Christ's life (1) as rendered in free self-sacrifice to God for man, and (2) as brought into perfect fellowship with God, having been set free by death. The blood of Christ is, as shed, the life of Christ given for men; as offered, the life of Christ now given to men; the life which is the spring of their life. In each case the efficacy of the life of Christ depends, from man's side, on the incorporation of the believer in Christ.' "The blood always includes the thought of the life preserved and active beyond death." "Participation in Christ's blood is participation in His life (John vi. 56)." "The blood is not simply the price by which the redeemed were purchased, but the power by which they were quickened so as to be capable of belonging to God." "By 'sprinkling' of Christ's blood, the believer is first brought into fellowship with God in Christ; and in the imperfect conduct of his personal life, the life of Christ is continually communicated to him for growth and cleansing. He himself enters into the divine presence 'in the blood of Jesus' (Heb. x. 19), surrounded, as it were, and supported by the life which flows from Him." (Note, pp. 34-37.)

It does not necessarily militate against this theory that it seems rather of a mystical and fanciful character, and certainly bears upon it the stamp of novelty. Scripture is an inexhaustible mine, and what appears to have escaped the notice of previous commentators, it may be reserved for others to discover. And the language of Scripture, we know, in dealing with the mysteries of redemption, often abounds in figure, which must not be taken literally; that is, it affords scope for the exercise of the imaginative faculties. In all ages, the figurative language of Scripture has furnished the material of mystical interpretation. It is not because the theory seems fanciful or novel that we propose to examine it, but because we believe it to be both exegetically incorrect, and dogmatically of very doubtful import.

The physiological conception on which it rests is that the blood, as separated from the "organism," *i.e.*, the body which it had before quickened, retains or suggests a principle of life, nay, that the life was actually liberated "in or with the blood." It must be left to physiologists to determine in what particular part of the living body the life resides; whether the blood, or the nerves, or the spinal cord, or the whole "organism" itself. We apprehend that the dispute has not yet exhausted itself, nor, indeed, is likely soon to do so. But of one thing we feel sure, that no physiologist would connect the idea of life with *shed* blood (*cruor*) as distinguished from blood circulating in the veins (*sanguis*). But we need not interrogate the votaries of science. What idea would the Jewish worshipper, what idea would any common man associate with a

vessel of shed blood (*cruor*, not *sanguis*), obtained by abstracting it from a victim the body of which lay on the ground before him? One only idea in our opinion; that of death, not of life. The moment the blood became *cruor*, it lost all its associations with life. It suggested, and could suggest, nothing but that a violent death had taken place. As long as it was in the veins, so essential is a healthy state of the blood to bodily health, it might be popularly said that the life was in the blood; drawn from the body, it would be as dead a thing as the body itself which it once animated.

But, of course, physiological objections must yield to the testimony of Scripture, if such can be produced. And the Canon does interpret Scripture in favour of his view. We cannot think, successfully. The capital passage is, of course, Leviticus xvii. 10, 11, "Whatsoever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set My face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." There seems little difficulty in arriving at the sense of this passage. The Israelites needed an "atonement" (literally a *covering*) for their souls, *i.e.*, for the sins of which they had been guilty (every Hebraist knows that "souls" in Hebrew = persons); such a (typical) atonement Jehovah provided in the death of a morally innocent being, the animal being incapable of moral guilt; and as the symbol and sure sign of the victim's having suffered a violent death, its shed blood (*cruor*) was carried by the High Priest into the most holy place and sprinkled on the mercy-seat. It will be observed that there is not a word in this passage implying that "life," except so far as the covering of sin from the sight of God may be called life, was an element of the shed blood; one idea, and one alone, that of atonement (*Cipper*, *Capporeth*[1]), pervades it. "The life of the flesh is in the blood;"—certainly in this sense, that when the blood is drawn from the body, death, as a matter of course, ensues; but not in the sense that the life, passing out of the body, becomes incorporated in the *cruor*, or shed blood. The idea is not only without warrant from the passage, but repugnant to common sense. As an old and valuable commentator on the Pentateuch observes, "The blood is figuratively called the life, because the seat thereof is in the blood, as Moses here sheweth; so that if

[1] That is, the mercy-seat. The word is derived from the Hebrew *Caphar*, to cover; Piel, *Cipper*, to cover sin; *Capporeth*, the cover of the ark, on which the blood was sprinkled, lxx. ἱλαστήριον.

the blood be gone, the life is gone with it" [gone not into the shed blood, but gone altogether], "as daily experience confirmeth" (Ainsworth, on Leviticus xvii. 11). So that what the High Priest bore to the mercy-seat was not a life but a death —an atoning or covering death—the sure evidence of which having been suffered was the blood obtained, not merely by bleeding the animal, but by bleeding it to death. And the Jews were commanded not to eat the blood, but to cover it with dust; not, apparently, for the reason assigned by the learned author, "that a man might not use another's life for the support of his physical life" (if this means that he might not eat an animal alive, it may be true; but not if it means that he might not support himself by taking the life of an animal—see Gen. ix. 3), but to impress upon the Jew the sanctity of that which was appointed as the special symbol and type of Christ's atonement: "Let no man apply to the common use of nourishment that which I have given as a typical covering of your sin." Precisely in a similar manner, even "the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin," since they were not, like other sacrifices, to be consumed by the priests, "were burned without the camp" (Heb. xiii. 11), and "in a clean place" (Levit. iv. 12), as being peculiarly holy from their direct reference to the Christian atonement, and therefore to be guarded from natural corruption. The blood was not to be eaten, but covered with dust, as being too sacred a symbol to be exposed to the same liability.

But we are told that "the slaughtering of the victim, which was properly the work of the offerer, was sharply separated from the sprinkling of the blood, which was the exclusive privilege of the priest" (Note, p. 35). No doubt it was: any offerer might slay the victim; only the priest sprinkle the blood upon the altar. And therefore in the Levitical ritual we cannot make the death of the victim strictly and formally equivalent to the sprinkling of the blood. Yet the two things were not distinct in nature, but parts of one great transaction, the covering of sin from the sight of God: and it was only the imperfection of the typical institute which rendered the separation necessary. The priest, the mediator between God and man, went into the most holy place "with blood of others" (Heb. ix. 25); he sprinkled the blood on the *Capporeth*, not because there was life in it, but as the evidence of an expiatory death, which (typically) silenced the accusations of the law within: the victim meanwhile lying dead outside the tabernacle. What was thus portioned out into several parts is united in the antitype Christ, Who is offerer, victim, and priest, all in one; and all connected, not

with the communication of spiritual life, but with propitiation for sin.

If the shed blood (*cruor*) had had the notion of life (in a sense different from that of covering sin) connected with it, it is not easy to understand why the Jew should have been forbidden to eat it. For such eating would have been a striking symbol of the appropriation of the life in the blood; in no other way could the worshipper have so intimately assimilated what is supposed to have been liberated with the blood. It would, in short, have been an eminent type of feeding on Christ by faith. That the Jew was forbidden, under the most stringent sanctions, to eat the blood; and thereby, if the Canon's theory is correct, to assimilate the life; is sufficient to throw doubts upon the correctness of that theory, and to confirm the conclusion that no life, except in the sense of remission of sin, was supposed to be in the blood.

Nor can we think that the passages which Canon Westcott adduces from the New Testament support his view; on the contrary, they seem in their obvious sense incompatible with it. We venture to say that in no instance is the expression "blood of Christ" directly used otherwise than with a reference to atonement—"We have redemption through His blood"—but it is that specific aspect of redemption which consists in "forgiveness of sins" (Eph. i. 7, comp. Col. i. 14); "the blood of Christ purges the *conscience* from dead works to serve God" (Heb. ix. 14); "by one offering He perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14), and His bearing His own blood with Him into the presence of God (whatever we are to understand by the transaction thus indicated) was but the completion of the expiatory work, the antitype of the completion of the Jewish atonement by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat. When St. Peter declares that Christians are "elect to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ," he directs our thoughts to the same topic. "We are saved," no doubt, "by His life," for if He had not risen from the dead we should have no living priest to offer the blood, no covenanted title to the gift of the Holy Spirit; but when "the blood" in the same passage is mentioned, it is in connection with justification, "much more being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath by Him" (Rom. v. 9, 10). The substance of the song of the Church triumphant is, that the Lamb had "redeemed" them "by His blood" (Rev. v. 9).

But "the blood of Jesus Christ," we are told, "cleanseth us from all sin." No doubt this passage, on which the Canon's theory is suspended, bears, in its connection, on the doctrine of sanctification; but only as that doctrine always depends on the atonement as its foundation. For there can be no true

sanctification objectively except through the Holy Ghost, the fruit of Christ's atonement, nor subjectively, except the conscience is first cleansed from guilt. "If we walk in the light," the Apostle says, "as He is in the light," if we strive to be perfect "as our Father in heaven is perfect," we have indeed "fellowship one with another;" but another effect is also to be anticipated. Every step of advance in holiness will be accompanied with a corresponding increase of sensitiveness to the remaining defilement of a corrupt nature; so that the Christian, in proportion as he ascends the height, becomes conscious of the depth whence he has emerged. Yet, continues the Apostle, let him not be cast down by these discoveries. The atoning work of Christ, comprising both His death and the offering of His blood, though never to be repeated, is of continuous application, and "cleanseth us from all sin," actual and original; that is, it covers from the eye of God the imperfections which, in spite of his efforts after holiness, cleave to the believer. The reference is partly to that mysterious transaction in heaven of which we have but a limited knowledge, and chiefly, indeed, through the typical ordinance, but which is expressed in Scripture by "Christ ever living to make intercession for us" (Heb. vii. 25), Christ bearing "His own blood" into the holy place above, and applying it, as the High Priest did "the blood of bulls and goats," to the purposes of atonement or remission. We are aware that the word used in the passage for cleansing (*καθαρίζει*) sometimes denotes what we mean by sanctification; but we cannot think it does so in this instance.

We proceed to make some remarks on the dogmatical import of the theory. We are constrained to regard it as a symptom of the tendency, visible at present in many quarters, to substitute the *Redeemer* Christ for the third Person of the Holy Trinity, the Holy Ghost, in the economy of redemption. If Scripture is plain upon any point, it is upon this: that Christ, the incarnate Son, is no longer upon earth, but has passed into the heavens, to discharge peculiar and most important functions on behalf of His Church, but not offices connected with sanctification. The offices of King and Priest He discharges in His own Person, the office of Prophet He has delegated to the third Person, His Vicar, and only Vicar, upon earth. It was expedient for His Church that He should thus depart, no more to be present as the incarnate Son until He comes again; and that He should commit the active administration of this dispensation, calling, quickening, teaching, sanctifying, to the Holy Ghost, who by His interior and most efficacious operation more than compensates for the personal intercourse which the Apostles enjoyed with the Redeemer (see John xiv., xvi.). The Holy Ghost is now "Christ in us,

the hope of glory," Christ "dwelling in our hearts by faith;" the same Christ Who instructed and comforted the Apostles, for where the Holy Ghost is, there is in fact the Son; but Christ under the form, the *modus subsistendi*, of the Holy Ghost, not as the incarnate Redeemer. The essential deity of Christ, by virtue of which He is everywhere present as God, is not here the point in question, but His presence as the second Person of the œconomical Trinity, the Trinity of Redemption. And we repeat it: He is no doubt present on earth, but it is as the Holy Ghost, Whom He has formally appointed to take His place, Who proceeds from Him, and receives from Him what is to be, in the way of spiritual influence, imparted to the Church (John xvi. 14). When the Saviour promised "I will come to you," "I will manifest myself to him," "I will sup with him, and he with ME" (John xiv. 18, 21; Rev. iii. 20), "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst" (Matt. xviii. 20), it is to this indwelling of the Holy Ghost that He refers: the Holy Ghost, Who is in fact Christ, but Christ *as* the Holy Ghost, and not as the incarnate Son. Only they who reject the doctrine of the Trinity, or refine it away, can find a difficulty in this interchange of Christ and the Holy Ghost. Difficulties, perhaps to a finite understanding insuperable, do indeed attach to the doctrine itself, but not especially to this particular application of it. And it is one proof among others how vitally that doctrine is interwoven with the economy of redemption.

It is impossible, in our opinion, to over-estimate the importance of the great truth now under notice. No Christian, no Christian theologian, professes to ignore the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as set forth in Holy Scripture. Nevertheless, it is unquestionable that its full import and bearings are far from being realized as they ought to be. Hence the tendency alluded to, to bring down Christ the Redeemer from heaven to earth again, in His human nature, and to invest Him with functions which He has Himself expressly assigned to His Divine Vicar, the third Person; to the disparagement, or at least comparative forgetfulness, of the peculiar functions which "terminate in" (*i.e.*, are specifically ascribed to) the third œconomical Person.

The danger will be best seen in the interpretations assigned to certain figurative expressions of Scripture, often used in this connection. We hear a good deal of "union with Christ," "the life of Christ imparted to us," "partaking of Christ's life," and the like; all good and Scriptural expressions, if properly understood, but liable to misapprehension. What do we mean by "union with Christ"? If we take it literally, we may lapse nto those physical theories which find their ultimate result in

transubstantiation. The physical conception of the fact culminates in Leo's unhappy saying, "*Corpus regenerati fit caro Crucifixi*" (The body of the regenerate man is made the flesh of the crucified One), which has given rise to so many erroneous theories. But the Apostle, we are told, expressly declares that "we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Ephes. v. 30). It is strange that they who insist on this strong figurative language should not perceive that the context is decisive against the physical view. The passage to which St. Paul alludes, and which he adapts to his purpose, describes, in its original application, the union of husband and wife—"Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. ii. 24)—language quite as strong as that of St. Paul. Was, then, the union of Adam and Eve a physical one, like that of the Siamese twins, and not rather a moral and spiritual union of the most intimate kind? The latter, no doubt. And such, and no other, is now the union of husband and wife, the figure which the Apostle employs to describe the union betwixt Christ and His Church. That is, the latter is a moral and spiritual union; not an immediate union of ourselves with Christ's glorified body, but a mediate union effected through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, Who (in this sense) does certainly unite us to Christ. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" (1 Cor. v. 17), not physically one flesh.

Again, it is said that "the life of Christ is communicated to His Church for its cleansing and growth" (Westcott, Note). The statement may, in a proper sense, appeal to Scripture for confirmation. "Christ is our life;" "Because I live, ye shall live also;" "I am the Life;" "He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." But the question is, what are we to understand, due regard being paid to the analogy of faith, by such language? If we suppose the present life of Christ in His glorified state to be literally communicated to us, it is not easy to form a clear conception of what is meant. The life of Christ while upon earth was not communicated literally to His disciples. What is there in the fact that He now lives in a glorified body to facilitate the conception? The saints, too, will exist in glorified bodies; but this will not, as far as we perceive, render them more capable of communicating "their life" to each other than when they had mortal bodies. It is obvious that, as in the former instance, the intervening link is wanting. Christ is our life, because from Him proceeds, as the purchased gift of His atonement, that Divine Agent Whose office it is *directly* to communicate spiritual life and growth. It may be that this, after all, is what is really meant by the language in question; but,

if so, why is it not expressly thus stated? Why is the office of the Holy Ghost in the work of redemption almost lost sight of? Why is mystical language employed about union with Christ, which, wrought out to its results, must land us in serious error? This practical eclipse of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost is, we may depend upon it, of serious moment; and not only so, but that all the theories which rest upon a supposed active administration of this dispensation by the incarnate Son lead, not remotely, to those physical views of the gift in the Eucharist of which the late Archdeacon Wilberforce's book on that subject is the fullest development. The "humanity," "the glorified humanity" of Christ has, of late years, played a conspicuous part in theological speculation; it seems time for us to dwell, in turn, upon "the Spirit of Christ," *i.e.* not "the life of Christ," but the third Person of the Holy Trinity—His gracious presence; His regenerating and sanctifying work; His assistance in prayer, interceding "in us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii.); His inward testimony assuring us that we are children of God (*ibid.*); His Divine teaching; His calling of ministers; His communication of spiritual gifts; in short, His discharge of the very offices, but in a more effectual manner, which Christ Himself would discharge if He, in His human nature, were present amongst us.

E. A. Litton.

Art. II.—PAU AS A WINTER RESIDENCE.

WHERE to spend the winter, is a question of yearly increasing importance to many whose health is too weak to stand an English climate without risk, and yet is susceptible of improvement under favourable circumstances. Each year more persons are sent abroad by our leading medical men, and each year more persons are enabled to resume their home duties and responsibilities, fortified by the effects of two or three winters' sojourn in a milder climate.

The south-west of France is less known to the general public than the Riviera and its neighbourhood, and yet its advantages are so great, and its points of interest so numerous, that it seems worth while to set them before the readers of The Churchman as far as may be done within the limits of an article.

Pau is the centre of a district whose hallowed associations

command our respect and admiration. When we were sunk in Popish error, Bearn, under Jeanne d'Albret, was throwing off the yoke, and daring everything for the privilege of worshipping God in spirit and in truth. Every town, every ruined castle, every valley in the neighbourhood of Pau, is a witness of what men can do, if they are in earnest, for the defence of the faith of Christ, as well as of the faithfulness of God in protecting those who dare the loss of all things, yea, life itself, for His name. And later on the same neighbourhood gave shelter to the persecuted Huguenots. Many a sequestered nook on the beautiful slopes of the Pyrenees has witnessed the impassioned worship of men who gathered at dead of night to honour their Lord and Master, knowing full well that their life would pay the penalty of discovery. Many a cave, which is now sought only for its wealth of fern or flower, has been the abode of the faithful pastors who went about, literally with their life in their hands, to cheer and edify the flock and support them through the terrible trials of faith to which they were exposed. It is the scene of such deeds of heroism that I am now endeavouring to describe.

The traveller who can endure a long unbroken journey leaves London by the morning mail, and, after about three hours' halt in Paris, starts by the night train (in a through carriage), by way of Orleans and Tours, reaching Bordeaux about seven in the morning. He passes through the somewhat dreary scenery of the Landes, and soon gets peeps of distant mountains, which rapidly extend into a long line of broken peaks, and about one o'clock he finds himself exactly opposite the highest peak as the train stops at the well-built and nicely arranged station of Pau.

To give some idea of its position it should be said that a line of beautifully wooded hills, or coteaux, run parallel with this part of the Pyrenees, at a distance of twenty miles to the north. Three miles to the north of them lies Pau, on high ground, forming a kind of semicircle, the circumference of which northwards is protected from north winds by another range of coteaux about five miles beyond it.

The traveller, on leaving the station, sees in front of him, high above his head, a row of fine buildings, beginning with the château on the left, long the residence of Jeanne d'Albret, and the birthplace of Henry IV.; the other buildings are hotels, or large private houses. Well-engineered winding roads, to the right and left, lead to both ends of the town; but a steep footpath immediately opposite the station brings one, in five minutes, to the Boulevard du Midi and the Place Royal, the fashionable resort of Pau.

The view from the Boulevard du Midi ranks among the

finest in Europe. At our feet flows the Gave, and beyond it rise gently the nearer slopes of the wooded coteaux, dotted here and there with châteaux and villas. Beyond these there are the Pyrenees, which stretch away to right and left as far as the eye can reach, riven into wondrous shapes and peaks, and during the greater part of the year glistening with snow. Immediately before us the chain opens into the Val d'Ossau, at the end of which is seen the Pic du Midi d'Ossau, the grandest of this part of the chain; to the left are the mountains of Bigorre, which form a peculiarly striking group of summits and peaks brought together by distance. The course of the Gave may be traced in the same direction almost as far as Lourdes, a continuous line of villages accompanying it through a valley of wonderful fertility.

When tired of the distant view there are points of interest close at hand. The grey walls of the château, the pretentious castellated Hôtel Gassion, the very fine new church of St. Martin, and then the Place Royale, with its statue of Henry IV. in the centre, and surrounded by hotels and clubs, the English Club sharing the east side with the Hôtel de France. The business part of the town consists of streets which run in three parallel lines from west to east, and of one long street with "tributaries" which goes from south to north. Beyond these streets in every direction are good country roads, with villas of every size and description.

The climate may be called a modification of the English climate, its great feature being the absence of high winds. It is sheltered from the north, and the hot Spanish wind is somewhat cooled by coming over the mountains. Notwithstanding a considerable rainfall, the air hardly ever feels damp, and with the exception of a few days of the first heat in April or May, the temperature is pleasant from the beginning of October to the end of June. For delicacy of the chest and lungs, and for asthma, the climate is particularly beneficial, and its soothing character is exceedingly good for overtasked energies and overworked brains. Persons suffering from spinal trouble often find the air of Pau very helpful, and some cases are known to the writer of this paper in which delicacy of this sort has been entirely overcome.

Two charming parks give shady walks with wonderful views, and are favourite rendezvous of children; and on the east of the town is a long avenue, not unlike the Broad Walk in Oxford. The rides and drives are almost endless, and in every direction there seems a fresh point of interest; while for those whose health permits them to take more violent exercise, there is a good pack of hounds, and tennis and golf clubs. Altogether, it may be said that for people in moderate health, few places

can be found which provide more varied occupation and amusement.

Pau has three English churches and a Scotch church. The old English church, founded by the Duchess of Gordon, holds about 350 people, and is in the gift of trustees, who are represented by the Colonial and Continental Church Society. Trinity Church, the property of that Society, holds about 400 people; and there is a small iron church, called St. Andrew's, which is devoted to those who desire a high ritual. The Presbyterian Church works most cordially with its English neighbours, and its minister is always ready to give assistance to any good religious movement. There is a monthly magazine issued by Christ Church and Trinity combined, and a series of missionary lectures is given during the winter.

The French Eglise Réformée and Eglise Libre have each a place of worship, the former holding service in Christ Church; and the Plymouth Brethren have a large congregation, mostly French and Dutch. Several agencies of evangelization are at work in the neighbourhood with more or less activity. English visitors are not idle in sowing the good seed of God's Word, and the avidity with which portions of Scripture and tracts are received gives great encouragement in their distribution. It seems as though a great number of the working class were on the very verge of renouncing the errors of Popery; at any rate, many are real students of Scripture, and are often to be found in Protestant places of worship.

Something must be said about the surroundings of Pau, and the places of interest and resort in the neighbourhood, the first of which, in point of nearness as well as beauty, is Eaux Chaudes. A railway goes direct from Pau to Laruns in the Val d'Ossau, from which place roads lead right and left to Eaux Chaudes and Eaux Bonnes. The former, especially if the journey be continued to Gabas, is one of the most beautiful roads that can be found. After leaving Laruns, it is cut with great labour for some distance through sheer rock, on emerging from which it winds gently upwards among box-clad slopes and huge masses of granite and limestone, until at about four miles from the station the valley seems closed by the large bathing establishment of Eaux Chaudes. The village is small, consisting of one street, a small Place, and two or three villas beyond, but it is one of the most charming places that can be found for a summer residence. Five miles to the south lies Gabas, approached by a very hilly but well-made road, and beyond Gabas stands in all its majesty the Pic du Midi d'Ossau, to the east of which a good road leads towards the Spanish frontier.

Eaux Bonnes is also well worth a visit. It lies at the foot of

the Pic du Ger, and its houses are almost touching the rock, so narrow is the space on which it stands. It is, perhaps, more fitted for invalids than Eaux Chaudes, and easy walks have been constructed at great cost in the neighbourhood; but it lacks the delicious current of fresh air which is always to be found in the other valley, and has a tendency to be overrun with Spaniards.

Lourdes is the next place of interest on the east of Pau. It has a melancholy interest of its own, as being the centre of superstition and idolatry; but its marvellous position, guarding three magnificent valleys, and the fact of its being the starting-point for some of the most beautiful scenes in the Pyrenees, make it a place of great resort for travellers of all kinds.[1]

Readers to whom this account of Pau and its neighbourhood seems attractive may be glad to know something more of the *modus vivendi*. Apartments are generally taken for the season of eight months, and range in price from £40 to £300. Villas are to be had at all prices, those at a little distance from the town being cheaper. Servants are good and active, but as a rule they have the Bearnais hasty temper, and will often leave suddenly on very slight provocation. A good cook gets about thirty-five shillings a month, a housemaid twenty-five, and a man-servant three to four pounds. The cook does all marketing, and makes a percentage of one sous in twenty, which it is good policy to ignore, as otherwise the prices rise and the quality of articles falls with incredible rapidity. Meat is much the same price as in an average English town; groceries are dear; poultry, eggs, milk, and vegetables are cheap. The whole cost of living approximates very much to that of an English country town. Cabs are cheap and good, and private carriages may be had on reasonable terms. There are good educational advantages for boys, and some for girls, but the former predominate, partly from the fact that so many ladies bring out governesses for their daughters.

It is difficult in the limits of a magazine article to do justice

[1] A branch railway goes to Pierrefitte, passing through the picturesque village of Argelez, which is much frequented in the spring, partly for its own sake, and partly as being a good starting-point for Gavarnie. At Pierrefitte, four miles beyond Argelez, two roads diverge, the right-hand one to Cauterets, and the left to Luz, St. Sauveur, and Gavarnie. Cauterets is one of the highest of the mountain bathing-places, and is filled with a gay crowd after the middle of June. Luz is a quaint town, well worth a visit; and St. Sauveur invites a longer summer stay. The Cirque of Gavarnie is so well known that it needs very little mention here, even if space permitted. It has been called one of the wonders of the world, and well deserves the title. Returning to the main line at Lourdes, and proceeding westward, we soon come to Bagnères de Bigorre, and still farther east, Luchon, both of which places may be easily reached from Pau.

to a place which has such varied attractions. It is commonly said that those who come to Pau once always come again, and each year they get more fond of it; at any rate, the best advice that can be given to those whose health compels them to seek southern skies, and who have not yet tried this neighbourhood, is "Come and see."

JOHN H. ROGERS.

ART. III.—THE FIRST POLYGLOT BIBLE.

"This Cardinal,
Though from an humble stock, undoubtedly
Was fashioned to much honour from his cradle.
He was a scholar, and a ripe and good one;
Exceeding wise, fair-spoken and persuading:
Lofty and sour to them that loved him not;
But to those men that sought him, sweet as summer."
King Henry VIII.

SPAIN is not a country to which we have usually been accustomed to look for any great advance in matters belonging to the regions of scientific or critical research. That country has produced great writers, such as Cervantes, the immortal author of "Don Quixote;" great dramatists, such as Calderon and Lope de Vega; and great painters, such as Velasquez, Murillo, Zurbaran, and Ribera. It also made itself conspicuous, in times gone by, by its great activity in the department of maritime discovery, and in the colonization of the continent of America. But, as above intimated, we have not been accustomed to expect from it much progress in matters calling for the exercise of scientific or critical knowledge.

The reasons for this backwardness are not far to seek, and are easily discernible even by superficial students of its romantic history. The long-enduring conflicts with the former masters of the peninsula, the Moors, in which religious motives played so predominant a part, served to impress upon the character of the Christian conquerors permanent feelings of a fervidly enthusiastic nature, which were easily fanned into fanaticism by a crafty priesthood. Added to this, the Inquisition with its awful terrors weighed like a nightmare upon the minds of the people, checking all tendency to improvement, and spreading the silence and inactivity of the grave throughout the length and breadth of the land. If we duly consider these circumstances in the history of the country we shall not be astonished that a spirit of inquiry

could find no outlet, and that all independent research after *truth* should be rendered well-nigh impossible.

Nevertheless, it is to Spain that we owe a work of high interest, if judged only from a literary and historical point of view, and even of no small critical importance, especially when we consider the age and country in which it was produced. This was the great Polyglot Bible[1] of the celebrated Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, as to which we propose to offer a few cursory observations in this paper.

But before proceeding to our immediate purpose it will be well, perhaps, to take a brief survey of the life of the distinguished man to whose zeal, learning, and munificence we are indebted for the execution of this great work.

Ximenes was born in the year 1436 in the small town of Tordelaguna in the kingdom of Castile. He came of an ancient but decayed family, and his father held the office of collector of the papal revenue in his native town. From his earliest youth he was destined by his parents for the Church. At the age of fourteen we find him at the University of Salamanca—then, and for a long time afterwards, the most famous seat of learning in Spain—where, after six years' residence, he received a degree both in Civil and Canon Law, an honour of rare occurrence at that time.

At the age of twenty-three he undertook a journey to Rome, which he did not reach without some adventures common enough in those days. He was twice robbed on the road; and, but for the timely assistance afforded him by an old fellow-student, he would in all probability never have arrived at his destination. In Rome, Ximenes seems to have fared sufficiently well, and he succeeded before his recall, at the age of twenty-nine, in consequence of the death of his father and various family embarrassments, in obtaining from the Pope a brief, or diploma, entitling him to the first ecclesiastical benefice under a certain value which would become vacant in his native province.

In due time a benefice corresponding to the definitions of his brief fell vacant by the death of the arch-priest of Uzeda (1473), and Ximenes forthwith proceeded to take possession of it by virtue of the Apostolic grant. This action on his part brought him into collision with Carillo, the then Archbishop of Tolodo, who thought to compel Ximenes to surrender his pre-

[1] Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, complectentia Vetus Testamentum, Hebraico, Græco et Latino Idiomate; Novum Testamentum Græcum et Latinum, et Vocabularium Heb. et Chald. Veteris Testamenti, cum Grammaticâ Hebraicâ, necnon Dictionario Græco. Studio, operâ et impensis Cardinalis Ximenes de Cisneros. 6 vols. folio, Industria Arnaldi Guilelmo de Brocario, artis impressoriæ magistri, Compluti, 1514, 1515, 1517.

tensions by imprisoning him in the strong tower of Santorcaz. In this, however, the Archbishop was mistaken, and he was at last persuaded to release his unyielding prisoner, but not until after he had undergone a confinement of more than six years. Ximenes was thus placed in full possession of his benefice. Soon afterwards he exchanged it for the chaplaincy of Siguenza, whereby he was brought under the immediate notice of the great Cardinal Mendoza, at that time Bishop of Siguenza, who made him the Grand Vicar of his diocese.

But the world and its concerns were becoming more and more distasteful to the austere character of Ximenes. He determined, therefore, to become a monk, and selecting for this purpose the Observantines of the Franciscan Order, the most rigid of the monastic societies, he resigned his employments and benefices, and entered on his noviciate in the convent of San Juan de los Reyes, at Toledo, the superb remains of which are well known to every traveller who has had the good fortune to visit that remarkable city.

But we must not dwell too long on this portion of the history of Ximenes. There is no need to recount the mortifications to which he subjected himself both here and in his seclusion at Castañar. It will suffice to say that, through the instrumentality of his former patron, Mendoza, who had since been promoted to the Archbishopric of Toledo, he was, though not without protestation on his part, appointed confessor to Queen Isabella, who, on the death of Mendoza in 1495, promoted Ximenes, now in the sixtieth year of his age, to the exalted post which had thus once more become vacant.

"And now let us look for a moment at what kind of figure that is which has stepped up upon this lofty pedestal, and stands thus observed henceforth of all observers of European history. A very tall and wholly erect figure, in a friar's frock and barefoot; stern and sombre, thoroughly monastic; his complexion sallow, his whole countenance thin and sharp; with a high and long head, shorn, all save a narrow circle of it; with small, black, vivid eyes, with overhanging brows, and a most ample and unwrinkled but retiring forehead; his nose prominent and very aquiline, and his upper lip projecting over his lower; with a voice harsh and grating, but of most effective speech, as of fire mingled with hail—not always blessing, but always leaving some traces of itself for long. Clearly a most penetrating, sagacious, determined man; rigidly calm, sternly disciplined; every way imposing, in no way attractive; a priest and not a prophet, and more an archbishop than an apostle."

I have borrowed the foregoing graphic description from Mr. Myers's lecture on Ximenes in his interesting "Lectures on

Great Men." "Such appears," adds that writer, "from the portraits we have of him, to be the kind of man who finds himself, without his seeking it, the Archbishop of Toledo in 1495."

No sooner was he installed in his new office than he proceeded, with the aid of his royal mistress, to carry out those schemes of reform among the clergy of his diocese upon which he had set his heart. His efforts in this direction were eventually crowned with success, in spite of the opposition which he encountered. But the stern spirit of Ximenes was not to be put down by opposition, however formidably it might display itself. He succeeded, in fact, in effecting in Spain so thorough a reformation of discipline that, as Mr. Myers aptly remarks, "had it been general throughout the Roman Church, it might have indefinitely postponed that reformation of doctrine which in the next century made half Europe Protestant."

But now, unhappily, the zeal of Ximenes was to manifest itself in another and less praiseworthy direction. In 1499 he attended Ferdinand and Isabella in their visit to their new conquest of Granada. Here he undertook the task of converting those Moors who still remained in the subjugated province. Persuasive methods were at first attempted; but, as these proved too slow in their operation, the zealous Archbishop proceeded to the adoption of more high-handed measures. All the Arabic books and manuscripts that he could seize upon, with the exception of medical works, which he kept for his library at Alcalá, were heaped together in a pile in one of the great squares of Granada, and were publicly burnt. Many of these volumes were valuable, not only for their contents, but also for their sumptuous bindings, illuminations, and costly ornamentations in gold and precious stones. But the taint of *heresy* clung to them, and that was, of course, a fatal defect in the eyes of Ximenes.

A riot which soon afterwards arose in consequence of the intolerant proceedings of the Archbishop, was with difficulty quelled. Nevertheless, the objects which he had never lost sight of were more or less imperfectly secured at last. Numbers of the Moors embraced Christianity, or pretended to do so. The more wealthy sold their estates, and migrated to Barbary. After this Mahometanism only lingered on in Spain among the inhabitants of the wild mountain region of the Alpujarras. The name of *Moors*, too, by which the Spanish Arabs had usually been designated, now gave way to the title of *Moriscos*, which was borne by this unhappy race until their final expulsion from the peninsula.

We willingly turn away from this portion of the life of

Ximenes. Acts dictated by bigotry and fanaticism are never pleasing subjects for contemplation, irrespective of the source from which they may happen to emanate. "It is a singular paradox," says Prescott,[1] "that Christianity, whose doctrines inculcate unbounded charity, should have been made so often an engine of persecution; while Mahometanism, whose principles are those of avowed intolerance, should have exhibited, at least till later times, a truly philosophical spirit of toleration."

After accomplishing the conquest of Oran—for the details of which I must refer to the brilliant pages of the author from whom I have just quoted—Ximenes retired to Alcalá de Henares, where he busily occupied himself with his new university, the idea of which he had conceived as far back as 1497, but which he was not enabled finally to complete until the year 1508. But this was not the only great work accomplished by Ximenes at Alcalá. Here it was also that he engaged in a task of equal magnitude and of greater difficulty, viz., the formation of his Polyglot Bible, usually called the Complutensian Polyglot, from *Complutum*, the old Roman name for Alcalá.

Ximenes lived to see the completion of this great work, as to which it is now our purpose to offer a few brief remarks. He died, however, soon afterwards at the ripe age of eighty-one, having attained to the high office of Civil Administrator of the kingdom, which office he united with that of Grand Inquisitor. Pope Julius II. had in 1507 conferred the dignity of a cardinal's hat upon the stern ecclesiastic.

Although the Complutensian Polyglot was the first work of the kind that was brought to a successful completion, it was not the first that was *projected*. This honour is due to the illustrious printer, Aldus Manutius, the elder, of whose work, however, only one page appears to have been printed, containing the first fifteen verses of the first chapter of the book of Genesis, in collateral columns, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. In 1516 a certain Peter Paul Porrus printed at Genoa the Pentaglot Psalter of Agostino Giustiniani, Bishop of Nebbio. This was in Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee, and Greek, with the Latin version, glosses, and scholia. Again, in 1518, John Potken published at Cologne the Psalter in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Ethiopic. But the production of a polyglot edition of the entire Bible was reserved for the zeal and munificence of the great Spanish Cardinal.

In those days subtle questions of theology and useless speculations were much in vogue among the clergy generally,

[1] "History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella."

while the more profitable study of the text of the Bible was neglected. The Cardinal thought that this neglect arose from the slight acquaintance of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin at that time possessed by ecclesiastics of various grades. In order, therefore, to counteract the evil effects likely to be produced in consequence of such a state of affairs, and to direct attention to the study of the original texts, Ximenes decided to undertake a new edition of the Bible, which should comprise, so far as the Old Testament was concerned, the Hebrew text, the Latin version, or Vulgate, and the Septuagint, or Greek translation, with the Chaldee paraphrase of the Pentateuch at the bottom of the page, and a Latin interpretation. To this portion of the work four volumes were devoted. For the New Testament the Greek text was to be printed with the Vulgate Latin version in a parallel column, thus forming the greater part of the fifth volume. In the Old Testament portion the Latin Vulgate was to hold the middle place between the Hebrew and Greek texts. For this collocation the following fanciful reasons were adduced, viz., that as Christ was crucified between two thieves, so the Roman Church, represented by St. Jerome's version, is crucified between the Synagogue, represented by the Hebrew text, and the Eastern Church, denoted by the Greek version. The sixth and last volume was to be devoted to an explanation of Hebrew terms, and other elementary and explanatory treatises.

An enterprise of such exceeding difficulty demanded for its achievement a man of dauntless energy and determination. But difficulties, instead of overcoming, only served to increase the ardour and constancy of Ximenes. He collected the most learned men of the day for the prosecution of the undertaking.[1] Unfolding to them his design, he promised to furnish liberal allowances for all their expenses, in addition to ample remuneration for their labours. Above all, he urged diligence in the prosecution of the work. "Lose no time, my friends," he would say, "lest, in the casualties of life, you should lose

[1] Their names have come down to us. There were Antonio de Lebrija, Demetrius Ducas, of Crete, who had been invited by Ximenes to Alcalá to teach the Greek language; Lopez de Zuñiga (Stunica or Astuniga), the chief of the learned band, with whom, as will be remembered, the accomplished Erasmus involved himself in a literary contest on the subject of the controverted clause in 1 John v. 7; Nuñez de Guzman, or Pintianus, of noble extraction, professor at Alcalá, and author of several commentaries on the classics. With the foregoing were associated three learned Jews, converts to Christianity, viz., Alfonso, a physician; Paul Coronell of Segovia, a professor of theology at the University of Salamanca, who died in 1534; and Alfonso de Zamora, who was specially appointed to compose a grammar and Hebrew dictionary for the Polyglot.

your patron, or I have to lament the loss of those whose services are of more price in my eyes than wealth and worldly honours." Inspired by the Cardinal's zeal and enthusiasm, and aided in their deliberations by his learning and acuteness, his band of scholars worked unflaggingly at their task.

For the purpose of the undertaking the Cardinal caused the libraries of Europe to be ransacked for suitable manuscripts. The literary resources of Spain were of course at his command. Leo X. liberally placed the treasures of the Vatican at his disposal. Seven Hebrew manuscripts were collected from different countries, on the purchase of which the large sum of four thousand golden crowns was expended.

The difficulties of the work were enormously increased in consequence of the scarcity of the necessary types, especially for the Oriental languages. The art of printing was then, it will be remembered, in its infancy. To Ximenes, however, such obstacles were as nought. If ready-made types could not be procured in the printing establishments of Europe, they could be cast to order. He accordingly established foundries at Alcalá, and imported artists from Germany, who worked under his own immediate supervision.

The cost of such an enterprise was, as may readily be conceived, enormous. The purchase of manuscripts; the remuneration of those engaged in procuring them; the expense of their journeys; the emoluments of the learned editors, copyists, and assistants; the expense, moreover, of the new types, which were all, as we have seen, cast on the spot; the bringing of artists from Germany; the actual work of printing itself—all these caused a total expenditure of over 50,000 ducats, or about £25,000 in our money.

Great was the joy of the octogenarian Cardinal on the completion of the arduous undertaking. It was begun in 1502; but, although completed in 1517, it was not *published* until 1522—the publication having been delayed by Leo X., who felt some misgivings as to the danger which might possibly arise to the Papal Crown through the impetus the work would be likely to give to Biblical research. The impression, moreover, was limited to 600 copies, of which three were printed on vellum.

For one of these excessive rarities so large a sum as £522 has been paid. This copy was bought at that price by Mr. Standish, and was afterwards bequeathed to Louis Philippe. It is now in the fine library of the Duc d'Aumale. Of the other two, one is in the Vatican, and the other, originally intended for Alcalá, at Madrid.

Up till late years it was generally supposed that the manuscripts made use of by Ximenes and his editors were destroyed

in 1749, having been, as was alleged, disposed of as so much *waste paper* by the then librarian of Alcalá, to a rocket-maker of the town, who lost no time in working them up for the purposes of his business. More recent discoveries have, however, thrown a new light on this whimsical anecdote. A sale of parchments to a rocket-maker had indeed taken place at the time specified, not however of original manuscripts, but only of their outer coverings when they were rebound. The manuscripts of the Old Testament were deposited in the University of Alcalá, whence they were afterwards removed to Madrid. Those lent by Leo X. were duly restored to the Vatican. In fact, the whole story turns out to be only another instance of what Mr. Hayward would call a "mock pearl of history,"[1] the spuriousness of which subsequent researches have made apparent.

In estimating the merits of the Complutensian Polyglot we must be careful to bear in mind the character and circumstances of the age and country in which it was produced. The science of criticism, as now understood, was then in its infancy, if, indeed, it can be said to have existed at all. The Cardinal himself was well versed in the Hebrew and Chaldee languages, which he had diligently studied during his chaplainship at Siguenza. His editors, too, were possessed of no small amount of erudition and capacity. But they could hardly have had access to the vast stock of materials that have been made available for critics in this more favoured age. It would not appear, for instance, that the famous *Codex Vaticanus* was included among the treasures borrowed from Leo X.[2] Judged, then, by modern standards, the value of the work from a purely critical point of view must be admitted to be small. The manuscripts employed, especially those used for the New Testament portion, were comparatively modern, and not reliable as sources whereon to found a pure text. Moreover, the Latin version was at that time more highly esteemed than the Hebrew and Greek originals, and was looked upon as the authorized translation of the Church. "The editors," says Dr. Scrivener, "plainly meant no disparagement to the original Scriptures *as such;* but they had persuaded themselves that Hebrew codices had been corrupted by the Jew, the Septuagint

[1] See "Selected Essays," by A. Hayward, Q.C., in 2 vols. Longmans, 1878.

[2] "The writer of the Preface to the Roman edition (Vol. vi., Præf. p. 9, 1881) vainly struggles to maintain the opposite view, because the Cardinal, in his Preface to the Complutensian New Testament, speaks about 'adhibitis Vaticanis libris,' as if there were but one there." Scrivener, "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament," note, p. 105. Third Edition.

by the schismatical Greek, and so clung to the Latin as the only form (even before the Council of Trent) in which the Bible was known or studied in Western Europe."

But when every admission of this kind has been fully made, the Complutensian Polyglot will still stand forth as a noble monument of zeal, piety, and munificence. The town of Alcalá, "*el famoso Compluto*," as Cervantes has called it, once a prosperous seat of learning, when its halls were thronged by eleven thousand students, has, since the removal of its University to Madrid in 1836, fallen away sadly from its former high estate. Its streets are now deserted, and its churches and public buildings forlorn and dilapidated. But it has, nevertheless, many claims to be held in remembrance. For here Cervantes was born; here Ximenes founded, and splendidly endowed, a famous seat of learning, filling its colleges with learned scholars; and here the first Polyglot Bible was given to the world.

F. R. McClintock.

Art. IV.—RAYMUND LULL.

RAYMUND LULL—Raymundus Lullus. "Who was he?" will very probably be asked by the majority of those whose eyes may catch the heading of this article. For the hand of time is struggling hard, according to custom, to extinguish what little spark of life this great and good man's name and history have within the memory of mankind. Our paper is a faint effort to fan the little spark into a little flame.

Don Ramon Lull, doctor illuminatus, was perhaps not only the most distinguished philosopher and scholar of the thirteenth century, but also one of the most enthusiastic and remarkable men of any age, and a very prince among missionaries, worthy to be ranked high in that noble army of martyrs who have laid down their lives for the Master's sake among a strange people and in a strange land. He was born of rich and noble Spanish parents at Palma, the capital of Majorca, about 1235. The island was then under the rule of King James of Arragon, in whose military service Lull's father held a post of great distinction. At an early age Raymund followed the paternal profession, and was quickly raised to the office of *gran senescal* in the royal court.

Until the age of thirty different traditions represent him as having lived a life of lawless pleasure and sensuality. He

abandoned himself thoroughly to all the license of a soldier's life. During this period he had a great reputation as a man of society and as a poet. The theme of his poetry, however, was the joys of a guilty love. Although he was married, yet this did not restrain him from satisfying his lawless passions; and he was actually engaged in composing an erotic in praise of a friend's wife, when he saw, or thought he saw, a vision of his Saviour, dying for him upon Calvary's cross, and was so mightily impressed by it that he could not think another thought, and so laid down his pen. After a few days, when the impression had become somewhat dull, he returned to his unhallowed work; but again the same image appeared, and disturbed his mind. On this occasion the effect was more enduring, so that when for the third time he had a mental vision of the same Crucified One, he was prepared for the conviction that it was a message for him; the great, high, and holy God was beseeching the poor sinner to overcome his vile passions, and consecrate himself and his talents to a loftier and nobler service. In his work on "The Contemplation of God" he thus writes of that time: "I see, O Lord, that trees bring forth every year flowers and fruit, each after their kind, and from them mankind derives pleasure and profit. But thus it was not with me, sinful that I am. For thirty years I brought forth no fruit in this world. I cumbered the ground—nay, was noxious and hurtful to my friends and neighbours."

Although this thrice-repeated vision so much impressed him, yet still there was some difficulty. Lull's way was not quite clear before him. He saw in that Divine image the exceeding great love of God, and the terrible heinousness of sin; but he did not see, as he himself writes, how he could, "defiled with impurity, rise and enter on a holier life." This was a perilous condition to be in, because at such a time doubt, melancholy, despondency, and despair do their fell work, like so many harpies preying upon body and soul and spirit. For many days and nights no sleep closed his eyes or eased his perturbed mind. At length the remembrance of the ineffable character of the Lord Jesus, and how that He had said, "him that cometh to Me, I will in no wise cast out," occurred to him, and with the remembrance came faith and comfort and peace.

In accordance with the spirit of the Christianity of the times, he concluded that he was obliged to give up his wife, friends, little ones, and everything, and devote himself, body, soul, and wealth, to what was then called distinctively the "Religious" life. As this idea increased upon him, he began to feel that he was travelling in the right direction, with God for his comfort and his stay. "Old things began to pass away. Powers

long dormant or dwarfed, or stunted by devotion to lower aims, put forth greater activity. The flower at the bottom of the long sunless cavern had caught at last the quickening ray of the Sun of Righteousness, and was beginning to expand and put forth its bloom."

Along with the resolution to consecrate himself to the "Religious" life, he conceived an intense desire to convert the Mohammedans to Christianity, and this desire pervaded his mind and spirit right up to the hour of his death. Strange to say, almost simultaneously with this desire his grand and wonderful idea for prosecuting the work suggested itself to him. His idea, like that of St. Francis of Assisi, was to try and assail Mohammedanism in its higher regions.

By Lull's time the forces of the Soldan had marched on unimpeded over Persia, Syria, Egypt, and North Africa, and, even then not contented, had pressed on and covered the country of Spain. They also had essayed to cross the Pyrenees, and but for the strong and brave arm of Charles Martel, the Church of the Franks would have suffered the same fate as had befallen the Churches of SS. Augustine and Cyprian. These vast conquests of the Mohammedans had for some time been exercising an unfortunate influence over the Christian hosts. They, on hearing of the terrible ravages which were being committed by the Mohammedans, became impatient, and, taking a lesson from their opponents, exchanged prayer and faith for frenzy and the sword. This spirit, once having entered Christendom, soon spread, and thousands were only too ready to leave their homes and families to rescue the Holy City from the Soldan, and to avenge the blood of their co-religionists. The Crusade fever reached even to the shop and to the cloister, and changed many a man of peace into the most bigoted follower after war.

Such was the character of the times when Raymund Lull appeared to vindicate the all-sufficient power of the Word and of true prayer, and calm, reasonable argument. Deafening his ears to the bitter wrangling and din of battle resounding on every side, he would fain show unto them a more excellent way. "I see," he says, "many knights who cross the sea on their way to the Holy Land. They think they shall conquer it by force of their arms, but one after another they are constrained to leave it without accomplishing their purpose. It seems to me, therefore, that the Holy Land can be won in no other way than that, whereby Thou, O Lord Jesus Christ, and Thy holy Apostles won it, even by love and prayer, and shedding of tears and blood. The Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Land can be won back far more effectually by proclaiming the Word of truth than by force of arms. Let, then,

spiritual knights go forth thither; let them be filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit. Let them announce to men the sufferings which their dear Lord underwent, and out of love to Him shed forth their blood, even as He shed His for them."

Lull's great method for the overcoming of the Mohammedans, was to construct a sort of universal science, which by its irresistible arguments should convince the most intolerant and sceptical Mohammedan of the truth of Christ's religion; and with characteristic energy he endeavoured to establish missionary schools and colleges, where the youth should be trained both in languages and doctrines, especially for work amongst the Mohammedans. To accomplish his object, he determined to apply to the chief ecclesiastical and civil dignitaries of the world. Soon after this a most interesting circumstance occurred, but for which, perhaps, his great design would have altogether been laid aside. It was the memorial day of St. Francis of Assisi, the 4th of October, 1265. Raymund Lull went to the Franciscan church in his city, and there heard from the pulpit the tale of the "Spouse of Poverty," "how the son of Pietro Bernadone di Mericoni, once foremost in all deeds of arms, and gayest at the gay festival, was taken prisoner at Perugia, and brought by disease to the very gates of death; how, in sight of the awful portals of the tomb, he learnt to weigh the things of time and sense in the balances of eternity, and recovering, arose to live no more to himself, but to his Lord; how he exchanged his gay apparel for the garb of the mendicant; how he visited the sick, tended the lepers and, renouncing the world, achieved the victory that overcometh it."

As will be supposed, such a discourse exercised a very great influence upon Lull. He, in the exuberance of his imagination, determined even yet greater things, and to begin them at once. He resigned his post of *gran senescal*, and gave his wealth, with the exception of what was barely sufficient for the support of his wife and children, to the poor. Assuming the mendicant's dress, he visited several places of pilgrimage, and then retired to a hill in Majorca. He purchased a Mohammedan slave, who knew nothing but Arabic, and with him as his only companion and help, he spent nine years in a little tumbledown cottage, thoroughly engrossed in the study of the Arabic language and the Mohammedan religion. The close of his connection with this slave was a very tragical one. The Mohammedan one day uttered some blasphemy against the Lord Jesus Christ, and Lull resented it by striking him across the face. The equally hot-tempered Moor, now excited to the utmost, stabbed his master in the stomach, and thinking that he had put an end to his life,

committed suicide.[1] In spite of this terrible interruption to his studies, Lull persevered in his work, and now retired to a mountain for eight days to invoke the Divine counsel concerning it. Here he had another vision of the Saviour in the semblance of a fiery seraph, by whom he was expressly enjoined to commit to writing, and to publish his method, *qui ad artem universalem pertinet*, and to which he himself gave the name of Ars Lullia, or Lulliana, but which his followers and admirers dignified by the title Ars Magna. This new science created quite a sensation at the time, and still has a kind of fascinating influence over many students. Its followers were called Lullists. As revised and improved by Giordano Bruno, it is an attempt to give a formal arrangement of all ideas with a view as well to facilitate instruction as to systematic knowledge. It consisted in collecting a number of general terms common to all the sciences, of which an alphabetical table was provided. Subjects and predicates taken from these were to be respectively inscribed in angular spaces upon circular papers. The essences, qualities, affections and relations of things being thus mechanically brought together, the circular papers of subjects were fixed in a frame, and those of predicates were so placed upon them as to move freely, and in their revolutions to produce various combinations of subjects and predicates, whence would arise various definitions, axioms, and propositions, which vary infinitely according to the different application of general or particular predicates to particular or general subjects. Here is the gist of the Ars Magna, and when it is stated that the ideas which were selected for the fundamental notions of this mechanical logic were purely arbitrary, it will be seen that the knowledge to which it professes to lead must be narrow and limited, and at the best can but furnish a few laws of universal notions for analysis and combination. Notwithstanding the weakness of his invention, the Ars Magna won for Lull the gratitude of the schools, and a place on the list of the reformers of philosophy.

The tragical account of the dismissal of his Arabic-speaking slave had probably reached the ears of the King, or it may be that his Majesty had heard of the completion of his manuscript. At all events, Lull was summoned to appear at the royal court. He took advantage of this visit to persuade the King to found and endow a monastery at Majorca for thirteen Franciscan monks, to be trained for missionary work amongst the Mohammedans. Encouraged by his success with the King, and his first book having been published and lectured

[1] Dr. Maclear thinks that he was first flung into prison, and there committed suicide.

upon several times in public, he resolved to seek the aid of the Pope. He started on this expedition most sanguine of success, as Honorius IV. had already manifested much interest in oriental studies. However, to his intense sorrow, he found the Pope in his grave; and the powers in Rome were occupied too closely in the selection of a successor to lend a listening ear, or helping hand, to Lull's urgent representations. With almost the same result he visited Paris. There they only permitted him to lecture on his method before the famous university.

It was either in Paris, or after his return to Majorca, that he composed his treatise on "The Art of Discovering the Truth," and received from the general of the Minorite friars permission to expound his ideas in the convents of the order. Besides these, Lull received very little direct aid. Tired of his fruitless solicitations, he determined to set out himself, and attempt alone and single-handed the propagation of the Gospel among the Mohammedans. He went to Genoa. His purpose was soon blazed abroad through that city, and the curiosity of the people was excited to the highest degree. And no wonder! For here was a man who had arranged an altogether new plan for the conversion of the Mohammedans, and who, moreover, had most implicit and enthusiastic confidence in his plan, about to start, unattended, except by the promises of his God, for the shores of savage Mohammedan Africa, to show in practice the potency of his demonstration and teaching. Most certainly such an earnest, devoted missionary would be terribly persecuted; and very probably he would be killed.

There was a ship anchored in the harbour, and soon about to sail for the land whither he wished to travel. Arrangements were made for the passage; his precious books, and other meagre luggage, were stored away in the vessel, and everything was ready for the voyage, when Lull was seized with the most inexplicable terror, and ordering all his books and things to be disembarked, he allowed the ship to depart without him. Such strange behaviour is not at all incompatible with a spirit of dauntless bravery, as many a young man on the eve of some great work or momentous event, in which he is especially interested, can bear witness. An overwhelming sense of weakness and inability, an unspeakable shrinking from danger, enter and take possession of the heart, which at other times would not, for one moment, permit such feelings to come nigh unto it. As will be seen, it was so in the case of Raymund Lull. No sooner had the ship disappeared beneath the horizon, than his courage returned, and he was seized with the most terrible remorse. For what had he done?

True, there were probably tortures and imprisonment awaiting him: true, he was one man against myriads of fanatics; yet had he not shown himself ungrateful for all the Saviour's great love: and had he not proved himself a traitor to the cause, and sullied the banner of the Cross? What would men say when they heard that Raymund Lull had "turned back"? These thoughts overcame him, and were the forerunners of a most violent, dangerous fever. Earnest friends watched his bed night and day most eagerly, and clever physicians tried various means for his recovery, but Lull did not thoroughly recover until he was safely embarked in another vessel, also lying in the port, and was fairly out from land. What skilful doctors and the most attentive nurses failed to accomplish, a clear conscience did. The fact that he was in the way of duty quickly restored peace to the troubled mind, and health to the pain-stricken body.[1]

On arrival at Tunis he challenged the Mohammedan scholars to a formal disputation. He informed them that he had well studied their religion, and was prepared to argue with them, and to be convinced, and to embrace Mohammedanism if they could prove that it was true. The Mohammedan literati flocked to the place of assembly with great eagerness, and soon concluded their list of arguments, whereby they thought to win over so clever and zealous a man to their religion. It was the missionary's turn now. Accordingly, after a long debate, Lull seated himself in the midst of the assembly, and with a bold, clear voice, advanced the following propositions:

Every wise man must acknowledge that to be the true religion which ascribed the greatest perfection to the Supreme Being; and not only conveyed the worthiest conceptions of all His attributes, such as goodness, wisdom, power, and glory, but also demonstrated the harmony existing between them. Now their religion was defective in acknowledging only two active principles in the Deity, His will and His wisdom, whilst it left His goodness and greatness inoperative, as though they were indolent qualities, and had not been called forth into active exercise. But the Christian faith could not be charged with this defect. In its doctrine of the Trinity it conveyed the highest conception of the Deity, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in one essence and nature. In that of the Incarnation of the Son it evinced the harmony that exists between God's goodness and His greatness, and in the person of Jesus Christ displayed the true union of the Creator and the creature. In His Passion he underwent out of His great love for man, it set forth the divine harmony of infinite goodness and infinite love; even the love

[1] It has been suggested that an incipient illness, and the depression ensuing, occasioned his indecision (Dr. Smith, "Mediæval Missions," p. 189). However, be this as it may, he soon overcame his wavering, and whilst in a state far more fitted for being kept in bed than for being carried on board, he commenced the voyage.

of Him Who, for us men and for our salvation, underwent these sufferings, and died upon the cross.[1]

As will be supposed, Lull's perfect cognizance of both religions, his complete command of Arabic diction, his clear grasp of his own arguments, and his perfect enthusiasm and self-denial, won for him the victory. Many professed themselves as convinced, and begged for baptism. Such result, of course, entailed great persecution upon the missionary. The Imáms[2] were exceeding mad against him, and instigated the people, so that the whole place was in an uproar. The noise reached the ears of the King. Lull, like the Apostle before him, was charged with speaking blasphemous words against God. He had argued against Mohammed, and was endeavouring to subvert the holy mosque and its worship. This charge was substantiated by an influential body of Mohammedans, who suggested that Raymund Lull should at once be put to death, in order to preserve peace, and to prevent any from really going over to his faith. Accordingly he was thrust into prison, and was awaiting the hour appointed for his execution, when an Arabian mufti[3] pleaded on his behalf before the King, whom he begged to act fairly in this matter, and to do to Lull as he would wish any Mohammedan propagandist to be done by, if he thus left his home and wealth and country, to earnestly scatter the seeds of his religion in another land. This intervention saved Lull. The sentence of death passed upon him was immediately commuted to lifelong banishment from the country. Hence he was placed on board the same vessel which had brought him to Tunis, and threatened that if he again visited those shores he would surely be stoned to death.

Nothing daunted, however, Lull found some means of secretly returning thither, but finding no opportunity for propagating his teaching, he took sail for Naples. Here he occupied himself several years in expounding his method, and preparing fresh material wherewith to assault the citadel of Mohammedanism. Cœlestine V. had just been elevated to the Papal throne; so Lull, still hopeful of obtaining so great a dignitary's sanction, revisited Rome, and again pleaded the need of missionary colleges and schools. As before, he was only met with coldness and rebuff. Boniface VIII. also,

[1] "Vita Prima," p. 665. Cf. also "Lib. de Contempl. in Deum," liv. 25-28.

[2] A Mohammedan priest, the person who leads the prayers and receives the revenues of the mosque.

[3] A Mohammedan law officer, who used to supply the judge with decisions in difficult cases. The office has ceased to exist under British rule.

Cœlestine's successor, did not show him any encouragement. So he returned unto his own country, and re-entered upon the work of a missionary among the Mohammedans and Jews in Majorca.

In the year 1300 he set forth for Cyprus, to inquire for help from the Christian King, to send him to the Sultans of Syria and Egypt, that he might show unto them the way of life. From Cyprus, attended by only one companion, he travelled to Armenia, and thence to the Holy Land, discussing with Mohammedans, Nestorians and Jews, as he went. He returned again to Cyprus, and there would have died by the hand of a fanatic, who attempted to poison him, had it not been for the kind and skilful ministrations of a Knight Templar, who cured him and then sent him back to Genoa. He now visited Italy and Paris, and lectured on his plans in the great universities. Meanwhile, becoming tired of lecturing and soliciting, he determined to go himself again and teach these poor Mohammedans. This was better, if possible, than trying to stir up others to do so, even as it is grander and nobler to go one's self to the fight, and bear the brunt of the battle, than to try and excite others.

Returning to Majorca, Lull thence quickly started for North Africa, and at Bugia, the capital of a Mohammedan kingdom, he stood up in the midst of a great congregation, and fearlessly declared, in the Arabic tongue, his firm faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and that He was the only Way, the Truth and the Life, whereby men could be saved and live. He further told them that Mohammed was not the way, and that he could prove this to the comfort and satisfaction of everyone. Great persecution followed this preaching, and indescribable indignities were heaped upon this faithful man, when it was known that sixty more souls had been given to him for his hire and sixty more seals to his ministry. Hence he went to Algiers, where the blessing of God especially rested upon his labours. Many Mohammedans were added to the church. Accordingly the rage of the people was great. They got Lull thrown into prison, and as he persisted in preaching to his guards, they gagged him, and deprived him of food for several days. They then, after parading him through the town, and unmercifully beating him, banished him from Algiers under the same condition that he was obliged to leave Tunis.

Many years had now elapsed since he had been banished from Tunis, and he thought that if he visited the place again, the great change which age and trials had worked in his countenance and figure would effectually disguise him. He went, but did not stay long, owing perhaps to want of opportunity, and a great desire to see Bugia again. At any rate,

he left for Bugia. Here he commenced preaching publicly as before, but was soon stopped by terrible persecution. Many a knife was drawn to sever his head from his body, many a hand would fain have stoned him to silence, but he was rescued by the Mohammedan literati, and secreted in some sure place. These men expostulated with him concerning his madness and danger; but he calmly replied that he had no fear, he cared not, as long as Death found him in the path of duty. Such audacious boldness on the part of one who had just been clutched from the jaws of death, his rescuers could not endure. Accordingly they again called upon him to produce his proofs. As before, he quoted the beauty and harmony of the doctrine of the Trinity. But, as before, his arguments only drew down upon him the most bitter hatred. He was cast into prison, where, for six months, he was closely confined, befriended only by some Genoese and Spanish merchants.

During this imprisonment, the Mohammedans tried their favourite plan for tempting the missionary in his religious profession. They offered immense wealth, the most beautiful wives, grand positions and great power, if he would only recant and declare his belief in the one God, and Mohammed as His prophet. To all such offers Lull retaliated that he would offer unto them wealth and honour and everlasting life, if they would forsake their false creed, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. He also suggested that both parties should argue the point out on paper, as to which creed was the right one, and he was occupied in the preparation of his paper, when an order came from the throne that he was to be dismissed from the country.

Raymund Lull thence took ship for Genoa, but during the voyage a storm sprang up, and the vessel was wrecked not far from the port. Lull fortunately escaped on a plank, and by some means his precious books and writings were also saved. The inhabitants of Genoa received him with all the respect and admiration due unto such a valiant and tried warrior for the truth. He was now over seventy years of age, but notwithstanding all his journeyings and sufferings "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

With hand and head as ready and as strong for work as ever they were, he now endeavoured to establish a new order of spiritual knights, who should be ready at any notice to go and do battle against Mohammedanism. Pious noblemen and ladies offered to help forward the object with the sum of 30,000 guilders. With this encouragement he started for Avignon to explain his plans to Clement V. Not meeting with any help, he turned his steps to Paris, and then heard of a General Council to be convened in Vienne. The thought

struck him that perchance a General Council might entertain what Popes and Cardinals had scarcely deigned to notice.

Accordingly, Lull started quickly for Vienne, and then in the presence of some of the greatest dignitaries of the age he pleaded hard for the opening of missionary colleges, where duly qualified men should be trained to gainsay the opinions of the infidels; and begged that they would express their interest concerning the followers of Averroes, by procuring sufficiently able men to contest their sceptical opinions.[1] The first request only was acceded to. A decree was granted for the founding and endowing of Professorships of Oriental languages, and especially Arabic, in the Universities of Paris, Salamanca, and Oxford, and in Rome and Bologna. The expenses of these were to be borne by the Pope and the Bishops, except in Paris, where the King volunteered to defray the costs.

It was an immense encouragement to Lull to see at last some fruit from his constant and earnest solicitations. The passing of this decree seems to have put new life into the old grey-haired man; for he resolved now, in his eightieth year, to pay a farewell visit to the scenes of his manifold and great labours. After confirming and strengthening the Christians in Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Tunis, he went to Bugia, and there for about a year, at the advice of his friends, laboured secretly among those Mohammedans only who were known to be prepossessed in favour of him. But this kind of work was "against the grain" of the man, and though he was over fourscore years of age he had sufficient spirit left in him to dare preaching in the public streets. Accordingly, he went and told the people that he was the same man whom they had heard before, and expelled from their coasts, but that he had come again, at the risk of his life, to tell them once more the way of salvation through Christ. Crowds gathered together to see and to hear him, and all might have passed off in comparative quiet had not Lull made some allusion to the inconsistencies of Mohammed and Mohammedanism. As it was, the rage of the people burst through all bounds. They pelted the preacher with stones; they dragged him towards the shore; they would have crushed out his life, had he not fallen into a swoon. A few minutes elapsed, and he rallied. He seemed to gather together all his remaining strength for one last effort, and then, raising himself on his hands and knees, shouted with a great voice, "None but Christ." The infuriated mob now returned, and with kicks, and sticks, and blows exhausted the

[1] Averroes (Ebn-Rashid) "combined, with his belief in the Koran, an almost servile deference to the philosophic views of the Stagyrite." Hardwick's "Church History," p. 283.

energy and closed the lips for ever, as they thought, of this holy man. They left him for dead upon the seashore. But in the dead of night a Christian captain came in a boat to bury the body, and to his very great surprise and joy found that it was yet alive. He soon had Lull conveyed to the vessel. However, the noble old man did not survive the voyage. Within sight of his native land he fell asleep in perfect peace, thus sealing by his death the great idea of his life to conquer Mohammedanism, not by the sword, but by preaching in demonstration of the Spirit and of power!

Thus ended, and gloriously ended, the life of one of the most remarkable missionaries that ever lived. Studying his history circumspectly, as it is handed down to us by different writers of varied views, we must reckon Raymund Lull as in the very foremost rank of the chief of missionaries. We know that he has been looked upon by some as a compound of folly and reason, as a heretic and a magician, and as a delirious alchymist; whilst others, like Neander, have extolled him to the skies; and others, again, the Franciscans, Antonio, Wadding, etc., would fain have got him enrolled within the Calendar of the Saints.[1] The Dominicans probably disliked Lull so much because the Franciscans thought so much of him. We know that some of the Pontiffs have pronounced him as an innocent and pious man, whilst others, like Gregory XI., have denounced him, and prohibited his writings. Let this be. However much opinion may be divided concerning the man, we, who have striven to study his character without bias, cannot coincide with either party. The thoughts which fill our minds on rising from a perusal of Raymund Lull's history is that he was a man saturated with the one idea of bringing the Mohammedans to Christ. To this end he studied prodigiously; wrote as much, Maclear says, as any other man could in an ordinary lifetime transcribe;[2] travelled on foot, or by sailing-vessel, more than probably the vast

[1] One authority states that the body remained under a pile of stones at Bugia, till a few faithful merchants of Majorca succeeded in obtaining permission to remove it, and conveyed it for interment to their native land.—Maclear, "Apostles of Mediæval Europe," p. 288.

[2] The writings of Lull in Latin, Arabic, and Spanish are very numerous. Dr. Smith, "Mediæval Missions," enumerates 486; but Wagenmann, in Dr. Schaff's "Encyclopædia," mentions 430 only. This latter number is probably correct, as it agrees with the catalogue in the Library of the Escurial, and with that given by Wadding and Antonio. Most of these writings remain unpublished in Spanish, French, and German libraries. They comprise a wide sphere of knowledge. Lull wrote on logic, memory, the will, morals and politics, philosophy and physics, mathematics, anatomy and medicine, law, grammar and rhetoric, chemistry, theology. Nearly half of his works were directly on theology, but all of them, more or less, were tinged with it.

majority of men do now in these days of railroads and steamships; and braved hardships, bitter persecutions, shipwrecks, and constant threatenings of martyrdom. Now, a man who under such an experience could so enthusiastically continue his studies, and writings, and preachings, and travellings until the age of fourscore and one, and who, in spite of such tremendous opposition, succeeded, by God's blessing, in gathering in such a large number of Mohammedans into the fold of the Christian faith, deserves to be remembered with the sincerest gratitude, and to be held up as a very pattern for those who, like him, wish to extend the kingdom of the Redeemer amongst the Mohammedans.

Nothing can be accomplished towards the breaking of the yoke under which this infatuated people are labouring and praying until, following Raymund Lull's example, we bring every power and ability into war against it, and sustain our every effort by such a spirit of prayer as was cultivated by him. Thank God for the good and noble and able men already labouring earnestly in the mission field, but "what are they amongst so many?" Some good men were stirred up by the example of Lull. Mention is made of one especially—a monk in 1345, who succeeded in obtaining entrance into the great mosque at Cairo, and there preached "Christ and Him crucified" before the Sultan himself; and so powerful was his sermon, that a renegade from Christianity was induced thereby to return within the pale of the Church. Many others also were stirred up. May the Divine blessing rest upon this necessarily imperfect sketch, that it may produce conviction in some, and deepen conviction in others, concerning the grandeur and nobility of the missionary enterprise. Hear ye the voice of the Lord, brother: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?"

J. Hinton Knowles.

Art. V.—THE LISLE PAPERS.

THE old saying, "Happy is the man who has no history," has much truth to recommend it. It is mainly troubles and sorrows which go to make personal history. How can any one write the biography of a man to whom nothing has happened of any moment, whose days have fled softly by, one just like another, to whom life has been a happy Valley of

Amhara, with no steep slopes to climb, and no valleys of humiliation into which to descend?

A striking illustration of this is furnished by the fact that of all the private letters which have come down to us from the distant past, the survival of the great majority is owing to the misfortunes of their owners. Odd letters here and there may exist from other causes, but any series is almost sure to fall under this head. Either writer or recipient—more frequently the latter—was attainted of treason, and his private letters became State papers, and were preserved accordingly.

It is to this cause that we owe, among others, that most interesting series of letters known as the Lisle Papers, from which we may acquire a more accurate idea of the private life, and many of the ecclesiastical and political events of the early part of the Reformation period, than we can hope to do from the pages of any contemporary chronicler. The recipient of these letters, though afterwards completely cleared, lay for two years in prison under suspicion of treason; and the King's officers, sent to secure his papers, gathered up not only official documents pertaining to his post as Governor of Calais, but also the private letters of his friends, the business despatches of his agents, the milliners' bills of his wife, and the childish intercommunications of his step-children. The Lisle Papers occupy nineteen folio volumes, of which fifteen are filled with English correspondence, and four with French. The letters which passed between members of the family comprise the first volume. Nearly seven are taken up with the letters of one correspondent, of whom we shall hear more directly. The remainder are occupied with despatches from a variety of persons. Before turning to the letters themselves, a short account of the Lisle family and the chief letter-writers may save some subsequent interpolations by way of necessary explanation.

Arthur Plantagenet, Viscount Lisle, Lord Deputy of Calais, was the son of Edward IV. and Elizabeth Lucy, to whom the King was legally married by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, though he subsequently found it convenient to deny his marriage, and had the baseness to call upon her to confirm his assertion. Elizabeth, who loved her worthless husband better than her own good name or future prospects, obeyed the command, and then passed out of sight. Her history consists beyond that of only the three words appended to every name in that oldest roll of "the world's grey fathers" to be found in the book of Genesis—"and she died." Her son appears to have inherited her character in the main, with one feature derived from his father. He took for his motto, "Dieu l'a voulu." In silent, calm self-abnegation he accepted such

honours as came upon him, and left all the rest to that will of God. There were several turnings in his life-road where, it may be said, he had but to lift his hand and he would have been King of England. But the hand was never lifted. On the contrary, he died in a dungeon of the Tower, under attainder of treason, living just long enough to receive a message of pardon from the King, but not to see it carried into effect by the subsequent and complete clearing of his character and actions. The religious side of Lord Lisle's life is even more interesting than the political one. On this subject the evidence is somewhat conflicting: but, so far as can be perceived, he was all through a Protestant at heart, though at times wavering; and it is difficult to say how far he authorized the use made of his name in the persecutions at Calais, of which a full account will be found in the fifth volume of Foxe's "Acts and Monuments." One thing is certain, that he suffered agonies of remorse for the part thus taken, whether by himself or by others in his name, and that the two years of penitence and pain had a large share in his sudden end. The one feature which Lord Lisle had inherited from King Edward was his spendthrift tendency, with this important difference, that the latter squandered his money on his own whims and vices, and the former flung it right and left for the advantage of his friends. He had, however, much less money to waste than his father, for he found it extremely hard work to get his salary paid by the Treasury.

Lord Lisle married twice. By his first wife, Elizabeth Grey —in whose right he was created Viscount Lisle—he had three daughters, Frances, Elizabeth, and Bridget: of whom the first was with him at Calais during the whole period covered by the letters, and the last for the last eighteen months only. But the Lady Lisle of these Papers is his second wife, Honor Grenville, widow of Sir John Basset of Umberleigh, who had a large family by her first husband, but no surviving issue by Lord Lisle. These Bassets—some of whom will keep appearing through the letters—were John, who in 1538 married Lord Lisle's eldest daughter Frances; Philippa, whose character does not appear; Katherine and Anne, both extremely amiable, and both maids of honour, of whom the former afterwards became Lady Ashley—but, as both her sons died issueless, she was not an ancestress of the present Lord Shaftesbury—and the latter was Lady Hungerford of Farleigh; the fourth was George, renowned for eloquence; the fifth, Mary, a rather self-centred beauty, who became Mrs. Wollacombe; and the last, James, a "black Papist," at one time servant of Bishop Gardiner, and at another gentleman-in-waiting to Queen Mary:

his wife was a daughter of the well-known Margaret Roper, the daughter of Sir Thomas More, who

> "clasped in her last trance
> Her murder'd father's head."

There is no doubt at all concerning the religious proclivities of the Viscountess Honor Lisle. She was a "stout Papist," and it was mainly and virtually by her that her husband's name was apparently compromised in respect to the persecution. The circumstantial evidence goes to show that Frances Basset was a decided Protestant; Katherine was probably inclined in that direction; Anne, as she was in Queen Mary's household, must have belonged to the opposite party, as well as her brother James. The opinions of the rest are doubtful, except that John Basset probably agreed with his wife.

John Husee, the writer of seven out of the nineteen volumes of letters, was one of the English agents of Lord and Lady Lisle. He was a Devonshire man, most likely an old friend of the Viscountess, since they were natives of the same county; and he was a married man, for one of the bills presents us with an entry of, "Given to Hussy again his marriage, xx s." But not one of his scores of letters seems to contain a single allusion to his wife. Husee's duties consisted in fulfilling commissions for his employers, who had almost every pound of meat and yard of ribbon sent to them from London; in attending to their business in their absence from England; in managing the estates which Lady Lisle held in dower from Sir John Basset; and in gathering and retailing to them every scrap of news, of whatever kind, which he was able to obtain. It is on this account that his letters are so interesting and valuable for the elucidation of the history of his times. As to opinions, Mr. Husee's were—as nearly as he might judge of them—those of the ruling powers. A very Vicar of Bray in his capacity for being Papist to day, and Protestant to-morrow, or the reverse with equal ease, was Mr. John Husee, of Subberton.

Much less is known of Thomas Warley, the other English agent, whose letters are few compared with those of Husee. In the opinion of the latter gentleman, Warley's intellect was evidently not of the first order. Both these agents were in London; the third, John Bekynsaw, dates chiefly from Paris: but his business appears to have been mainly the looking after that rather idle and very discontented young gentleman, Mr. James Basset, who was at school in that capital.

A second group of writers were English dignitaries, whether in Church or Court. This class comprises Archbishop Cranmer;

Sir William Kingston, Comptroller of the King's Household; Sir John Russell, afterwards the first Earl of Bedford; Thomas Cromwell, Lord Privy Seal; and Sir John Wallop, ancestor of the Earls of Portsmouth. All these except the last were on the Protestant side, though frequently urged thereto by very diverse motives. Kingston, indeed, seems to have veered round with his royal master. A meaner member of this group was Anthony Waite, servant of the Bishop of Chichester; the word "servant" in those days was much more elastic than now, and included many educated gentlemen.

The third series of correspondents were those who held official positions at Calais, or in the "English pale" around it. One of these was William Lord Sandes, Governor of Guisnes, a stout Papist, and the oddest of spellers even then, when every man spelt as he thought proper: for the old regularity of the pre-Reformation period had been broken up, and the new regularity of the modern age had not come in. The time was entirely a transition period, in regard to secular no less than ecclesiastical matters. Another of this group was Sir Thomas Palmer, Knight Porter of Calais; he too was a strong member of the "orthodox" party, and was afterwards one of the chief witnesses against the Protector Somerset on his trial. In the Diary of Edward VI., another hand than the King's has interlined over the name of Palmer, "hating the Duke [of Somerset], and hated of him." Palmer was beheaded on the accession of Mary, having been a partisan of Lady Jane Grey, or rather of the Duke of Northumberland, and died expressing great penitence for his evil life, and for the course which he had taken against the Gospellers. He had been in earlier life one of a group of profligate gamesters about the Court, and was known by the sobriquet of "Busking [dandy] Palmer." Francis Hall was one of the spearmen of Calais, and a Gospeller. John Rookwood was a member of the Council, and a "stout Papist." Thomas Larke and Thomas Boys appear to have filled offices in Lord Lisle's service: the latter, if not both, was a fervent member of the Romish party.

It was at the close of 1532 that Lord Lisle was appointed Deputy of Calais, but none of his letters have much interest for the general reader until the beginning of 1534. At that period the work of the Reformation was commencing. Queen Katherine of Aragon had been divorced, and was now known as "My Lady Princess," namely, as the widow of Arthur Prince of Wales; the Queen was Anne Boleyn, married to the King in November, 1532, by Cranmer, almost clandestinely, and formally acknowledged in the following May: the dissolution of the monasteries was fully resolved on, but had not yet begun to take effect; the chief advisers of the King were

Cranmer and Cromwell, both of whom were not Gospellers but Lutherans.

Much mischief is done by inaccurate ideas of the state of parties at this time—by a supposition that there were Papists and Protestants, and there the matter ends—instead of a true and definite recognition of the four parties into whom society was then divided. These were, first, the Papists, or men who acknowledged the Pope's supremacy—these mainly leaned to the old, *i.e.* Roman creed; secondly, the Lutherans, who held consubstantiation, and desired to keep as near the Roman boundary, in respect both of doctrine and ceremony, as truth and necessity would admit; thirdly, the Gospellers,[1] who wished to get as far away from it as possible, and held that the Lord's Supper was a memorial institution only, and not a sacrificial one in any sense (both Lutherans and Gospellers were included in the term Protestant, which then merely meant a man who rejected the supremacy and dictation of the Pope); fourthly, the Henricans, who cared nothing for views of any sort, but whose grand object was to be weathercocks, to whom King Henry was the wind. There was also, though they can scarcely be called a party, that "mixed multitude" which always follows a camp, and is least of all absent from the camp of Israel. These belong in turns to any party or all parties, and alas for that one to which they ally themselves!

But there is another source of perhaps greater mischief still, and that is the singular but very popular notion that if the character of a man can be undermined and shown to be bad, the character of his cause or party must necessarily fall with it. Those who hold this opinion fancy that if it can be shown that Henry VIII. was a sensual tyrant, that Cromwell was a time-server, that Cranmer was timid and malleable, the Reformation is proved beyond all question to be a wicked series of proceedings, and one that deserves to be reversed as quickly as possible. Now, if the Reformation can be shown to be Scriptural, what can it signify whether the Lord worked to bring it about with instruments set in handles of plain deal or of carved ivory? Is the Reformation the only event wherein the evil passions of men have been used by God for the accomplishment of His own purposes? "Measures, not men," should surely be the test in this matter. And those who are most ready to apply the fallacious test above-mentioned to the doctrines of the Reformation would probably be, as little as any one else, ready to admit that every Bill introduced into the

[1] This word, originally applied to the followers of Wycliffe, was now revived by the Papists, and was also used by the Lutherans. How far the Gospellers themselves employed it is doubtful. Underhill writes, "I was also called the hot Gospeller, jesting and mocking me."

Legislature should be approved or condemned according to the good or evil private life of the man who introduced it. The absurdity of the suggestion would then become patent.

Arranged in chronological series, which is not an easy task, for few of these letters have any year appended, and internal evidence requires to be carefully sifted before assigning their places, the series commences with one from Sir Brian Tuke, then an officer of the Treasury, dated Jan. 15th, 1534. "The King has established my Lady Princess [Katherine of Aragon] to keep her estate and house at Hatfield; and my Lady Mary is there, and her house dissolved." It is followed by a long and interesting letter from John Rookwood, who writes on the 8th of March:

The ambassadors of Scotland be not yet come to the [Court], howbeit they be at Ware; a bishop and abbot, with other gentlemen, to the number of seventy horse. . . . The Lady Dowager's [Katherine of Aragon] jointure is clean taken away by Act of Parliament, and she is restored to other lands in the name of Prince Arthur's Dowager's, and the saying is that the Queen's Grace shall have the said lands for her jointure: and as concerning the Pope, there is taken from him by Act of Parliament, that he shall have no more out of the land, neither Peter pence nor yet none other thing. All his authorities be clean disnulled here; and daily doctors and great clerks maketh new books, and writeth against his pomp and other his inordinate living. As upon Thursday last past, all the whole Parliament House were with the King at York Place in his gallery the space of three hours: and after that, all the Lords went into the Council House at Westminster, and there sat till ten o'clock at night. . . . And as for preaching in *this* quarters, the preachers accordeth metely [tolerably] well; for here preacheth none but such as be appointed ["by the King," which follows, is crossed out]; beseeching God that all may be well, for there *is* many men much desirous to hear them preach; and the most famous doctors of Oxford and Cambridge, with the Vicar of Croydon and many other good clerks, faileth not to be at their sermons, and marks their opinions and articles, as well of Latimer as of such as preaches: and it is thought that when the matter shall come to disputation amongst them, that the business and inconvenience thereof shall come to great trouble, when the contrary parts may be suffered to dispute with them.[1]

Sir Thomas Palmer, writing on April 15th, is "informed Dr. Noylson was [yesterday] committed to the Tower, and some saith the Vicar of Croydon also. My Lord of Winchester [Gardiner] is out of the Secretaryship [of State] and [it] resteth

[1] On the 28th of March, Warley writes: "The abbeys shall down, and the King's solicitor, Mr. Rich [afterwards Sir Richard Rich, Earl of Warwick and Lord Chancellor], is made general surveyor of the same, and Mr. Pope, my Lord Chancellor's servant, is made general receiver, and have great fees allowed them for the same; and there shall be eight other receivers made, which shall have during their lives every of them yearly £20 fee, and for carrying of every thousand pounds, £10 for their labours; their costs and charges borne. . . . [This is] as evil a time for suitors [petitioners] as can be, the King and Council have so many matters in hand."

in Master Cromwell." To this Husee adds, two days later, "The Bishop of Rochester [Fisher] is in custody of my Lord of Canterbury [Cranmer], and Sir Thomas More in the keeping of the Abbot of Westminster, and Dr. Wilson in the Tower." In an undated letter, written about this time by Rookwood, we find further that "the Bishop of Norwich[1] is condemned in ten thousand pounds, for that he [a word or two here illegible] in *premunire*, and is committed to the keeping of the Knight Marshal unto Friday, and he agreed for the payment of the sum. Some men thinketh the Bishop of London [Stokesley] shall bear him company." On the 18th of April Warley writes: "All abbeys of three hundred marks and under shall be put down." The small and poor religious houses were first suppressed; the rich and famous ones followed later. Warley, writing on the 13th of August, says:

> Nothing can be done because of Parliament, the Queen's dowry [jointure], and matters of my Lady Princess, the Lady Katherine Dowager, [and] the Lady Mary. . . . [Mr. Skevington has been sent] into Ireland on news that the Lord Garrad [Garret, the colloquial name of the Earl of Kildare] had shamefully slain the Archbishop of Dublin and his chaplains, and servants, and spareth not to put to death man, woman, and child, which be born in England. . . . Dr. Barnes and others do daily dispute with the bishops and doctors, but their conclusions are kept secret. . . . Here is a priest which would do you service [that is, wishes to do so]: he writes a very fair secretary hand, and text hand, and Roman, and singeth surely, and playeth very cunningly on the organs; and he is very cunning in drawing of knots in gardens [labyrinths, then very fashionable], and well seen in grafting and keeping of cucumbers and other herbs.

We should think some of these, in the present day, rather odd qualifications for a family chaplain.

Anthony Waite writes, a little drily, on the 10th of October, "Many preachers we have, but they come not from one Master, for it is reported their messages be diverse. Latimer many blameth, and as many doth allow. I heard him preach on Friday last, and as methought, very godly and well." He adds that the Archbishop had sent for that troublesome black sheep the Vicar of Croydon, "but he hath made sickness his excuse, and, as some said, because he would not appear before him." A letter from the Abbot of Hyde, Bishop of Bangor elect, dated Nov. 16th, contains the only reference to Elizabeth Barton, the professed prophetess, who endeavoured to prop up the falling cause of Popery, and made so great a sensation as "the holy maid of Kent": "Our holy nun of Kent hath confessed her treason against God and the King, not only a traitress but also an heretic; and she with her accomplices are like to suffer death." Sir William Kingston writes, on the 24th of February,

[1] The blind Bishop, Richard Nix, who had been a great persecutor.

apparently in 1535, "Upon Ash Wednesday, Mr. Latimer preached afore the King, and shall so do every Wednesday, this Lent; and for the first part he hath well begun, and is very well liked: God send him good continuance!" The irrepressible Vicar of Croydon, as we learn from a letter of Rookwood, dated April 6th, "hath desired of the King's Grace to have license to dispute with Latimer, whereunto the King hath granted; and my Lord of Winchester is gone to his diocese of Winchester, and not to return back till the King's Grace send for him."

The uncertain and tumultuous condition of England was repeated on a smaller scale at Calais. A letter from Lord Sandes, dated, as provoking people do date, "Sunday night," to the confusion of posterity, reports that he had received a letter from the Council of Calais, inquiring about a report that the parish priest of Guisnes "had caused the image of St. Anne to be borne about" on St. James's Day previous, and the Archbishop's Commissary (Sir John Butler, who was Vicar of St. Pierre-lèz-Calais) had desired that the priest might be kept in safe custody until the facts had been investigated. Lord Sandes reports that the parson of Guisnes knows nothing about the matter. The English authorities, however, were far from being pleased with the state of affairs. "Mr. Secretary" (Cromwell) writes Husee, on June 28th, "is not a little displeased with the rumours and surmised news of Calais and the Marches, and what salutation he gave me at the delivery of your letter, I will not now express. . . . . When Mr. Marshall cometh, he shall have his part, for surely he loveth him not." The Marshal of Calais, thus designated, was Lady Lisle's nephew, Sir Richard Grenville, the circumstances of whose heroic death, many years later, have earned for him a place as a hero of romance. He was an uncompromising Gospeller.

An amusing letter from Sir William Kingston, in the following September, tells us that "the King's Grace hath heard never word from my Lord of Winchester, so the King hawks every day with goshawks and other hawks." Are we to understand from this that King Henry's intermittently sensitive conscience had been troubled by doubts about the lawfulness of hawking, and that he had referred the solution of his difficulty to Bishop Gardiner, meanwhile continuing the questionable amusement? Sir William adds, "We thank my Lady for my token [*gift*], for it came to me next the Church of the Black Friars, and my wife was disposed to have offered it to Saint Ley that her horse should not halt, and he never went upright since." Whether this lamentable result was caused by Lady Kingston's superstitious reliance on the offering to St. Ley—probably St. Eloy, the patron saint of blacksmiths—

or by the omission to propitiate that powerful person, Sir William does not clearly indicate.

Anthony Waite writes on the 12th of November:

We have no news, but that it is preached here that priests must have wives, and that we should receive the Sacrament of the Altar in the espece [kind] both of bread and wine, like as the priest doth. But as concerning Purgatory, some preacheth [it] to be tribulations of this world; and some saith there is none. Yesterday there was at *Powles* [St. Paul's Cathedral, usually thus irreverently termed] a great and solemn procession, in which what abbots, what bishops! There were five that ware mitres, and the blessed Sacrament was borne under a canopy.

This procession was in thanksgiving for the recovery of King Francis I., of France, from a dangerous illness.

The eventful month of May, 1536—the month which saw the downfall and execution of Anne Boleyn, and the immediate marriage of the King to her maid of honour, Jane Seymour—brings us, as might be supposed, a handful of letters from all quarters. It opened quietly enough. On the second of that month, Warley's news is of the most unsensational character:

The King . . . is minded to set forward to Dover the next week. Robert Whethell brags freshly in the Court in a coat of crimson taffeta, cut and lined with yellow sarcenet, a shirt wrought with gold, his hosen scarlet, the breeches crimson velvet cut and edged, and lined with yellow sarcenet, his shoes crimson velvet, and likewise his sword-girdle and scabbard, a cloak of red frisado, a scarlet cap with feathers red and yellow. He hath many lookers-on. . . . Sir Richard Chichely, B.D., priest, well seen [skilful] in physic, astronomy, and surgery, and can sing his plain-song well, and is well apparelled, which would fain serve you, if you would help him to a chantry at Calais, and meat and drink: he demands no more. . . . Also he saith he is cunning in stilling of waters.

Ten days later, the blow has fallen, and the whole Court and kingdom are in a turmoil. "This day," writes Sir John Russell on the 12th, "Mr. Norris and such other as you know are cast [convicted]; and the Queen shall go to her judgment on Monday next [15th]." On the following day comes a letter from Husee, who writes as if the indictment of the Queen had stunned his intellect:

Madam, I think verily that if all the books and chronicles were totally revolved, and to the uttermost *proscruted* and tried, which against women hath been penned, contrived, and written since Adam and Eve, these same were, I think, verily nothing, in comparison of that which hath been done and committed by Anne the Queen: which, though I presume be not all things as it is now rumoured, yet that which hath been by her confessed, and other offenders with her . . . is so abominable and detestable, that I am ashamed that any good woman should give ear thereunto. I pray God give her grace to repent while she now liveth. I think not the contrary but she and all they shall suffer. John Williams hath promised me some cramp-rings for your ladyship.

The last sentence has in it more than bathos. The cramp-

rings, of which Lady Lisle was an acquisitive collector, would have had no value beyond that of their metal, but for the virtue inherent in the touch of the Queen—this very Anne of whom the previous horrified paragraph was written. Mr. Husee was so capable of writing up or down to the level of his correspondents' views, that it would perhaps be scarcely safe to suppose that he felt as scandalized as his expressions augur. On the 19th he writes, "The late Queen suffered this day in the Tower, who died boldly [*i.e.*, with firm fortitude]; and also her brother, Mr. Norris, Brureton, Weston, and Marks [Mark Smeaton], suffered the 17th day of this instant upon Tower Hill, all which died charitably. God take them to His mercy, if it be His pleasure! Mr. Page and young Wyatt are in the Tower; what shall become of them God best knoweth." With respect to nine silver cramp-rings which he sends, he adds, "John Williams [the keeper of the Jewel House, afterwards Lord Williams of Thame] says he never had so few of gold as this year. The King had the most part himself; but next year he will make you amends." Mr. Williams evidently did not expect his royal master to continue a widower long.[1]

Five days later, Husee writes: "Touching the confession of the Queen and others, they said little or nothing: but what was said was wondrous discreetly spoken—the first accuser, the Lady Worcester, and Nan Cobham, with one maid more." On the day following he adds, "Touching the Queen's accusers, my Lady Worcester beareth name to be the principal;" and in a duplicate letter, "Mr. Russell wrote to my Lord how he should write the King's Highness in laud and praise of the [new] Queen."

The Tudor capacity for swallowing flattery was exceptionally large: but even bluff King Hal at times grew weary of that dish of sweets which his courtiers spent their lives in setting before him. Witness that Sunday morning when, coming into the vestry after a sermon pointedly levelled at his personal sins, the King took honest Hugh Latimer in his arms with, "Is there yet one man left bold enough to tell me the truth?" Possibly, had there been a few more, it would have been better for Henry and for England.

Courtiers, however, could scarcely be expected to see matters in this light. The letter just alluded to from Sir John Russell is probably the following, which has no date beyond May:

My Lord, as upon Friday last, the Queen sat abroad as Queen, and was served with her own servants, and they were sworn that same day,

[1] Pickering writes on the same day: "The 18th, my Lord Rocheford, Norris, Weston, Brurton, and Marks, of the privy chamber, were put to death on Tower Hill. Also this present day the Queen was put to death within the Tower, in presence of a thousand people."

and the King and Queen came in his great boat to Greenwich the same day, with his privy chamber and *her*, and the ladies in the great barge. I do assure you, my Lord, she is as *gentill* [amiable] a lady as ever I know, and as fair a queen as any in Christendom. The King hath come out of hell into heaven, for the gentleness in this, and the cursedness [shrewishness] and unhappiness in the other. My Lord, we think it were very well done when you write to the King again, that you do rejoice that he is so well matched, with so gracious a woman as she is and you hear reported by her, wherein you shall content his Grace in so doing.

Sir John had written after "reported by her," four words which on consideration he erased: "and he was so——" They evidently were about to lead to some slur on the memory of the dead Queen, that "entirely beloved" Anne, touching whom only a few weeks before Henry would have brooked no sinister word. Her playful satire, not always wise nor delicate, but rarely ill-natured, was not termed "cursedness" then. Now —"*la Reine est morte: vive la Reine!*"

Next comes a letter from Anthony Waite (June 11th): "It is rumoured among the people that one should be committed unto the Tower" for the heinous offence of predicting the weather! The prophet had asserted that "this month shall be rainy and full of wet, the next month death, and the third wars: there to be kept until experience shall entryst [discover to] us the truth of his prophecy." Rather a neat method of testing a vaticinator! Waite has further to recount that twenty-three Anabaptists, three being women, have arrived from Flanders, who

hold these no less strange than damnable opinions (as by report I do hear): first, that Christ hath not of the nature of God and man: second, that Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, took no part of the substance of her body; third, that the bread consecrate by the priest is not the incarnate body of Christ; fourth, that baptism given in the state of innocency (that is, to children) doth not profit; fifth, that if a man sin deadly after he be once baptized, he shall never be forgiven. My Lord of London and Dr. Barnes, with other, be in commission to examine them, which hath sitten these two days past at Poules in consistory there; but they be too stiff; as yet there is small hope of their conversion. And as to-morrow they shall be examined again, and take their judgment if they be obstinate; but if judgment be given, it is doubted whether the King's Grace shall suffer execution of them here, or else send them to their countries, there to suffer, according to their laws and their deserts.

It was not for long that society could cease worshipping its new idol. Even grave Anthony Waite is carried away by the popular fervour. After saying, on the 12th of June, that his master, the Bishop of Chichester, had resigned his see at the request of the King to Dr. Sampson, Dean of the King's Chapel, "a man in very great favour with his Prince," he follows the popular lead by adding, "as yesterday [the new Bishop] did in his pontificals execute the Mass before the King and Queen at

Westminster, which came thither from the New Hall on horse back, highly accompanied with two archbishops, bishops, dukes, marquises, lords, barons, abbots, and justices, with a great part of nobleness [*sic*] of his realm, and with no less solemnity went a procession after the blessed Sacrament, to the great comfort and rejoissance of a great multitude of his subjects . . there gathered to see his Grace and the Queen, which is a very amiable [handsome] lady, and of whom we all have great hope." No doubt those of his Majesty's subjects whose minds had been made uneasy by his recent rapid progress in the Protestant direction, would hail this retrograde movement with much relief.

Two letters came this autumn from the English ambassadors in France, Bishop Gardiner and Sir Francis Bryan. The former, written from Antibes, June 19th, records a meeting between the sovereigns of France and Germany and the Pope: "The Empress' Court is great, the Bishop of Rome's less, and the French Court three times so big as the most of them: so that with them all the towns and villages being within four or five leagues of the Courts any way from them be so full that no man passing by the way can but very hardly find lodging. In the French Court I [Bryan] never saw so many women; I would I had so many sheep to find my house whilst I live."

A letter from William London, Comptroller of Lord Lisle's house, undated, in which he makes the irreverent statement that "the idol of Rome departs to-morrow," probably refers to the same event. This letter, however, is among the Harleian MSS. By October the ambassadors had reached Marseilles, where apparently they did not find the commissariat satisfactory, since they wrote to Lord Lisle, "We would ye had part of the wines that we drink here, and then we doubt not ye would pity us!"

Lady Lisle had now earnestly taken up an object which she thought exceedingly desirable — to advance two of her daughters, Katherine and Anne, to be maids of honour to the new Queen. The first difficulty in the way was how to recommend her suit; and the letters written to her amusingly show the numerous suggestions made by her Ladyship. "The Queen does not care for dogs,"—Anne Boleyn had been fond of dogs, and Jane Seymour showed a fancy for doing everything as unlike her predecessor as possible. "The Queen loveth no such beasts as your monkey, nor can scant abide the sight of them." Her Majesty graciously accepted some quails, but the anxiety with which Husee impresses on his mistress that royalty "would have them fat"—"the King hath written unto my Lord for fat quails"—"let them be very fat, or else they are not worth thanks"—in perpetual repetition, shows either

great care on the part of the donor, or much fastidiousness on that of the recipient.

After Jane Seymour's premature death, Lady Lisle continued her endeavours to obtain promotion for her girls; and by this time she had discovered that bluff King Hal himself was no less physically than morally a "sweet tooth," liking marmalade as well as flattery, and as much pleased with offerings of early vegetables as of personal adulation. Some grapes which were sent over from Calais, and proved to be spoiled on arrival, are much lamented by Husee. Had they been good, "I would certainly have ridden to Court and presented them to the King myself; for I know he has had none yet." Her Ladyship's endeavours proved successful. Anne Basset continued in the royal household until she married in 1554; and Katherine was, after much waiting, taken into the service of Anna of Cleve after her divorce from the King.

In December, 1536, Sir John Wallop, then ambassador to France, writes several letters, in two of which he gives us an interesting glimpse of James V. of Scotland, the hero of the "Lady of the Lake," presenting a rather different portrait from that drawn by Scott. "The King of Scots is a right proper man, after the northern fashion." "He is a man of the fewest words that may be. He shall shortly be ensured to Madame Magdalene [of France], and soon after marry her. His wife shall temper him well, for she can speak; but if she spake as little as he, the house should be very quiet."

Husee, writing on Jan. 13th, 1537, says, "Here are fair behests [promises] and small performance." He is sending to Lady Lisle the Queen's gift for the new year, "a pair of beads of gold, weighing as they now are with their tassels three ounces [a scrap is here torn from the letter]; they are of her Grace's own wearing." In February, he finds a difficulty in sending the spices for which Lady Lisle had written, because "your Ladyship shall understand that now the grocer is dead, and his wife is a limb of the Devil; I will in no wise deal with her." A few days later, he appears to have discovered a less objectionable dealer in spices, for he forwards an "invoice of spices bought of John Blagge" as follows:

Raisins Alicants, at one penny farthing, 10s.
Figs *dorte*, one tapnet, 3s.
Raisins corants [currants], 20 lb. at 3d., 5s.
Sugar fine, 8 loaves per oz. [*sic*], 71 lbs. at 7d. per lb., 44s. 10d.
Rice, 50 lb. at a penny halfpenny, 6s. 3d.
Almonds, one gret at a penny halfpenny, 23s. 4d.
Cinnamon, 2 lb. at 6s. and 8s., 13s. 4d. [*sic*].
Cloves, 10 lb. at 5s., 50s.
Maces, one pound, 6s.
Nutmegs, one pound, 3s.

Ginger *casse*, 2 lb., 5s.
Turnsole, 2 lb., 2s. 8d.
Figs *merchat*, one piece, 4s.
Figs of Algarve, one tapnet, 3s.
Blue, 3s.

Total, £10 15s. 2d.

The reckoning, which is not always intolligible, is that of Mr. Blagge.

Lady Lisle was not always satisfied with the proceedings of her agents, and occasionally, like other people, wanted what they could not send her. "Your night gown [evening dress] and waist coats are even in every point made as my Lady Beauchamp's," writes Husee in a deprecating manner, "and it is the very fashion that the Queen and all the ladies doth wear, and so were the caps." And again, "There is none of that colour of cloth to be had which the Queen's brother did wear at Calais." "The Court is full of pride, envy, indignation, and mocking," is the opinion of the same writer shortly afterwards.

The Queen had now promised to accept one of the Basset young ladies as her maid of honour, having arrived at that decision when she was dining on the quails. Mr. Husee, who liked to save money as well as his master did to spend it, thriftily suggests that there is no need to spend much until the final decision has been made: "but two honest changes they must have, one of satin, the other of damask." Both the girls were to be sent over from Calais, for the Queen wished to see them, "and know their manners, fashions, and conditions, and take which of them shall like her Grace best,"—that is, in modern diction, which the Queen liked best. Very curious is the account, showing how fastidious the Queen was, and to what minute particulars she descended. She went so far as to inspect the young ladies' linen, and pronounced it too coarse for their new position. Anne was the one she chose, the younger and handsomer of the two. At first the Queen commanded that her "French apparel" should be laid by, but on second thoughts she allowed it to be worn out, the hood excepted, for the shape of the French hood did not please her. Husee deplores that her new velvet bonnet became Anne "nothing so well as the French hood: but the Queen's pleasure must needs be fulfilled."

On the 17th of July, 1537, "Other news there is not, but that the bishops cannot yet agree." The plague had now broken out, and Husee writes, "Your Ladyship will not believe how fearful the Queen's Grace is of the sickness; yet the death is not so great as it was the last year, for there died this last week in London but 112." The same writer reports that "All the Court did eat fish, St. Lawrence Eve, but divers in

the realm did eat flesh." "Here is nothing but every one for himself," he says, in September. "I remember my Lord of Rocheford's words, who exhorted every man to beware of the flattering of the Court." On the 16th of October he writes to announce the baptism of the new-born Prince of Wales, afterwards Edward VI.:

On Sunday last, by twelve of the clock, the Prince was christened, in most solemnity and triumphant manner, whose birth hath more rejoiced the realm and all true hearts in the same more [*sic*] than anything hath done these xl. years. I pray Jesu send his Grace long to prosper and live, and the King's Highness many more sons. . . . Your Lordship hath heard of his birth before this, for John Skarlett went directly with the Queen's letters. The Duke of Norfolk and Archbishop of Canterbury were sponsors, with my Lady Mary, at the fount, and the Duke of Suffolk was godfather at the confirmation. . . . My Lord Admiral [Fitzwilliam] and my Lord Privy Seal shall on Thursday next be created earls; the one, as I am informed, Earl of Warwick [Southampton], to whom the King hath granted £2000 out of the attainted lands, and out of the suppressed lands [of the monasteries] a thousand marks by the year; and the Lord Privy Seal shall be either Earl of Kent or Earl of Hampton, to whom the King hath given 200 [*sic*] a year;[1] and divers other shall be made lords, and certain knights shall be made.

What my Lady Lisle wanted with old carpets may not unreasonably be asked; but as there was "not one to be had for no money," it is evident that she had to do without them.

Mr. Husee was in the spring of 1538 in a Protestant frame of mind. So was his master, King Henry. The two facts, indeed, were cause and effect. On the 6th of February he "prays God send him little ado with any spiritual men"—by which term Mr. Husee meant not men of spiritual discernment, neither do modern writers who employ it.

Archbishop Cranmer writes on the 4th of March, "I send to you your own man Master Hore; as you liked him so well last Lent, I appointed him to preach again, accompanied by a very honest, discreet, and well learned man, Mr. Nichols: desiring your Lordship, with the rest of the Council, to assist them in the doctrine of the Gospel, and in the promoting of the truth." There are two letters to Lady Lisle from the Rev. Richard Hore, which show him to have been a spiritual man in the real sense of the word.

On the 6th of March Husee writes that he has received £4 from his mistress through Corbett, "wherewith I will please the tailor the best I can, and also entreat the grocer to tarry till November, and send such Lenten stuff as you write for with the first [*i.e.*, on the first opportunity]: yet I think I

[1] Cromwell was only created a baron; he was not Earl of Essex until 1540.

shall get no ling without ready money." Three days later he reads his lady a solemn lesson on her Romish proclivities:

I first protest with your Ladyship not to be angry with me [which she was very sure to be, and to let him know it]; but if it might be your pleasure to leave part of such ceremonies as you do use, as long prayers and offering of candles, and at some time to refrain and not speak, though your Ladyship have cause, when ye hear things spoken that liketh you not, it should sound highly to your honour, and cause less speech: and though that thing were right good and might be suffered, yet your Ladyship of your goodness might do a very good deed to conform yourself partly to the thing that is used, and to the world as it goeth now, which is undoubtedly marked above all other things. I trust your Ladyship shall not be miscontented, but take it within in as good part as I do mean it; for if I did not bear you my true heart and service, I would not write so plainly.

Poor Husee! only one of her Ladyship's letters to him has been preserved—in vinegar, it might be said: for if she usually wrote with as much sharpness as in that instance, the correspondence must have been charming to receive. He might well beg her not to be miscontented.

"Here is a priest which would gladly serve my Lord and your Ladyship; he seemeth to be a right honest man, and I think your Ladyship lacketh such a one!" Mr. Husee was not wrong in that opinion, if he alluded to that far from honest individual, Sir Gregory Botolph, then Lord Lisle's chaplain, who in all probability had some hand in his master's undoing: nor was he mistaken in his estimate of the priest, who was Sir Oliver Browne, and a Gospeller.

On the 21st of March Husee writes: "Pilgrimage saints goeth down apace, as our Lady of Southwick, the blood of Hales, St. Saviour, and others; and this day the Abbey of Stratford is suppressed. I am glad to hear that your Lordship doth set forth so earnestly the Word of God, wherein above all others you shall demerit high thanks." The next day he writes to Lady Lisle, hinting at some disagreeable reports which had been circulated to her disparagement, and which seem to have been to the effect that she did not earnestly favour the Word of God as her husband did. There was reason for them: and, as Husee regretfully notes, they were not spread by "low people, but great men. I think if your Ladyship will leave the great part of your ceremonies, and have only mass, matins, and evensong, of the day, they shall have nothing to speak of." He is glad to hear that the preachers—Hore and Nichols—are liked, and trusts their wholesome doctrine may do good. It will be seen that Mr. Husee is a Protestant—just now. "The most part of saints whereto pilgrimage and offering were wont to be made are taken away: our Lady of Southwark is one, St. Saviour, the blood of Hales, and other: I

doubt the Resurrection shall after. I can no more, but God be lauded in all His works!" The allusion to "the Resurrection" is not easy to explain; it was probably some assemblage of figures, such as those now termed "Calvaries."

King Henry was now in his most evangelical frame of mind, and reaction ensued ere long.

EMILY S. HOLT.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. VI.—CLERICAL CHARITIES.

The North Riding Clergy Charity. Report for the year ending December, 1883. Thirsk: Z. Wright, Market Place.

Report, Rules, and Regulations of the Society for the Relief of Distressed Clergymen in the Diocese of Durham, for the year 1876. Durham: *County Advertiser* Office.

The Clergy—too Many and too Few. A Paper read at the Leicester Church Congress, 1880, by the Rev. J. J. HALCOMBE, M.A.

The Church and her Clergy. A Plea for a Sustentation Fund by B. and C. 1884. Boston: Dingwall and Wilson, 42, Market Place.

The Diocesan Clergy Charities. A Paper contributed to the *Guardian*, November 28th, 1883, by the Rev. E. G. O'DONOGHUE.

THE centenary celebration of "the North-Riding Clergy Charity" was held at Thirsk, on Tuesday, August 19th. The Archbishop of York was the preacher, and at the subsequent gathering made some very forcible remarks on the whole question of the social condition of the clergy. The special Charity which enjoyed the privilege of the Archbishop's powerful advocacy was founded at a general meeting of the clergy of the North Riding of the County of York, held at Northallerton, on Thursday, the 5th day of August, 1784, "To consider of a plan for the better provision of the necessitous clergy and their families within the said Riding." In pensions and donations, this charity disbursed last year about £300, and administered the interest of a sum of £2,000 called the Edmund Smith Fund, bequeathed on the express condition "that it be applied for the benefit of clergymen who should become necessitous by reason of age, sickness, infirmity, or unavoidable misfortune, and for no other purpose whatever."

A much older charity is "The Society for the Relief of Distressed Clergymen and their Widows and Families, commonly called the Society of the Sons of the Clergy in the Diocese of Durham." Founded in the year 1709, it made no

distribution, however, until the year 1712, when eight pounds were divided amongst eleven widows and their children, in sums varying from one shilling to two pounds, the last-named donation being for the son of a widow towards his maintenance at Cambridge. This excellent charity appears, from the last report to which the writer has access, to have distributed in 1876 over £1,100 in ministering to the relief of two incapacitated clergymen, twenty-one widows, twenty-eight daughters, and three sons, together with sundry donations to the Clergy Orphan School.

Older than both Societies, however, is the "Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, founded 1655, and incorporated by Royal Charter, 1678." This Society grants

1st. Donations to Poor Clergymen, incapable of duty from mental or bodily infirmity, or hindered with large families, or in unavoidable necessity.

2nd. Pensions to Poor Widows, and Aged Maiden Daughters of Deceased Clergymen, and temporary relief in cases of great age or sickness.

3rd. Apprentice-fees and donations towards the education and establishment in life, of children of Poor Clergymen.

In 1882, the Governors of this Charity made grants to no fewer than 245 clergymen, 305 children (of whom 94 were orphans), 224 widows and single daughters; and afforded pensions to 406 other widows and 306 daughters—in all 1,486 individuals, at a cost of £24,296.

I. The necessity for the establishment of such Societies will be no surprise to those who are familiar with the history of the clergy during the eighteenth century. The words in which Lord Macaulay sketched the condition of the country clergy at the close of the seventeenth century, are too well-known to require quotation. Less familiar, however, will be the description of their social condition by Swift: "His wife is little better than Goody in her birth, education, or dress; and as to himself, we must let his parentage alone. If he be the son of a farmer, it is very sufficient, and his sister may be very decently chambermaid to the squire's wife. He goes about on working-days in a grazier's coat. His daughter shall go to service, or be sent apprentice to the seamstress in the next town, and his sons are put to honest trades. This is the usual course of an English vicar from £20 to £60 a year."[1]

It was the calculation of Bishop Watson when asked by

[1] See Abbey and Overton's "English Church in the Eighteenth Century," vol. ii., chap. i., for this quotation and the other details immediately following.

Lord Shelburne "whether nothing could be gotten from the Church towards alleviating the burdens of the State," that the whole revenue of the Church, if equally divided, would not yield £150 to each clergyman, and that any such proposed diminution would involve a beggarly and illiterate clergy. In those days, moreover, it must be remembered a great gulf existed between the Bishops and clergy in the matter of income as well as in social standing.[1] The fortunate Bishops on the one hand could take their stand with the highest nobles in the land, whilst the bulk of the country curates and poorer incumbents were on a level with the small farmer. When Parliamentary returns showed that 6,000 of the clergy had at a middle rate not £50 a year, we may realize the existence of an immense amount of clerical poverty, and the consequent need for the establishment of Clerical Charities. Stackhouse, the celebrated author of the "History of the Bible," published in 1733, went so far as to affirm in his "Miseries and Great Hardships of the Inferior Clergy in and about London," that "the inferior clergy were objects of extreme wretchedness; they lived in garrets, and appeared in the streets with tattered cassocks; the common fee for a sermon was a shilling and a dinner; for reading prayers, twopence and a cup of coffee."

II. Are these Societies, it may be asked by those ignorant of the true circumstances of the clergy in our own days—and such ignorance it is well feared is far too prevalent—charitable survivals, or is there still the need to provide for a class of clergymen who may fairly be entitled "necessitous and distressed"? The simple facts constitute a sufficient and sad reply. In this present year the number of Societies of the nature of Clerical Charities has grown to 227, of which, whilst 130 are purely diocesan, not fewer than 97 are general in their operations. The combined income of these Societies amounted last year to £156,693, of which £129,956 was disbursed in relief. From the very carefully prepared tabular statement which appeared in the *Guardian*, November 28, 1883, it appears that 4,757 widows and children depend upon the benefits of these

[1] "There is an odd illustration of the immeasurable distance which was supposed to separate the bishop from the curate in Cradock's 'Reminiscences.' Bishop Warburton was to preach in St. Lawrence's Church in behalf of the London Hospital. 'I was,' writes Cradock, 'introduced into the vestry by a friend, where the Lord Mayor and others were waiting for the Duke of York, who was their president; and in the meantime the Bishop did everything in his power to entertain and alleviate their patience. He was beyond measure condescending and courteous, and even graciously handed some biscuits and wine in a salver to the curate who was to read prayers!'"—Abbey and Overton, vol. ii., pp. 16, 17.

clerical charities, and that no fewer than 1,272 clergymen—that is to say, considerably more than 6 per cent. of the clergy who are actively engaged—are receiving relief from their funds. The enumeration of these figures is sadly suggestive. If 1,272 clergymen are thus constrained to appeal for help lest they should faint under their burden, how many must there be in addition who struggle on without making any sign, though sorely tried. How necessitous and distressed are some of the applicants may be gathered when it is remembered that the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation (established 1856, incorporated by Royal Charter 1867)—its operations, however, extending to the colonies—gives immediate assistance in clothing as well as in money to the poorer clergy, and had, up to May 1883, aided 6,478 cases of clerical distress with grants ranging from £5 to £25, besides numerous parcels of clothing, blankets, sheeting, boots, etc.[1] The existence of such Societies and such statistics abundantly justify the touching sentences in which Archdeacon Farrar has eloquently alluded to the privations and distresses of many of our English parsonages: "There is suffering which is silent, resigned, unobtrusive; clergy there are who drain to the dregs the bitter cup of poverty, and die, and are not known. They have held out bravely to the end; they have kept up respectable appearances; they have put their children in the way of earning their own bread; and though the iron has entered into their very souls, no murmur has escaped their lips. Oh, those quiet, pretty parsonages of England, with the rose and the honeysuckle trained over their sunny walls; those happy-looking homes which romance invests with the colours of imagination, and about which poets write their idylls; those homes to which many of us look back with unspeakable affection, because they were hallowed by piety and love—do

[1] "Imagine a lawyer in practice applying for a grant from a professional charity, and being grateful for a dole of £5; perhaps applying again if he failed the first time. Yet this sort of thing does exist in clerical circles and in society. The Poor Clergy Relief Corporation distributes blankets, sheets, and clothes. The very possibility of the thing was turned into ridicule in the pages of *Punch* some few years ago, and ridiculous pictures were shown of clergymen issuing from the doors of the charity office, parti-clad in billycock, and "mark of the beast," and hunting-boots, and even the hat and nether garments of our friend Jeames—yellow-plush—were depicted as forming part of the dress of the reverend brother in distress. All this, no doubt, may be called a mere joke; it is not, it is more than a joke: it has truth in it—sad, terrible truth; it is a caricature, but there is truth in it. The clergy do receive grants of clothes. Think of this, Church of England laymen, whether you are wealthy or substantial, or merely independent! How can you—how can the lower orders, resist the tendency to treat with slight respect the recipient of a five-pound note and a pair of shoes?"—("The Church and her Clergy: a Plea for a Sustentation Fund," by B. and C., p. 15.)

not many of us know, also, how trying were their conditions? how hard it was to keep the wolf from the door? what constant, what unwearying care it cost to maintain the position of a gentleman on the income of an artisan? with how sore a burden at the heart the daily work was often done? And when the vicar dies, and the home is broken up, and the little he had saved is absorbed, and his widow and children leave—in yet deeper penury—the scene which, with all its privations, they loved so well, oh, what tragedies of silent anguish lie often within the walls and gardens of those country homes!"

III. No injustice could be greater than the one which would lay at the door of the clergy a charge of improvidence or reckless living as the explanation of this impoverished condition. The only sense in which such a charge could wear the semblance of truth arises from the open-handed generosity with which the clergy seek to maintain the organizations amid which they are placed. The support given to many a Church school by the incumbent of the parish has been at the cost of comforts due to his own children. Let it be remembered, as the *Times* newspaper stated in an article on March 7th, 1878, that one half of the clergy of the Church of England have incomes under £200 a year, and we have the true explanation of the 227 charities, and a revelation of a state of things which demands, as the article expressed, "serious and instant remedy." The number of benefices is as near as may be 13,739, but of these it is computed that some 1,100 so-called livings are under £100 a year, 1,600 more or less under £150 a year, and 4,650 under £200 a year. Notwithstanding the creation of the See of Liverpool, the Diocese of Chester in its diminished area has still 65 out of its 250 benefices under £200 a year, and 7 under £100, as many as 19 having no parsonage-house. This, however, is not the whole case. For these livings, so-called, there are crowds of applicants, many of whom, after frequent disappointments, are constrained to seek a means of maintenance apart from parochial work. If the beneficed clergy be stated at 13,500, and licensed curates at 5,500, we have a total of 19,000 clergymen actively engaged in parochial work. As the Clergy Lists, however, give the names of 23,000 clergymen, we have no fewer than 4,000 unattached. How large a proportion of the 4,000 are unwillingly unattached, it cannot be accurately estimated, but undoubtedly the proportion is very considerable.

The professional prospects open to curates under these circumstances have been very clearly stated in an able paper by Mr. Mackreth Deane. "Supposing, for the purpose of illustration, that all promotions were regulated strictly by

seniority, a curate might then expect to obtain a benefice at the end of eleven years — that is, when he was thirty-five. In eight years, however, this so-called living would be under £150 a year; in his forty-fourth year, and for ten years following, he would enjoy an income of from £150 to £300; from his fifty-fourth to sixty-fourth year he would be passing rich on a stipend of from £300 to £600; whilst for the last two years of his life he would be comfortably off with £600 and upwards."[1] This supposition, however, rests upon a system of graduated seniority to which all benefices would be conformed. If any patrons might be supposed to confer their livings upon such a system, it would be the Bishops who, whilst having regard to merit, would also consider length of service as a factor in the case. The patronage in the hands of Bishops is, however, comparatively limited. Of the 13,739 benefices, 7,800 are in private hands, for which any clergy but such as are relations or friends of the patrons have but little prospect. Of the remaining number the Universities possess about 900, which naturally fall into the hands of those who in early life have taken good degrees and obtained fellowships. Of the rest, the Crown and the Duchy of Lancaster present to about 400, and the Lord Chancellor (previously to Lord Westbury's Act) to about 830. By these and other minor sources of patronage we find the benefices which remain to the Bishops are only 2,375 out of 13,732, and of this number 825, that is more than one-third, are under £250 a year.[2]

IV. An explanation of the circumstances under which the present phase of clerical distress has become pressing is not far to seek, and, when found, points, alas! to an augmentation of the list of needy clergy, unless the present conditions be materially changed:

(*a*) The increase of endowments during the last fifty years has in no way kept pace with the magnificent advance in the number of churches built. Between the years 1840 and 1880 a sum of not less than thirty millions of money was expended in the erection and rebuilding of churches. The last five years have probably not been less productive of endowments than the years preceding, but it does not appear, so far as can be learned from the Reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Queen Anne's Bounty, that a larger amount than £200,000 has been annually contributed for endowments, yielding at 4 per cent., say, a yearly increase of £8,000 of income.

(*b*) During the last fifty years the Additional Curates

[1] Quoted by the Rev. J. J. Halcombe. "The Clergy too many and too few."—Church Congress Report, 1880.

[2] "The Church and her Clergy," pp. 14-16, and "Official Year-Book of the Church of England," 1884, p. 557.

Society and the Pastoral Aid Society have been founded, the one providing 620, the other 570—that is to say, 1,190 curates at the present date. It is a matter for thankful recognition that curates' stipends have risen materially in recent years, but it must equally be remembered that for the additional clergy brought into the Church by these two grand Societies there has been no proportionate increase of benefices. It is stated in the papers issued by the Curates' Augmentation Fund that no fewer than 1,200 of the 5,350 stipendiary curates have been fifteen years in Holy Orders. Remembering the immense cost involved in the erection of churches, and the provision necessary for the adequate maintenance of incumbents, it is not a matter of surprise that the question is now gravely discussed whether, except in special cases, the limits of churches and clergy have not been approached, and whether the additional necessary means of grace should not be provided by the multiplication in our large towns of simple mission churches with the ministrations of a permanent diaconate, or of duly qualified voluntary lay helpers, working under the directions of the incumbents.

(*c*) During the last fifty years, with the exception of St. Bees, which is somewhat earlier in its establishment, the Theological Colleges have arisen, which provide special facilities for men to take Holy Orders who, as a rule, possess no private means. It would not be possible to overrate the importance of the services rendered by the clergy who have been thus trained; but having regard to the question of Clerical Charities, and the demands made upon them, it is not possible to ignore the fact that during the last fifty years 3,500 men have thus entered the Church. It is true that men similarly circumstanced are ordained from the Universities; but, broadly speaking, training at Oxford and Cambridge presupposes such a social condition as will be less probable to constrain a needy clergyman to seek that aid from charities which, if occasion require, he might receive from friends and relatives.

(*d*) Though the Pluralities Act of 1839 practically provided 4,000 additional benefices, yet the individual preferment was thereby materially reduced in value. The Act would, doubtless, tend to increase the number of clergy by the fact that separate benefices were thus practically created, and, accordingly, we find that the clergy increased by 3,000 between 1841 and 1851. The class of poor benefices was, however, very largely increased, and thus the number of applicants for the benefits of Clerical Charities. To such an extent has the value of preferment been diminished by the Pluralities Act, that it is now becoming a recognised necessity to enlarge the limited power for holding small benefices within reasonable distances.

V. No man who fairly considers the facts which have been adduced but must admit that an augmentation of our poor benefices is an urgent necessity, and a duty which, in the interests of the Church and of the nation, ought to occupy the best thoughts of our Bishops.

(*a*) Various plans have been suggested, and everywhere the cry is heard that we must have a rearrangement of our revenues. Thanks to the shameless statements reiterated on many a Liberationist platform, the idea prevails among many that Church property is boundless in its extent. When a collection was recently made in a church on behalf of the Pastoral Aid Society, a paper was found in the collecting-plate on which was written, "I will give nothing; you have plenty of resources, if all were fairly distributed."

In this country, the main reliance of the clergy is on endowments, and the great majority of the people believe in the sufficiency of our endowments. It is impossible to exaggerate the good work which has already been achieved in the rearrangement of Church Property by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The laity need now, however, to have the truth brought home to their minds that the limit of subdivision has been all but reached, and that if all existing endowments were equally divided, not more than £153 per head would be the result. The endowments of the past ought to be examples to the present generation of Christian liberality—not exemptions from the duty which rests upon each generation to provide for its own spiritual ministrations. Rearrangement of Church property, then, will not supply the remedy for our present distress. The present endowments of the Church of England are inadequate, totally inadequate, to the efficient maintenance of her clergy.

(*b*) A more generous support of our existing Clerical Charities is the remedy which some suggest. Much more might be done assuredly, but the whole system of Clerical Charities as at present administered is humiliating. Help in the education of children, and pensions to widows and orphans, constitute its brightest features; but it were far better to pay the workman his full wage than to grind down the incomes of the poor and then to prostitute the sacred name of charity by granting doles to those whom our niggardliness has impoverished. A system which combined the opposite evils of deliberately impoverishing and then gratuitously pauperizing might be justly reckoned the *summum malum* of any organization. When the Church, if ever it rise to its duty, sufficiently remunerates the services of its clergy, there will still remain the frequent opportunity for true charity arising from those changes and chances which will from time to time befall the clergy as

well as the laity. That there should be any waste of resources in the administration of such charities is inexcusable, and the question cannot but obtrude itself when we think of the 97 general charities (apart from Diocesan Charities) administering only £88,000, whether there is no room for amalgamation amid such a multitude of agencies, and no possibility for reduced expenditure by more economical administration.

(*c*) One mode of clerical relief which might be afforded with delicate regard for the feelings of the poorer clergy would be the aided insurance of their lives. If ever a system were devised and carried out by which the Church as a whole could share the burdens of the less favoured clergy, not by occasional doles, but by the yearly payment of premiums, so that in times of sickness—in the declining years of old age—and in the event of death, the advantages of sick pay, of the modest annuity, and of the seasonable legacy might be forthcoming, much would have been done to preserve the self-respect of the clergy, and to free them from the overwhelming dread of leaving those dear to them not only stricken by bereavement, but left in the time of sorrow to struggle as best they may to keep their heads above the dark waters of actual need.

In the Dioceses of Bangor and Durham well-devised schemes of aided insurance are at work. In the former there is a Diocesan Clergy Charity with an income of £300, of which £50 is derived from consols, and therefore a constant source of income. This sum is applied to aid the poorer clergy to insure their lives—the trustees contracting to pay £3 per annum in part payment of premium on condition the clergyman insured pays the remainder. The office must be approved by the Society, and the total premium must not be less than £6 nor more than £15 per annum. The Clerical Insurance Fund in the Diocese of Durham was established so far back as 1810, and owes much to the munificence of Bishops Barrington and Maltby. At an expenditure of £350 a year thirty-five clergymen are aided. Married clergymen, or widowers with children, are eligible if their income does not exceed £300 a year. The benefits may be enjoyed so long as the clergy continue in the diocese and do not dispose of their policies. The committee pay the expense of the policy and the first year's premium on any sum assured not exceeding £500, and subsequently one half of the premium. The offices are restricted to the Amicable, Equitable, Pelican, University, Rock, or Clergy Mutual. The funds of this Durham Society exceed £10,000, invested in consols.

(*d*) The only worthy method and effectual plan for the evil with which we have to grapple would be the permanent augmentation of the poorer benefices to a minimum of £300 a

year. There is no need for the clergy to be wealthy, but they ought to be raised above grinding poverty; and none ought to be allowed to remain wretchedly poor while they are in the active discharge of useful ministerial work. Is this possible?

The Marquis of Lorne's experiment has not been cheering in the amount of success it has achieved. Established in 1873, after consultation with the Archbishop of Canterbury, and favoured with an annual subscription from the Queen, the Fund can only report, after ten years 95 benefices permanently benefited by the capital amount of £28,751; that is to say, an addition of £1,150 has been directly made to the yearly income of the Church, which has been allotted among 95 poor benefices, augmenting each on an average to the extent of £12 per annum. Nor is the advance made by the Benefices' Augmentation Funds now established in most dioceses of a very satisfactory nature. The rate of progress is so slow that such schemes never seem to create enthusiasm among the laity. No such Diocesan Fund was begun under more favourable circumstances than the one in Chester. Bishop Jacobson not only warmly advocated its claims, but also generously contributed £100 a year to its funds. And yet, though 65 of the 252 Chester benefices are as yet under £200 a year, only 49 churches out of the 253 (including the Cathedral) contributed to the funds of the association, the whole amount collected being £144 19s. 4d., whereof seven churches sent offertories of under £1!

Either there is an ill-founded belief that Church property can be drawn upon to make good all deficiencies, or the system of investment which secures only 3¾ per cent. does not commend itself,[1] or, worst of all, there is an entire indifference among the members of the Church of England as to the circumstances of those who minister to them in spiritual things. Be the explanation what it may, the poor clergy who turn their eyes in hope of help to the Lorne Incumbents' Sustentation Fund or to the respective Diocesan Poor Benefices' Augmentation Funds, may well despair as they behold the slow and slender results. In their case, indeed, the proverb may be quoted that while the grass is growing the horse is starving.

VI. If the augmentation cannot be permanently made, the easier and apparently the more practicable remedy will be that these poor livings should be annually supplemented by grants

[1] The plan by which local contributions are doubled by the Diocesan Fund and the combined amount again doubled by the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty or by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, admirable as it may be, does not seem to fire the enthusiasm of our ordinary Church people, resulting, as the plan does, in 3¾ per cent. income on the whole amount.

from a sustentation fund similar to that which the Free Church of Scotland possesses, and which in the year ending March 1882, realized the sum of £236,363 12s. 11d. Such sustentation funds are in existence in the Disestablished Church of Ireland and among the Wesleyans. Such a scheme originally formed a part of the Lorne enterprise, but unfortunately in a subsidiary degree, as not more than £1,613 was thus granted to 34 benefices during the first ten years of its existence. Such a sustentation fund it is difficult to believe could fail to be a success if only the Archbishops and Bishops would heartily combine and strongly commend the scheme to the faithful members of the Church of England. A pastoral letter stating briefly but authoritatively the facts in reference to Church property, and the condition of many of the poorer clergy, would disperse a dark cloud of ignorance. The recommendation of a simultaneous Sunday for collections and offertories, such as the first Sunday in the year, would ensure very general adoption and screen the individual clergyman from any charge to which he might be keenly sensitive of pleading for himself. There may have been the time when Bishops with their large revenues and princely establishments could not for very shame have consistently pleaded the necessity for such a fund. In these happier days when Bishops are moderately endowed and are distinguished, as a rule, for simplicity of living and hard working, and when notoriously the wants of the clergy meet with a generous and sympathetic response from their fathers in God, such an appeal would bring honour to themselves and the gratitude of thousands of their less-favoured brethren.

VII. There is one aspect of the Clergy Relief question of which mention has not yet been made, but the importance of which it would not be easy to exaggerate, viz. that of Clerical Pensions. In many of our large towns aged incumbents are compelled to sit at the oar they have no longer strength to pull. The Bishops, as a rule, have but few county livings where a man might, with moderate health, fulfil the duties even in declining years. In many instances, however, health has been so completely broken that no Bishop could conscientiously impose such an incumbent on any county parish, however limited its area and light its duties. But it may be answered, Does not the Incumbents' Resignation Act expressly provide for such cases by affording a retiring pension not exceeding one-third of the income of the benefice? The principle, we reply, is admirable, and its working most satisfactory, provided the benefice be of sufficient value to provide a pension for the outgoing and an income for the successor. In the case of small livings the Act is, however, practically inoperative. The third of the income does not furnish an adequate pension, and the

diminution even of a small amount constitutes a heavy tax on the succeeding incumbent. Hence, it is essential that a fund should be formed for the express purpose of supplying modest retiring pensions for the aged incumbents of poor benefices, unless such a system can be arranged as a detail of some sustentation fund which would cover the whole ground in connection with clergy relief. Such a scheme has been discussed at the last Rochester Diocesan Conference, and the following resolution moved by Canon Legge was unanimously agreed to:

That it is desirable to organize a "Clergy Pensions and Widows' and Orphans' Fund" for the purpose of aiding the poorer clergy to insure, or of augmenting the benefits which they would derive from insurance on their own account in the ordinary manner; and that it be referred to your committee to draw up a scheme for the organization of such a fund in this diocese, and to lay it before the Conference at their next meeting. That, in view of this, they be requested to place themselves in communication with the administrators of the Diocesan Clerical Charities.

The report very clearly enumerated the advantages which might be expected to attend the establishment of such a fund: 1st, reducing the clerical destitution which tends to discredit the present administration of Church revenues; 2nd, inducing retirement in the case of disabled and infirm clergy, and enabling the Bishop, when desirable, to urge such retirement; 3rd, facilitating the promotion of the younger clergy; and 4th, increasing the general efficiency of clerical administrations by relieving the minds of the clergy of much anxiety in regard to the future of themselves, their wives and children. Moving the resolution, Canon Legge urged that clergy pensions and endowments to aid widows and orphans should be separately considered. The advantages which would accrue to the Church by the comfortable retirement of incapable clergy ought, he believed, to win the hearty and generous support of the laity. It is greatly to be desired that some such action should be taken in all our Diocesan Conferences.

The ventilation of the whole question in conferences and convocations, and the zealous co-operation of the Bishops, could not fail to lead to some permanent result. The Church which has raised seventy-five millions of money during the last half century for ecclesiastical purposes, and which year by year cheerfully contributes, through her two Missionary Societies, a sum which would be more than adequate for all her immediately pressing necessities in the way of clergy relief at home, is not only able but, it may be sincerely trusted, willing to remove the reproach of an impoverished clergy when once the way has been made plain. If, however, the laity be unwilling to do this service, then the Church is established no longer in the affections of the people but only in the traditions of the

past; for very truly has it been recently said, "The readiness of the community to supply religious wants, as they arise, must be taken as the true gauge by which to measure the hold which an Established Church, as such, retains upon the confidence and affections of the nation."

JOHN W. BARDSLEY.

Review.

The Greek Liturgies, chiefly from Original Authorities, edited for the Syndics of the University Press by C. A. SWAINSON, D.D., Master of Christ's College, and Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity, Cambridge; formerly Norrisian Professor, and Canon Residentiary of Chichester Cathedral. Cambridge University Press, 1884.

THIS is a work of great value and importance, and must long remain the starting-point for Liturgical students and inquirers. The sources from which former writers upon this subject obtained their documentary information are in several instances rediscovered and re-collated, while several hitherto entirely unknown and unused documents are for the first time employed, to the great increase of our knowledge in this important portion of theological science. The whole work extends to 395 quarto pages, to which is prefixed an Introduction of 52 pages.

In the first chapter of the Introduction Dr. Swainson gives an account of the printed editions of the Greek Liturgies. In the second he goes into the extensive subject of "Liturgical Manuscripts." A very interesting account is given of the search for and rediscovery of the "Rossano" Manuscript. The Greek language had fallen into disuse in the Basilian monasteries in Italy and Sicily, and the Greek Service-books were taken from them and removed to Rome. Nothing remained by which the Rossano MS. could be traced but a description of its external appearance. Signor Ignazio Guidi discovered in the Vatican Library at Rome the octavo volume, which was "bound in dun-coloured leather, and labelled on the back with the Roman numeral IX in gold."

Several of the Liturgical MSS. used by Dr. Swainson are what are termed "contacia," κοντάκια, or *rolls*. The description of these given by Montfaucon is so graphic and interesting that we give it from Dr. Swainson's translation: "A κοντάκιον is a short rod, about a palm long, to which is fastened, and around which is rolled up, a parchment of wondrous length, composed of many skins glued together; and on it are written the prayers and offices of the priests, which they recite while performing their sacred functions. These contacia are written on both sides of the parchment, so that, when the priest arrives at the end of the roll, he simply turns it over, and commencing again from the same extremity of the leaf, proceeds to read the other side, and so passes on till he comes at last to the rod from which he had at first commenced."

Lady Burdett-Coutts has allowed Dr. Swainson the use of several manuscripts in her valuable collection, from which he is enabled to give the condition of several Liturgies in the eleventh century. The Liturgies thus given are those called by the names of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, and that of "the Presanctified." This latter term is a very singular one, and this Liturgy was used on occasions when the Eucharist was not consecrated at the time, but "presanctified," or rather "previously consecrated," "breads" were used. It is "the Liturgy of the previously consecrated breads."

Chapter III. takes up the question of the "Authenticity of the Liturgies," and it is with some surprise that we learn that the first record we have of the existence of Liturgies ascribed to St. Basil and St. James is of no earlier date than A.D. 692. Neither do we hear of a "Liturgy of St. Mark" before the eleventh century. The Coptic Liturgies do not claim the authority of St. Mark, whence Dr. Swainson infers that the ascription of the "Liturgy of Alexandria" to St. Mark is not of very ancient date. The "Liturgy of St. Peter" was formerly dismissed by Renaudot and other Liturgical scholars with contempt, in spite of the efforts of its original editor. But more copies have been discovered, and those of a character which demands further consideration. The Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil were more or less assimilated to the Roman Canon for the benefit of Greeks of the Roman "obedience," and the "Liturgy of St. Peter" appears to have been an attempt to manipulate the Roman Canon itself for the use of the selfsame Greeks.

In Chapter IV. Dr. Swainson considers the character and results of his work. His aim has been "to reproduce as nearly as possible, without unnecessary repetition, the manuscript authorities still existing for the various Liturgies of the Greek Churches." We can now trace the actual growth of the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom (so called) and St. Basil. In the oldest copy of the former—that of the Barberini manuscript—the Liturgy is not attributed to the great patriarch: two prayers only are stated to have been his. A few years later the Rossano MS. ascribes the whole Liturgy to St. Chrysostom.

But the most important discovery of all is that of the manner in which the worship of the Virgin Mary has been surreptitiously introduced into the Liturgies. In the Liturgy of St. James there was a series of appeals to God, not only to remember those for whom prayers were offered, but also to remember the actions of saints of old. Among these came: "Remember, Lord, the archangel's voice, which said: Hail, thou that art highly favoured! the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." Some years passed away, and the words: "Remember, Lord, the archangel's voice, which said," were omitted, and only, "Hail, thou that art highly favoured," etc., retained. By this trick the Commemoration of the Annunciation became an Invocation of the Virgin, and the appeal to God became an appeal to her! A similar process took place in the "Liturgy of St. Mark."

To his Introduction Dr. Swainson has added a "postscript," giving the Liturgical portion of the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which was lately published by Philotheus Bryennius, Metropolitan of Nicomedia, from the same MS. from which he had previously edited the complete text of the "Epistles of Clement of Rome." For comparison

with this Dr. Swainson has also given the corresponding portions of the seventh book of the "Apostolical Constitutions," which were developed from it about two hundred years later.

Passing from the Introduction to the book itself, we come first to the "Liturgy of Alexandria," which in the Greek MSS. is ascribed to St. Mark.

Next come the Liturgies of St. Basil, of St. Chrysostom, and of "the Presanctified," in their eighth or ninth century condition.

Then come separately the same three Liturgies from the eleventh century to the present time, the eleventh century form occupying the upper, and the sixteenth century form the lower part of the page.

Next comes the so-called "Liturgy of *St. Peter*," and then (1) the Liturgies of Palestine, so far as they can be collected from the statements of Justin Martyr and Cyril of Jerusalem; and (2) the "Great Liturgy of St. James," in four parallel columns from four distinct MSS. Collations of important editions and MSS. are given throughout at the foot of the page.

Lastly, in an Appendix is given "The Ordinary Canon of the Mass, according to the use of the Coptic Church, from two MSS. in the British Museum, edited and translated by Dr. C. Bezold, Privatdocent in the University of Munich."

From this brief account it will be at once discerned how vast a work has been done by Dr. Swainson, and how much there must have been to attend to simultaneously in it. If there had been no trips and lapses in such a work, it would simply have been superhuman, and any well-disposed reviewer would rather point them out for a possible page of *errata* than make use of them for a personal attack upon the editor. Such, however, has not been the course pursued by a reviewer in the *Guardian* (July 30, 1884), who has undoubtedly hit several blots, but has at the same time made so many blunders and misrepresentations himself, while speaking in a most omniscient and authoritative tone, that we think it our duty, in the interests of truth and fairness, to reduce his lengthy indictment to its real proportions. And this we are the more ready to do in the case of one like Dr. Swainson, who has previously rendered such great and independent services to the cause of Ecclesiastical History and Literature.

In the first failure of accuracy, which the reviewer lays to Dr. Swainson's charge, the blunder is his own, not Dr. Swainson's. Anyone but himself would have seen at once that "p. 180," on p. xxiii., line 22, refers to that page of *Goar*, not of *Swainson*. The references to the Coptic

[1] Dr. Swainson writes: "The comparison is most instructive. Dr. Harnack draws attention to the fact that the word Apostles is used in the work to signify Missionary Evangelists; and that whilst we read of Apostles, Prophets and Teachers, of Bishops and Deacons, we never read of Presbyters. And I would draw attention to the interesting illustration of the well-known statement of St. Basil (that the words used in the Services of the Church were not committed to writing in the earliest years) which is furnished by the clause at the end of Section 10, allowing the Prophets to give thanks in the Eucharist to such extent as they may desire. It will be seen that this direction was entirely altered in the recension contained in the Apostolic Constitutions."

Liturgy on p. lii. we have ascertained to be due to change of paging at the last moment. The references are correctly given to the paging as printed at Munich (1-44), but the alteration therein made at the request of the University printer has put them wrong. This is certainly unfortunate, but it is not an ordinary inaccuracy. It is the kind of thing that requires a page of *errata*, which, as we go on, we hope we shall prove likely not to be a very crowded one.

Passing over MSS. on p. xxii., which is just as good as MS., we come to a set of petty hypercriticisms, which we wonder the reviewer was not ashamed to put on paper. Why in the world should Dr. Swainson be bound to reproduce the obsolete spelling "antient" on every occasion of referring to a modern book, the title-page of which spells the word in this manner? Why grumble because "*Joannes* a S. Andrea" is sometimes so styled, when his name is quoted from a title-page, and sometimes called plain "John" when otherwise referred to. Bilingualism in the notation of dates is commenced at once when the convenient Arabic are used instead of the inconvenient Roman numerals. The only thing required in such cases is to be clear and intelligible, and when that is attained, what is there to complain of in the way a date is accurately given? It is an important matter, when an ell of cloth is deficient or redundant in a purchased piece, but it makes little difference whether "*Additional*" be abbreviated ADD. without, or (once in a way) ADDL. with an L. Such criticism we may safely designate ADDLepated. The first impression of the date of a MS. may be, that it was written about 960, while further investigation may fix it to the immediate neighbourhood of 983. It would be a pretty principle of editorship to stop all progress and improvement in a book, because the first sheet has been already printed. Why should not further inquiry render it desirable to modify some statement therein contained, and why should not the reader have the benefit of the modification?

The reviewer's wrath is highly excited at the heading of the Coptic Liturgy: "The Ordinary Canon of the Mass." "What in the world," cries he, "is the Ordinary Canon of the Mass? . . . The expression 'Ordinary Canon' is a meaningless jumble, and has no place in Liturgical phraseology!" But the reviewer does not know Coptic, and either cannot or will not see, that Dr. Bezold has selected "ordinary" as the proper equivalent for a Coptic word, which is probably as unintelligible to the reviewer as it is to us. *We* bow to Dr. Bezold's judgment, corroborated as it is (p. lii.) by that of Dr. Hörning, and say to the reviewer, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam!* Renaudot gives "*Communis*" as the equivalent in Latin.

We cannot sympathize with the reviewer's "regret" that Dr. Swainson identifies Gregory Dialogus with Pope Gregory II. We should like to know with whom else the reviewer would identify him. It is quite true that Leo Allatius wrote: "*Gregorio quem insulsè nimis Dialogum nuncupant.*" The Greeks may have been stupid in giving him that surname, but it is beyond question that they always did so, and Dr. Swainson simply states the fact that they did so. But perhaps Leo Allatius had then forgotten the words of Photius ("On the Holy S.," Migne, vol. cii.,

col. 395) : Ὁ μέντοι θεῖος Γρηγόριος ὁ Διάλογος, οὐ πολὺ μετὰ τὴν ἕκτην σύνοδον ἀκμάσας"—"The Divine Gregory Dialogus, who flourished not long after the Sixth Council." Photius does not say that Gregory II. was the author of certain "Dialogi," also attributed with greater probability to Gregory I., nor does he inform us why he was called *Dialogus*, but simply states the fact that he was known as "Gregory Dialogus." Photius, in the middle of the ninth century, probably knew more about the nickname of a Greek-speaking Pope in the preceding century, than Leo Allatius in the seventeenth or the reviewer in the nineteenth. The Greek MSS. so persistently ascribe the "Liturgy of the Presanctified" to either Gregory Dialogus (usually), or to Germanus (occasionally), that we must conclude that that Liturgy was re-edited and enlarged in their time and by their directions, if not actually by them. The impossibility of its having been originally composed by Gregory II. is amply proved by Dr. Swainson on pp. xxvii. and xxviii. to the mind of anyone who makes the slightest effort to compare and consider the dates there given.

If the "Liturgy of St. Gregory Dialogus" really be "merely a translation into Greek of the Roman Mass as arranged by Gregory I.," it is a pity that the reviewer has not endeavoured to add to our information on the subject, as it has been neglected, according to him, by Dr. Swainson. But, as already observed, the Greek MSS. so persistently assign the authorship of the "Liturgy of the Presanctified" to Gregory Dialogus, that, in the absence of further information, we should infer that the "Liturgy S. Gregorii τοῦ Διαλόγου," in the Paris MS. 2059, is that of "the Presanctified."

The reviewer goes on to say that "another, but chronologically impossible, authorship of the 'Liturgy of the Presanctified' is indicated in three MSS. referred to on p. 175, n. 1, of which, *alas!* the editor gives us neither date nor name nor press-mark." We cannot sympathize with his sorrows in this respect, which, indeed, appear to us somewhat hypocritical. Why waste space on giving special indications of the locality of a "*chronologically impossible*" statement?

We come now to a mighty count in the indictment. The reviewer says: "On pp. 195-201 Dr. Swainson professes to print the Gelasian Canon as given by Muratori." Dr. Swainson's words are: "I have taken this ancient Latin from the so-called 'Gelasian Sacramentary,' as reprinted by Muratori from the copy published by Thomasius in 1680." Do these words necessitate Dr. Swainson's treating Muratori's reprint after Thomasius, who is known to have taken liberties with the text, with the sacredness of a genuine early MS.? Is every misplaced comma, every mis-spelling, every blunder, every interpolation, to be reproduced exactly? For instance, Muratori prints *Barnaban* and *Agnem* (*sic*) in the accusative after the Latin preposition *cum*. Dr. Swainson restores the ablative, thus consulting the convenience of those who care nothing for Muratori or Thomasius, but simply wish to compare the Gelasian Sacramentary with the Greek. As to the omission of *Dei* after Domini in two places, we believe it to be the rejection of an interpolation which was really "an important and unwarranted tampering with the Gelasian

text." None of the older MSS. mentioned by Gerbert have *Dei*. Thus we think we have fairly shown that the reviewer's lengthy collation of Muratori's text with Swainson's "Transcript," exhibiting thirty-two variations, is a very useless, as well as a very ill-natured work of supererogation!

In p. xxiii., ἐνταῦθα μνημονεύεις οὐ θέλεις, οὐ is a clear misprint for οὓς, arising probably from the ς having been drawn in the printing, and then the accent altered to suit. On p. xxiv. Dr. Swainson does not profess to transcribe the passage taken from B. M. 1, part of which even the reviewer admits to be illegible, but simply says: "In the margin of the roll may be detected *the names*" which follow. Here the reviewer appears to have deciphered, whether rightly or wrongly, two names more than Dr. Swainson has given. He has also, *without notice*, taken four names out of the abbreviated state, in which Dr. Swainson had left them. νικοιωαννης contains νικολαου, ιωαννου, and αννης, while νικ. implies νικολαου. A pretty tempest in a teacup!

The reviewer goes on: "In the portion printed on pp. 82-84 there are the following variations from the original text;" and then proceeds to give and correct "*Swainson's Transcript*," which at the top of the next column he prematurely converts into "*Swainson's Notes*." Now as regards this *Transcript*, what are the facts? In p. 74 Dr. Swainson says: "The Barberini MS. has unhappily lost eight leaves in 'St. Basil,' but the differences between the surviving portions and the mediæval copies are such as to enable us to represent with full confidence the character of the portion lost; and this I have done, *following in part the guidance of Bunsen*, as furnished in his work on 'Hippolytus and his Age,' and in his 'Analecta Antenicæna.'" Thus this so-called "*Transcript*" is not a "*Transcript*" at all, but by aid of B. M. 1, Dr. Swainson endeavours to reproduce what would probably have stood in the Barberini MS., had it been perfect! This collation of the reviewer's may also safely be termed an equally useless and ill-natured work of supererogation.

So careless, too, has he been, that he actually sets down the variation of πόλιν for ποίμνην as a blunder of Swainson's, though Dr. Swainson calls especial attention to this curious reading—ποίμνην—in a note on p. 84! And he verily complains that Dr. Swainson has not printed in his text πίεται, for πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, πάντες!

In p. 156, line 1, B. M. 1 agrees so nearly with the text, that the variations are not worth the space they would take up. They are merely κεκλικότας for ὑποκεκλικότας, the blunder of τὰς for τοὺς αὐχένας, and the insertion of σου before τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ in a prayer of some length.

In p. 157, line 2, where the reviewer asserts Dr. Swainson to have given χερουβίμ for χερουβικοῦ, we must send him back to the British Museum to look again. We believe he will find a little μ (possibly, though, the sign for β) written over the end of χερου, which indicates χερουβίμ rather than χερουβικοῦ. The latter would be the more correct.

In pp. 160 and 161 neither Dr. Swainson's nor the reviewer's mode of collation is satisfactory. The reviewer's, however, is the most comical, amounting to: "B. M. 1 inserts four words, omitting two." The mode

of collation adopted in pp. 162 and 163 with regard to the same words is the proper one.

As to p. 166, line 1, where the reviewer remarks that B. M. 1 has only four words instead of twelve, he is right in the letter, but not in the spirit. It is just as if Dr. Swainson had said: "The Doxology is here," and the reviewer had replied: "Oh no, it isn't! only 'Glory be to the Father,' etc., is there."

By this time our readers will be crying, "Hold! enough!"

Admitting that there has been some carelessness with regard to the unimportant MSS., which Dr. Swainson says he has only used "cursorily," we hope we have satisfied our readers that the available counts of the reviewer's indictment have been reduced to a very small number, and that Dr. Swainson and the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press may rather be congratulated that so lynx-eyed and determined a Zoilus has been able to produce so few objections that can really stand the test of examination. However, it has often been remarked that the spitefulness of the learned towards each other is the main guarantee to the unlearned that the truth is really placed before them.

Short Notices.

Canadian Pictures, drawn with Pen and Pencil. By the MARQUIS OF LORNE, K.T. With numerous illustrations from objects and photographs in the possession of, and sketches by, the Marquis of Lorne, Sydney Hall, etc., engraved by Ed. Whymper. The Religious Tract Society.

THIS is a very attractive volume of that charming "Pen and Pencil" series, published by the Religious Tract Society, which we have often had the pleasure of commending,—"American" Pictures, "Scottish," "English," and so forth. "Canadian Pictures" reached us too late for notice in the September CHURCHMAN; but there has been time to examine it at leisure, so that we now can thoroughly commend it, as not only both readable and enjoyable, but highly informing. There are many admirable illustrations; some of the sketches of scenery are delightful; the photographs are most tastefully produced. Lord Lorne is obviously a good draughtsman, and the merits of Mr. Whymper's engraving need no remark. In an artistic point of view, indeed, this volume is excellent, and reflects great credit on all concerned in it. But the work, as we have said, not only merits warm praise as "pretty" and "pleasing;" it is able and instructive, giving a large amount of accurate, useful, and interesting information. As becomes an ex-

Governor-General, the author touches on the relations between Canada and England, and gives timely counsel as to commerce, trade, emigration, and self-government. Some of his statements are, in a way, suggestions; his remarks, *e.g.*, on Federation are statesmanlike, and will widely commend themselves, no doubt, as thoroughly sound.

We may quote a bit from Lord Lorne's reference to Miss Rye's labours:

Miss Rye and Miss McPherson have both shown how thoroughly successful such a system as theirs may be when carefully worked. Personal care is essential, but how many ladies there are, both in Canada and England, who could well afford time to follow their example! Provided that the children are brought to Canada when young, and that proper establishments under good supervision be provided for them, too many cannot be sent. I have on several occasions visited the Home shown in the woodcut, and nothing can exceed the healthiness of the house and its situation. The girls looked as though they thoroughly appreciated the good done them, in the happy life they were leading. . . . The official inspection had proved that the Government authorities were well satisfied with the institution.

As regards the emigration of women, we read, in another passage:

For women there is plenty of space and places, but the women who will succeed must be women who will work. . . . The clergy may be relied on to report wisely and kindly as to the chances for working women. . . . The cost of reaching settlements where there are no railways is unfortunately great, but if £8 be given to take women on from Winnipeg to places like Prince Albert, they are certain to be welcome there.

At the close of his review of the provinces of the Dominion—a contented and united family, with a population of five millions (rapidly increasing)—Lord Lorne remarks:

They are thoroughly devoted to the connection which exists between them and the mother country, a parent land which has allowed its children the utmost liberty. If it had not been so, they would long ago have cast off the allegiance of which they are now proud, and which is so useful to them, and will in the future be of such value to ourselves. It is our duty to cherish and to foster to the utmost those feelings of regard and loyalty which they express. They entertain these because their union with us is one of perfect freedom. We should remember at home what a strong nation their descendants must become, and how it is for our interest to make them satisfied to live under the flag we serve, for commerce always follows the flag; and a greater commerce, both for them and for us, will be obtained by an adhesion to the sentiment which has made them one with ourselves. Their countries offer to our youth, unable to find a proper outlet at home, an unfailing field for success. There is hardly a man who has left these shores and has cast in his lot with them who has not found it to his benefit.

Lord Lorne thus concludes: "Let those who see the misery, the hopelessness, the overcrowding, and the unhealthiness of the thronged quarters of our great cities, rejoice that within fourteen days of London, Glasgow, Liverpool, and Manchester, land and healthy life can be provided for all sound in health and limb. Let them aid all less fortunate than themselves to get together the little money sufficient to ensure a new start in the new world of the north, where in another century will be a nation powerful as that of Britain in numbers and resource."

Parochial Missions. By the Right Rev. ANTHONY W. THOROLD, D.D., Lord Bishop of Rochester. Pp. 50. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

In earnestly recommending this little volume, apparently a reprint from the year 1873, we may at the outset state what are its contents. The nine chapters, then, are these: the first, Introductory; then "Object of Mission Services," "Preparation," "Arrangements," "The Mission Preacher," "The Mission," "The Incumbent," "Incidental Considerations," Conclusion. There is also an Appendix on tracts, printing, etc., with an admirable synopsis of Mission subjects. In a second edition, we may hope, there will be a chapter headed "*After* the Mission."

On the spirituality and tenderness of tone of these counsels, on their sound, and yet liberal and wisely comprehensive Churchmanship, no remark need here be made. Dr. Thorold is, happily, well-known as a Mission Preacher, and over all his teaching spreads the glow of the Evangel. One remark, however, we venture to make, and it is this—the counsels in "Parochial Missions" are marked by shrewd commonsense.

We are glad to see this book on the great Church Society's list.

Memoir of the Rev. C. T. Hoernle. Pp. 223. Dorking: E. J. Clark, 16, High Street. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1884.

"This is the simple record," writes Sir William Muir, in his preface, "of a life of labour, earnest and unobtrusive, in the mission-field. The story is all within the truth. I had the privilege of Mr. Hoernle's friendship for many years at Agra; and having been associated with him in some part of his work, gladly bear testimony to the devotion and untiring zeal with which he consecrated himself to the Master's service. The charge of the orphanage at Secundra, near the great Akbar's tomb, devolved on him and his wife. They watched over it with parental solicitude. They were rewarded by the filial regard of the boys and girls, and by the confidence with which these, as they grew into mature life, resorted to them for guidance and advice. It was a work of faith and love; and many a bright Christian character was formed under their fostering care. Mr. Hoernle's pulpit ministrations were much esteemed, and a series of his excellent sermons was published in Urdu. Secundra (though since re-habitated) was wrecked in the Mutiny, and the orphan colony was transplanted to Allahabad, where the name of Hoernle is still repeated with affection in many a home."

Sir William Muir proceeds as follows:

Mr. Hoernle's intimate acquaintance with the native languages enabled him to render valuable service to the Bible and Tract Society at Agra. I helped him in the commencement of his revised version of the Urdu Testament, and was struck by the literary aptitude which he brought to bear upon that arduous undertaking. The version is a step in advance of those that preceded, and a material contribution towards a perfect translation of the Scriptures.

After a busy life at Agra and Meerut, Mr. Hoernle returned to the peaceful settlement of Annfield, at the foot of the Mussooree Hills. While my camp was pitched in the vicinity, I had the opportunity of again seeing him at work—the same pattern of apostolical devotion, ripening now into the aged disciple. It was a lesson to watch him, the enviable type of a Christian patriarch, with his dear wife, surrounded by their numerous family, and by a loving people, God's blessing resting on them all.

We may add that this volume is also recommended in some introductory remarks by the honoured Bishop of Lahore.

Dryburgh Abbey, and other Poems. By THOMAS AGAR HOLLAND, M.A., Oxon, Rector of Poynings, Sussex. A new edition. Pp. 220. Hatchards, 1884.

It is difficult to review poems which were published more than fifty years ago: and indeed to attempt it would be a work of supererogation. Several editions of the work before us, it seems, have found their way among the poetry-reading public; and friends of the much-esteemed author will be glad that in his ripe and vigorous old age he has sent forth a new edition. A portion of "Dryburgh Abbey"—it may be well to quote the fact from the preface—was the result of a visit paid by the poet to his maternal uncle, the literary Earl of Buchan, in the year 1820. About this youthful essay a kindly note was sent by Sir Walter Scott to Captain Erskine in 1823. The poem opens thus:

> "Dryburgh! I fain would sing thy towers,
> Thy ruddy rocks, thine oaken bowers."

As beseems a poet who under such auspices began to write, Mr. Holland is warmly *Scotch*. Thus, in writing to Mr. Wilton, Rector of Londesborough (whose graceful strains have been welcomed by many readers of THE CHURCHMAN), acknowledging the receipt of a bit of heather,

> "Fresh from its native tuft on Scotian land,"

Mr. Holland inquires:

> "Sprung it by lonely Sunart's craig-bound waters,
> Or in loved Cripisdale's romantic glen?
> Its bloom the blush of Morven's winsome daughters,
> Its stem the crest of sternly patriot men:
>
> (E'en now I view their tartaned clans repelling
> Hosts of sleek Southerns from the purple lea,
> And hear the bagpipe's shrilly slogan yelling
> Its dirge-like wail attuned to victory)."

Several sonnets, it appears, owe their origin to Mr. Wilton's brotherly suggestion. Of the smaller pieces, we think, some are by no means the least pleasing portions of the book.

In the Light. Brief Memorials of Elizabeth Phebe Seeley. By her Sister. With a Preface by the Rev. H. D. RAWNSLEY, M.A., Vicar of Crosthwaite, Keswick. Pp. 278. Published for the British Syrian Schools and Bible Mission, by Seeley and Co. 1884.

"In his preface to the story of Ida by Francesca, Mr. Ruskin tells us that 'lives in which the public are interested are scarcely ever worth writing; for the most part they are compulsorily artificial, often affectedly so.' And he adds, 'The lives we need to have written for us are of the people whom the world has not thought of—far less heard of—who are yet doing the most of the work, and of whom we may learn how it may best be done.' It is just such a life as is written in the following pages: a life more remarkable for its self-suppression and its reserve of power than for any brilliant and startling effects."

The preceding paragraph is the opening of Mr. Rawnsley's preface—very interesting and suggestive. Rightly to read this "simple biography," he says, and we quite agree with him, is to feel richer for the knowledge. "From every chapter goes forth the message, Behold how natural and

unaffected goodness is! How possible it is for others to be like her! and if like her, what a power in the world quiet, self-sacrificing souls can be!" Mr. Rawnsley continues:

> The subject of this memoir came of a good school. Religion, she was taught, was to be evidenced by deeds, not words. . . . As she grew, she wondered more why people were so eager to be doing *great* things. . . . Her catholicity of thought was not weak for want of the backbone of a definite creed, nor generous for lack of discernment. Charity gave her the clear eye. It was delightful to her to find out evidences of great holiness and faith and love in those from whom she differed most. The need of this greater breadth of charity was emphasized to her by her experience in the British Syrian Mission-field, to which arduous work she so bravely went in her Master's service. . . . Of her own actual work it was difficult to get her to speak. "Why can't people work without talking about it?" she would say. . . . As I think of her, I find myself repeating Wordsworth's lines:
>
> A being breathing thoughtful breath,
> A traveller betwixt life and death;
> The reason firm, a temperate will,
> Endurance, foresight, strength, and skill.
>
> A perfect woman, nobly planned,
> To warn, to comfort, to command;
> And yet a spirit, still and bright,
> With something of an angel-light.

Miss Seeley's character, as revealed in her own letters, in the memoir, and in Mr. Rawnsley's preface, is that of a prayerful, devoted worker—

> Content to fill a little space;

cheery, clever, and practical; with strong common-sense, and a store of humour:

> A creature not too bright and good
> For human nature's daily food.

The account of her last illness is very touching. They were in the mountains. In company with one of the ladies attached to the Training Institution, she started, Sept. 2, to visit a native teacher at a distant village. They passed through a village which, though unknown to them, was suffering from an outbreak of fever; and on their return home in the evening, Miss Seeley exclaimed, as she dismounted from her horse, "We are both very bad," adding that they must have breathed foul air or drank foul water. Her companion threw off the effects in a few days; but Miss Seeley became every day more poorly. On Oct. 11 she was taken down to Beyrout; on the 17th, the doctor (in the Hospital) said the fever (typhoid) had left her. But there was a change; and after fluctuation, the end drew near. She was waiting to "see Jesus." She opened her eyes wide as Mr. Mott repeated the words, "The Lord give you an abundant entrance into His Heavenly Kingdom." Then there was a short sigh—"our Bessie had gone Home!"

For nine years she had been Mrs. Mott's valued helper in Beyrout.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: The Book of Job, with Notes, Introduction, and Appendix. By the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D. London: Cambridge University Press Warehouse.

There is a good deal of scholarly and suggestive matter in Dr. Davidson's ably-written Notes; and the Introduction is full, as well as fresh; but the book is hardly conservative enough, in our judgment, as a book for schools. We agree in many matters with Dr. Leathes, rather than with Dr. Davidson.

Babylonian Life and History. By E. A. WALLIS BUDGE, B.A., Tyrwhitt Hebrew Scholar, etc., etc. Religious Tract Society.

This is a good volume of the timely and very useful series of the Religious Tract Society, "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge." The author's position in the British Museum (Assistant in the department of Oriental Antiquities) will make a few readers, perhaps, inclined to listen to him; but any thoughtful person who began to read without knowing the author's name, would be led on by a clear and simple style, through page after page of a very interesting narrative.

Principles for Churchmen. A Manual of Positive Statements on Doubtful or Disputed Points. By the Right Rev. JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. Pp. 460. W. Hunt and Co., 1884.

In this volume appear eighteen papers. Some of these papers were read at Congresses or Conferences; others are reprinted addresses. Three appeared in "Knots Untied." A little repetition, under the circumstances, is almost unavoidable. Yet the book, as a whole, is excellent: the papers stand well together, and make a very welcome whole; and few devout and thoughtful Churchmen who begin to read, open where they may, are likely to be dissatisfied. We earnestly recommend it. From the honoured Bishop's remarks on unity among Churchmen we may quote the following:

"For one thing, let us all take care that we do *not underrate the importance of unity*, because of the apparent difficulty of obtaining it. This would indeed be a fatal mistake. I consider that the subject is of PRESSING IMPORTANCE. Our want of unity is one great cause of weakness in the Church of England. It weakens our influence generally with our fellow-countrymen. Our internal disunion is the stock argument against vital Christianity among the masses. If we were more at one, the world would be more disposed to believe. It weakens us in the House of Commons. Liberationists parade our divisions before the world, and talk of us as 'a house divided against itself.' It weakens us in the country. Thousands of laymen who are unable to look below the surface of things are thoroughly perplexed, and cannot understand what it all means. It weakens us among the rising generation of young men. Scores of them are kept out of the ministry entirely by the existence of such distinct parties among us. They see zeal and earnestness side by side with division, and are so puzzled and perplexed by the sight that they turn away to some other profession instead of taking orders. And all this goes on at a period in the world's history when closed ranks and united counsels are more than ever needed in the Church of England. Popery and infidelity are combining for another violent assault on Christ's Gospel, and here we are divided and estranged from one another! Common-sense points out that this is a most dangerous state of things. Our want of unity is an evil that imperatively demands attention.

"I never felt more convinced than I do now, that the very existence of our Church in a few years may depend on our obtaining more unity among Churchmen. If disestablishment comes (and come it will, many say), the Church of England will infallibly go to pieces, unless the great schools of thought can get together and understand one another more than they do now. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' A self-governing Church, unchecked by the State, with free and full synodical action, divided as much as ours is now, would most certainly split into sections and perish. To avoid such a consummation as this,

"for the sake of the world, for the sake of our children, for the sake of "our beloved country, in the interests of Christ's truth, and to prevent "the triumph of Popery, Churchmen ought to strain every nerve, deny "themselves much, and make every sacrifice except principle.

"While we have a little breathing time and a little peace, let us see if "we cannot make up our breaches, and build up some of the gaps in our "walls. Why should the Assyrian come, and find us hopelessly divided "among ourselves? Why should the Roman army approach our walls, "and find us wasting our strength in internal contests, like the Jews at "Jerusalem when Titus besieged them? Were Churchmen more united, "we might defy our worst enemies. Shoulder to shoulder, like the 'thin "red line' at Balaclava, which defeated the Russians—back to back, "fighting front to rear at once, like the Forty-second at Quatre Bras—"we might hope to withstand Pope and Infidel and Liberationist, all "combined, and be more than conquerors. But going on as we do now, "disunited and divided, and ready to say lazily, 'It cannot be helped,' we "are weak, and ready to fall. '*Divide et impera*' is a maxim well-known "to the devil. 'The Romans will come and take away our place and "nation' (John xi. 48)."

In the *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivingtons) appears this review paragraph:

"We regret that the Dean of St. Paul's, Principal Shairp, and others, "have lent their names to give credit to the series of 'Lives of English "Men of Letters,' edited by Mr. John Morley. Mr. John Morley went "out of his way to publish a book—not, we believe, withdrawn—in "which he declared that he regarded it the duty of atheists to take "advantage of their position in the world to propagate atheism, and to "use active measures to effect that purpose. In reading this series of "books edited by him, we must not forget the principle which he has "laid down as that which ought to guide him. Take the example of the "'Life of Shelley,' by Mr. Symonds. Here is a man who, on the author's "showing, was a liar and a foul slanderer of those whom he was bound "to respect and screen, a fornicator and an approver of fornication, an "habitual adulterer, whose hard-hearted cruelty and faithlessness caused "the suicide of two women—one of them, his wife, deserted for a para-"mour on the eve of her bearing him his second child—the other, the "sister of his paramour; a man who made the hero and heroine of one "of his chief poems brother and sister, in order that their sin might be "one not only of impurity but incest; a man who, in his utter selfish-"ness, transgressed every duty to parent, wife, child, friend: defying "his father, deserting his wife and child, seducing one, if not two, of "the daughters of his chosen friend, and giving opportunity to his com-"panion (Byron) to seduce a third. And this man is represented as a "demi-god, as being far above all other men, then and now, spiritually "and religiously. And why? Because he tried to preach Fenianism to "the Irish people; because he propagated atheism, in season and out of "season, at home and abroad, with his pen and tongue, in prose and in "verse; and because he was gifted with poetic genius.

"Nothing could be better adapted for carrying out Mr. John Morley's "principle of the duty of propagating atheism. But we warn parents "not to be decoyed into admitting this series of books into their homes "by the unobjectionable character of some of them, and the talent dis-"played in them all."

Leaders in Modern Philanthrophy. By Dr. Blaikie (R. T. S.). An interesting volume, contains sketches of such workers and thinkers as Howard, Wilberforce, Chalmers, Titus Salt, George Moore, and Ellen Jones.

The Quarterly Paper of the British Syrian Schools and Bible Mission may well be read and recommended. The work of this excellent Institution has often been praised in THE CHURCHMAN.

In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* appears an able article on "Theosophism." The *Quiver* and *Leisure Hour* are admirable as usual. In the *Church Worker* is continued Mrs. Malden's "Workers for Christ." In the *National Review* Lord Dunraven writes on "Democracy and the House of Lords;" and Canon Hayman on "The Rights of Laymen in the Church."

A charming book for children is *Story-Land* (R. T. S.). Thirty-two choice illustrations in colours; a very attractive volume in every way.

A review of CANON COOK'S *Origins of Religion and Language* is unavoidably deferred.

We may take this opportunity of expressing our regret that, owing to a temporary failure of editorial supervision, the name of a venerable scholar was incorrectly printed in the article on *Recent Theories on the Text of the New Testament*, by the Rev. Edward Miller. Mr. Miller is not responsible for this erratum.

THE MONTH.

MR. GLADSTONE'S second Midlothian campaign has, in many respects, no doubt, been as successful as the first. His eloquent speeches were well calculated to excite enthusiasm. But in his references to the House of Lords and the Franchise Bill, and also to the Foreign Policy of the Ministry, Conservative critics have not been slow to mark weak points.

Sir Stafford Northcote has replied, in Edinburgh, with skill and spirit.

The Earl of Northbrook, an able administrator, has been sent to Egypt as High Commissioner. Lord Wolseley commands a Gordon Relief Force. What is Mr. Gladstone's policy in regard to Egypt none can yet tell.

Mr. Mackenzie, whose book was reviewed in a recent CHURCHMAN, has been recalled from Bechuanaland. The Boers appear to be managing matters according to their own will.

The ravages wrought by the cholera in Naples have been extraordinary. King Humbert has shown courage and sympathy, with the happiest effect.

The meeting of the "three Emperors" took place at Skernievice, near Warsaw.

There have been deplorable scenes in Brighton, Worthing, and other towns in connection with processions of the Salvation Army.

The enthronement and installation of Dr. Boyd Carpenter, the third Bishop of the See of Ripon, drew together large numbers of the clergy and of the laity. In the course of his sermon on the occasion ("The lot fell upon Matthias"), the Dean said:

It is enough for me to notice that by whatever process it was brought about, the designation of the individual was not of man, but of God. And this is what I specially desire to bring under your attention in the impressive ceremonial in which you have taken part to-day. For notwithstanding the intricacy and the complication of the political with the ecclesiastical in our National Constitution, still our laws and system of Government are based upon the truth of God's Holy Word, and our civil as well as spiritual office-bearers, from the Sovereign downwards, are solemnly pledged to accept and maintain the principles of the Christian religion; and we have now, as in the days of the Apostles, the recognition of the same testimony that the authority and dignity and blessing of the prelate comes from the Holy Ghost, and not from the will and patronage of man—the lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord. It is upon this principle, and upon no other, that we have as a diocese united in our prayers to the great Head of the Church for His holy anointing and blessing in the consecration of our Bishop, and now again on his instalment and enthronement in this his cathedral. Here within these sacred walls, and with the conscious presence of the great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, we not only stretch out to him the hands of welcome and fellowship upon his entrance into his new administration, but we honestly, prayerfully, and with all our hearts offer unto him as our chief pastor and Bishop of this diocese the homage of our respectful obedience. And in doing so we thankfully acknowledge the great privilege we enjoy in this our Established Church, for we have both our dependence and our independence. We have our laws and our liberties. For whether it be the episcopate, or the cathedral body, or the beneficed clergy and their curates—each has its limits of the restraint of legal obligation on the one hand, and of conscientious liberty of action on the other. In the due observation of these lines of relationship one towards the other, lies the true efficiency, the unity, the peace, the order, harmony, and brotherly love of the Church. Each has his sphere of duty, for which he is responsible not to the caprice of an individual but to the law of the Church.

The announcement that the Earl of Dufferin is to succeed the Marquis of Ripon in the Viceroyalty of India has been received with general satisfaction. Lord Ripon has not been very successful.

The Evangelical Alliance has been holding its Eighth General Conference at Copenhagen. The meetings were attended by some two or three thousand members. A strong desire was manifested for increasing union amongst Evangelical Christians, especially in view of the spread of Rationalism and Atheism. Great interest in the proceedings was shown by the Royal family of Denmark. The King and Queen, and the Crown Prince and Princess were present at some of the meetings. The Lord Mayor of London was amongst the English delegates.

The death of the Rev. Canon Fenn has called forth tributes of respect and esteem, in which most sincerely we ourselves desire to join. In the *Record* appeared an interesting *In Memoriam* paper, of which the following is an extract:

Canon Fenn obtained in his early years the distinction of a Fellowship at Trinity College, Cambridge. What this means is well known. He was also to the last one of those who are not ashamed frankly to denominate themselves Evangelical Churchmen. There have been, and are of course many still, who have combined similar or greater academical success with the same outspoken confession. But yet Mr. Fenn had, as was well known in Cheltenham, and by all those elsewhere who enjoyed his acquaintance, his own peculiar characteristics. Many Evangelical men who have gained College distinctions have in subsequent life to a great extent discontinued their own general mental culture. Even in theology, intellectual thought, excepting directly for devotional or homiletical purposes, often does not appear to have attracted their special efforts. The sermons of such men as Francis Goode, Henry Venn Elliott, John Tucker, and others, responded to the academical renown of their writers rather by their logical arrangement, lucidity of expression, and in some cases literary graces of style, than by attempts to think out difficult subjects, or to meet the intellectual perplexities of the day. In thought, and to a great degree in expression also, these good and able men resolutely kept to the beaten track. If they at all read or referred to writers of a different school, it would be chiefly with a view of guarding against what they deemed to be their errors. Mr. Fenn, as the Cheltenham public and his own intimate friends well knew, followed a different line. He conscientiously read and studied writers of all kinds, who seemed to him to be sincere in their search after truth, or who exercised any marked influence on the present age; and he studied these writers not only with the view of refuting their errors, but also in order to find out what was true and beautiful and good in them, and in order to enrich thereby both his own mind and the minds of those that came under his influence. In the opinion of many of his hearers, this effort was eminently successful, and gave to his sermons a breadth, a depth, a freshness, and a satisfying power, which they did not find elsewhere. All this was likely to have, and in fact had, a tendency to lead him in the direction commonly known as "Broad Church."

In another respect, also, the late Canon Fenn was especially amenable to the influences at work in his own day and generation. There was a spirit of intense reverence in him. He had also a natural craving for all that was comely, and a natural shrinking from all that was unseemly or incongruous. He had, moreover, as might be expected, an unbounded attachment to the Church of England. In other words, he was a natural subject for all those influences which in the present day lead so many in a direction opposite to that just named. In some external matters, indeed, he expressed a desire for a closer approximation to High Church modes than the writer of these lines and many other of his friends would have thought desirable. Again, he had a generosity of character, a breadth of sympathy, a largeness of mind, under the impulse of which he felt a strong revulsion at anything which, sometimes perhaps mistakenly, he regarded as unfair, or narrow-minded, or party-spirited. Of course he most frequently witnessed, or seemed to himself to witness, manifestations of these feelings among those clergy with whom he oftenest acted.

Notwithstanding all these varied influences, he never wavered in styling himself what he truly was—an Evangelical clergyman. His own

communion with the Saviour—we tread here on holy ground—was far too strong and too living for him ever to think that such communion could be dependent on any materialism or earthly symbolism, or human officialism; and his intellectual perception, quickened on this subject by early teaching, was far too keen not to perceive that where ecclesiasticism differs from evangelical teaching, and just so far as it has practical effect on the persons that hold it, that direct communion must be seriously interfered with. His experience of the Divine power of Holy Scripture was far too deep and real for him ever to doubt that in the Bible God is speaking to man; and therefore it was that notwithstanding his esteem and affection for many who thought differently, he to the last took up his cross, for a cross to him in some circumstances it really was—he took up his cross and said, "I belong by conviction to the Evangelical body."

The Sydney Diocesan Synod commenced its first session since the arrival of Dr. Barry, the new Primate, on Tuesday, July 8th, under the presidency of Bishop Barry. There was a full Synod, over 200 answering to their names. In his opening address, the Bishop said:

What are the practices and functions of our own Church in this growing community? There is, of course, that which belongs to all Christians and to all Christian communities. But there is, I believe, a special function which devolves upon us of the Church of England. Our position is widely different in many points from that of the Church at home. We have not, and ask not for, any exclusive privilege or recognition from the State; we have not, except indirectly, the time-honoured inheritance of institutions and associations of which we find visible symbols in the grey old village church, with the generations lying asleep around it, or the cathedrals which, in their varied beauty and magnificence, are a history of the past in stone. We have not anything like its material resources; for these are in great measure the inheritance of the many ages of the past, and not exclusively the efforts of the present. But yet we are unquestionably the heirs of its mission and its traditions. We represent here the old historical Christianity from which (unhappily as we think) so many English Christians have diverged—on one side because it threw off three centuries ago the despotism of Rome; on the other, because it seemed to them that not otherwise could they bear witness for this or that Christian truth, or, in some cases, for this or that form of Church life and government. That representation, I repeat, imposes upon us faithfulness, so far as this may be, to the old traditions of the Church of England—modified, indeed, like our political constitution, by transplantation to a new soil, but in their essence the same. In all our life here, at least in the ecclesiastic, I hear continually what difference there is between the new colony and the old country at home. It is true, but only half, and that the lesser half, of the truth. There is, I believe, more likeness than difference; and while the difference lies on the surface, the likeness is deep at the heart of things.

In speaking of unity, the Primate said:

What is above all other things necessary, if the Church of England is adequately to do its own work and to hold its right position towards other Christian bodies, and in the community as a whole? I venture to answer unhesitatingly, unity—a vigorous and energetic unity—among ourselves. Not only must there be no bitterness and antagonism of parties—High Church, Low Church, Broad Church, and the like—

varieties of opinion, faith, and practice there must be; and I for one shall always desire to give to all frank and impartial recognition within the broad and yet definite limits of honest devotion to the principles of our Church—intestine strife and hostility there need not be, and there ought not to be. But beyond this, it is clear that the very necessities of Church life here, especially in its early struggles, in new and remote districts, tend to an independent, almost separate, existence of Protestant congregations, each thinking of itself and forgetting the unity of the whole body. All this, especially in a comparatively settled diocese like this, should pass away. All influences which strengthen this unity we may well cherish more and more. The highest of all is, of course, this Synod itself, in which the collective voice of the whole Church is uttered. The next, in things practical, is the action of our great Church Society, the central focus of maintenance and extension of your Church organization, the means by which the wealthier districts may help the poorer, the well-established parishes those which are just struggling into existence. In a large extension of its activity I see the key to most of the practical questions pressing upon us. There should be another rallying-point in the fuller development of the work of our cathedral. We have no division or antagonism between episcopal and capitular power. We have a Chapter, and, though the constitution was new to many, I rejoice that it includes both clerical and lay elements. We have no legal confusion of the parish church and the cathedral. All that we need here—and I feel that I almost weary you by so constantly dwelling upon it—is greater material help. The Chapter has resolved, if such help can be given, to establish a regular choir—with, of course, the invaluable voluntary help which we have now—and a daily Church service. Is it too much to hope that some of those magnificent gifts with which at home we are so familiar, and which I observe are given here freely to University extension and public benevolence, may make us an endowment adequate for the work? Is it too much to ask at once that Churchmen will aid us with some £600 a year in subscriptions to begin the first part of the work? Such influences of unity, and others which might be named, we may well cherish. But I cannot refrain from a brief allusion to the same need in relation to other Christian bodies, and to the community at large. We desire no exclusive predominance, but we ought to have, in all matters of public policy, the influence which is our due. Have we this, as a matter of fact, on great social, moral, and religious questions of policy?

There has been an abundant harvest, and the thanksgiving services throughout the country have been especially hearty.

A newspaper quarrel between the philosophers, Mr. Harrison and Mr. Spencer, has excited much interest. Mr. Harrison asserted that Mr. Spencer had derived all his ideas from Comte! "This question is to me," he says, "primarily one of religion; to Mr. Spencer one primarily of philosophy." He adds: "The Religion of Humanity, as I conceive it, is simply *morality fused with social devotion, and enlightened by sound philosophy.*"