
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

MARCH, 1885.

ART. I.—MORE ABOUT THE DIACONATE.

THE subject of an "extended" or opened Diaconate has been already brought before the readers of THE CHURCHMAN in several articles. The recent debates in Convocation and the Bishop of Lichfield's address to his Diocesan Synod have drawn attention to the cognate subject of the employment of licensed laymen for evangelistic work among the masses. Canon Bernard has pointed out certain advantages which accrue from the combined consideration and combined use of the alternative schemes proposed, viz., that for establishing an office of "Readers," and that for extending the "Diaconate." Both schemes point to a growing perception of the great need (an "overwhelming need," the resolution calls it, which was carried in the Southern and adopted in the Northern Convocation) of more living agents to circulate the Word of Life, and to aid the clergy in Church work. This means "an increase in the number of the ministry," whether we think of ordained ministers who possess the prestige and official status of Holy Orders, or of duly authorized helpers of the clergyman in his ministerial labours. We are thus brought face to face with the important and practically difficult subject of the tests whereby the competency of ministers should be approved at the commencement of their professional work. This question is by no means so simple a one as some persons think it to be. The question is also, as now raised, complicated by the difficulty in defining the difference between the "Reader" and the "Deacon," regarded as evangelistic assistants of the Presbyter in charge. An important official distinction is evident in the fact that only ordained Deacons could assist in the administration of the Lord's Supper. The real need of the Church of England, however, if it is successfully to grapple with the

work of evangelizing the masses, is the increase of ministerial evangelists, so recognised and so regulated as to become a publicly acknowledged and effective addition to the present clerical body. Now, the proposed "new order" of Deacons is of a very limited description. They are "not to be under thirty years of age;" they "must be willing to serve gratuitously;" that is, they must, as the Bishop of London says, "be laymen who have education, leisure, and independent means." This plan may in a few places succeed, but it certainly does not provide for a large additional supply of ministers. We must have in the larger parishes and centres of population many more Readers or Evangelists, as well as make use of "the great army of Christian working-men," spoken of by Archdeacon Blakeney in his paper at the Diocesan Conference in York last October. But this multiplication of agents involves the application of tests over a wider area; and the question forces itself upon our attention how the qualifications of such agents may best be proved. The Bishops' resolution, in speaking of the ordination of the unpaid Deacons, lays down two conditions: (1) That they "be tried and examined according to the Preface in the Ordinal, and in particular be found to possess a competent knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general;" (2) "That they be in no case admitted to the priesthood unless they can pass all the examinations which are required in the case of other candidates for that office, and that they shall have devoted their whole time to spiritual labour for not less than four years, unless they are graduates before they present themselves for these examinations."

The recommendation concerning the Readers is that "the Bishop should satisfy himself of (the Reader's) personal fitness, knowledge of Scripture, and soundness in the faith; that the Reader should also be required to sign a declaration expressive of his acceptance of the doctrines of the Church of England, and of obedience to the incumbent, and to the properly constituted authorities."

It would seem, then, that the practical exigencies of Church work are pointing towards a relaxation of what may be termed, for distinction's sake, the "scholastic" requirements of candidates for Holy Orders, so far as the office of Deacon is concerned; and thus, as has been previously pointed out, "the maintenance of the standard of culture and attainment in the ordained ministry of the Church becomes the subject of practical anxiety." This has long been a subject of anxiety and questioning to myself. My experience of fifteen years as an Examining Chaplain and as a Principal of a Theological College chiefly intended for non-graduates, has given me

opportunities of considering from a very "practical" standpoint how far any such relaxation as has been mentioned is needful, and in what respects it may be, on the one side, useful for the Church, and, on the other, may involve dangers against which we have to guard. The danger obviously is that the standard of intellectual culture may be unduly lowered for the clerical profession generally, when relaxation of certain scholastic tests is made for the purpose of facilitating or widening the area of admission to the Diaconate. But I much question whether persons in general adequately estimate the difficulty of fairly testing the various capabilities of those who as candidates for the ministry may be usefully qualified in diverse ways and degrees. There is the temptation to make the technical tests too rigid and narrow, and so to exclude worthy, earnest, diligent men. There is the temptation, on the other hand, to be impatient of all restrictions, and to admit men simply because they are earnestly religious and wish to preach the Gospel. I have found, by personal experience, that to steer between two extremes—namely, that of sacrificing what is practicable to what is ideal, and that of too readily giving up a higher ideal for "practical" considerations in clerical training, is no easy matter.

Our duties in reference to the clerical profession are to take a broad view of the Church's requirements; to provide for a painstaking investigation which shall not be merely general, formal, and technical, but also personal and specific, into the capabilities of *each* candidate; and, so far as is possible, to have a judicious supervision which shall prevent "weaker" men from occupying positions for which they are incompetent, and to keep back the "ill-prepared" men until they are better prepared either for "the higher grade," or for the special sphere which they seek to occupy. I will make a few remarks on these points under the heads of Comprehension, Investigation, Localization.

I. *Comprehension.*—Canon Bernard seems astonished to hear "from so prudent a man as the Bishop of Winchester" the wide view which that eminent and excellent prelate propounds concerning the social area from which the clergy should be drawn (See CHURCHMAN, x. 209). But I fully sympathize with that view; and although I most earnestly wish that there were more university men ("educated gentlemen") from the higher social grades, who would come forward and employ their intellectual power, their refinement, and the personal advantages which accrue from superior and more leisurely training, in the service of the Christian ministry, not the less do I earnestly maintain that men who belong to "the farmer and tradesman class"—yes, and a "certain number enlisted

even from the class of operatives"—can become and have become competent clergymen, whose work contributes to the welfare of the English Church and of the English nation. In a National Church like ours, which, by virtue of its historical and legal position, possesses opportunities such as are given to no other Christian body in the land of reaching with its ministrations all classes of the community, and is therefore bound to recognise a corresponding range of claims and obligations, the field of clerical work is very wide and varied. It is a field which calls for and can employ a great diversity of workers. Rigid uniformity is here, as in other departments of human activity, impossible and undesirable. We need not a clergy all cut to the same pattern, but a clergy capable of adjustment to various sorts and conditions of men and of work. Some say, and say with much reason (and I agree with them), "We want a *learned* clergy." Others most strongly insist on the *social* qualifications of the clergyman, and will deprecate (if not despise) an imperfectly cultured candidate for the ministry, as if he were an altogether alien element to the profession. Another cry is, "We want *practical* men who can organize and administer." Some ask for a curate who can "preach;" others for a man who will "visit" diligently and take an active interest in the details of parochial work. Sometimes *musical* requirements come to the front; at other times a helper is sought for who shall be qualified for *missionary* work among certain classes of the population.

Perhaps the most serious objection urged against choosing candidates for the ministry from a wide area is the contention that by trying to become comprehensive we shall fill the ranks of the clergy with unlearned men. But is it not a fact, which, upon consideration, will be acknowledged by all, that the really "learned" and "skilled" element in every profession must be a small one? and particularly must this be so at the outset of the professional career; for it is professional experience which ripens, matures, and develops the mind of those who diligently pursue their profession, and imparts a knowledge and a power which not even the most promising *débutant* possesses, or can be expected to possess. In every profession there are average and ordinary requirements, and the capacity to meet these must be exhibited and tested in some way at the commencement of the professional career. There are also special branches of professional work for which some may be more capable than others. There can be no doubt at all about the fact that an intelligent and educated clergy is a condition essential to true religious progress; and Churchmen should have the maintenance of this condition deeply at heart. We must, however, take care not to narrow the term "education for

the ministry" to such a special range of scholastic requirements as may make it impossible for the average student to satisfy the imposed test, or may exclude men who, though inferior in learning and in power of passing examinations, might justify the choice of them to be "Deacons" in the Church of England on practical grounds, duly investigated and approved.

II. *Investigation.*—I choose this term as a wider and more pertinent term than examination. For the tests by which a candidate for ordination should be proved ought not to be confined to technical examinations, however necessary and important a place such examinations may hold in the course of the candidate's training.

In estimating the capability for useful work in the ministry of the Church we have to take the personal, the local, and the practical aspects of the matter into consideration.

(1) The primary requisite is personal fitness, *i.e.*, the competency of the agents themselves for the work to be entrusted to them. Good character, intelligence, and manners (or demeanour) are the three constituents of the qualification for a clerical position, as for any professional position which is to command respect, and to produce beneficial results for the community. These lines of investigation are implied in the familiar formula, that a clergyman should be "a Christian, a scholar, and a gentleman." The first essential in the candidate for Holy Orders is the spiritual character. Moral uprightness, the force of sincere conviction, the possession of religious fervour, and religious energy are an indispensable basis for the structure of ministerial usefulness. We can perceive clearly from the New Testament that the qualifications there laid down for the ministry are spiritual, moral, and practical, rather than literary, or scholastic. And in our own Ordinal, godly and blameless character is one of the principal requirements mentioned. The investigation into character and sincerity of desire and resolve may easily become merely formal and superficial; and it is matter for regret that testimonials are not seldom given, and accepted, in too perfunctory a manner. Referees should be careful lest by overstatement in praise of a candidate, or by omitting to state something that should be known about him, they give a misleading description: and those who have to judge of the testimonials sent in should not be lax in their scrutiny, where the testimonial is at all unsatisfactory. The second constituent of "personal fitness" is the possession by the candidate of a due measure of intellectual power and attainments. Mental culture must be added to moral and religious worth. The minister must be, in some sense, a man of "learning," which is to be coupled with "godly conversation." In this "learning," the intelligent knowledge

of, and belief in, the Scriptures should occupy the foremost place. How far a knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin should be required, is a moot-point among those who are interested in clerical education. On practical grounds afterwards to be noted, I am in favour of having a *minimum* test which shall not make linguistic attainments a *sine qud non* either in reference to general learning, or to the learning of Scripture in particular. A man may be "sufficiently instructed in the Holy Scriptures" by means of English only. The study of the three sacred languages should be by all means, and in every way, encouraged, as peculiarly appropriate for clergymen. But those who cannot, from circumstances, take up the study early in life, ought not to be thereby prevented from reading for the ministry, and approving themselves in English. Of the three languages the one which should be last abandoned as a test is Greek. Some knowledge, even though slight and elementary, of the Greek Testament should be an almost universal requirement. No one will contend for the imposition of Hebrew as a compulsory test. But it is urged that Latin cannot be an optional subject, because Rubric and Canon enjoin it. Let us see what is prescribed. The Preface in the Ordinal enjoins that a Deacon should be *learned in the Latin tongue*, while the 34th Canon lays down that a student who has not taken "some degree of school" in Cambridge or Oxford shall "at the least be able *to yield an account of his faith* in Latin, according to the Articles of Religion . . . and to confirm the same by sufficient testimonies out of Holy Scriptures." If this Canon is satisfied by a man's learning by heart and being able to write down some of the Articles in Latin, it is not a very severe test. But if being "learned in the Latin tongue," and being able to give an account of one's faith in Latin, mean the power of translating English into Latin, and of writing Latin composition, there are a great many graduates who in this respect are certainly not superior to the non-graduates, or undergraduates, who are by the Canon disqualified from being admitted to Holy Orders!

What we want to test in candidates for the Diaconate is whether they have studied honestly and with good results; and whether they are so far intelligent and educated as to permit of their exercising the functions of a Deacon to the glory of God, and the good of their fellow-men—and this may certainly be done by persons who are unacquainted with any other language save that "understanded by the people." "A competent knowledge of theology in general" is a very different thing from specific theological learning. There must always be a wide difference between "the scholar" in the technical use of that term, and men of inferior learning and powers,

who are yet distinctly superior to the status of illiterate and uneducated persons. Investigation of mental capacity (like the choice of candidates) must be comprehensive, and not confined within a too narrow or pedantic range. It should not be forgotten that personal interviews, and conversation, will often prove a more useful method of estimating a person's general capacity than an examination on paper. There was a time when paper examinations were too few, and their value was not sufficiently appreciated. The danger now seems to be that they may be overrated, and made to count for more than they are really worth. The personal knowledge of students' intellectual calibre by tutors (private or collegiate), if honestly and candidly imparted, in confidence, to the Bishop to whom they present themselves, is also an element of investigation into the applicants' capabilities which should not be overlooked. This might reasonably be taken into account in conjunction with any estimate formed from the result of an "independent," or of a "chaplain's," examination.

In addition to moral and intellectual fitness, it is desirable that there should be such a measure of social adaptability in a clergyman as may render him competent to win respect in varying social circumstances. Birth and education have much to do with good manners; but honesty of purpose, and a Christian disposition of mind and will, go a long way towards supplying the lack of what is termed good-breeding. And a man humbly born, and even passing his youth in circumstances unfavourable to refinement, may have much roughness modified, and manners softened and shaped by that refining process of intellectual with religious training which tends to make a man "gentlemanly," even when not a born "gentleman." Whether a candidate has had sufficient of such training must be judged of by the Bishop's private inquiries.

(2) Investigation concerning "personal fitness" should be connected with the consideration of *local* suitability. Some consideration of this point is demanded before, as well as at and after, ordination. It comes into the question of selection of men for the Diaconate, and bears upon their admission into colleges or classes, in which they are prepared for the ministry. If it were assumed, for instance, that all clergymen must be "theologians" (not in the general sense in which the Bishops' resolution speaks of possessing "a competent knowledge of theology in general," but in the sense of being learned men who can read the Fathers in Greek and Latin, can digest the philosophy of the Schoolmen, and write commentaries on the Old and New Testament), a very small circle indeed of disciples would be gathered in, either at the Universities, or other training-places, as *præparandi* for Holy Orders. If, on the

other hand, the fact be recognised that the field of clerical work in our ever-increasing population is as extensive and comprehensive as has been already intimated, then those who seek for and those who train candidates for the Christian ministry are bound to feel the force of the consideration that various spheres of work may admit of various degrees of intellectual culture and attainments. But the full weight of the regard to be paid to the consideration of locality belongs to the appointment of the clergy where they are ordained, and to this we shall draw attention presently.

(3) There is a *practical* aspect of the subject of investigation which can escape the notice of no one who admits that the supply of candidates for the Diaconate is insufficient. The test of admission must be one which will admit men who, on spiritual and practical grounds, are found capable, although they may lack the higher "scholastic" attainments which it is desirable for the clergy in general to possess. How far shall promise, or proficiency, in one line of qualification compensate for defect in another? The candidate for Deacon's Orders who is "over thirty years of age," though a "man of education and leisure," may have little knowledge of Latin and Greek; but if his means, position, and practical powers commend him to the Bishop, he will be ordained. Here is another case. A man, who has been prevented from learning Latin and Greek in youth, wishes to take orders. He is a man of earnestness, vigour, and gifted with some power of speech. He is between twenty and thirty years of age, is suited to the parochial and evangelistic wants of a particular place, is willing to go through a course of theological study, but cannot manage to study Greek and Latin with any good effect. Shall the Bishop refuse him because he cannot approve himself in Greek and Latin? Then there are cases of men who are between thirty and forty, who are willing to study for, and to serve in, the Christian ministry, and are competent for practical work, but cannot give their services "gratuitously." Suppose a man of this sort to be desirous of being ordained; but he knows "very little of Greek," and no Latin. He is ready to study at a Theological College, but the Principal has to inform him that a man of his age would probably be unable in the period of the College course to learn sufficient Greek or Latin to satisfy the current requirements of episcopal examinations. Is the linguistic test a fair one in his case? Or again, provided that he can obtain a title from a clergyman, should his age prevent him from being allowed to be a candidate for ordination on the same conditions of examination as the Deacons "above thirty years of age," who can serve without remuneration, viz., "a simpler examination than the usual one," which shall, however, "re-

quire a sound and intelligent knowledge of the Old and New Testaments, the Prayer Book, and the formularies of the Church of England."

But it will be said these are exceptional cases, and cases in which the discretion of the individual Bishop must decide. Certainly so; but the possibility of these exceptional cases being admitted, cannot but affect the question of previous training. It seems certain that the "linguistic" test will be relaxed in some cases. But if so, in what cases? And how should this bear upon any course of training to be laid down for men who have not had those advantages of school and university education which others have had?

The normal course should obviously include Greek and Latin; but might there not also be opportunity afforded for some candidates for the Diaconate who would go through a course of theological teaching in which the knowledge of English only should be required? I am sure that some men who read for orders would be benefited by devoting the hours, which have now to be given to acquire a mere smattering of Greek and Latin, to a more thoughtful and thorough study of the Scriptures in English, of Christian doctrine and evidences, and to more frequent practice in English composition, and in delivery of addresses and sermons. Might not Bishops, in any previous test of a general kind which they require before candidates come up for the episcopal examination, recognise a difference equivalent to the difference between "honour" men and "pass" men at the Universities? This would enable Theological teachers to encourage the *maximum*, while they admitted of the *minimum*, test. The knowledge that "distinction" in passing a higher standard would commend them to the Bishops as better trained and more cultured men, would stimulate all who felt they had time and ability to work for the higher standard. At the same time, those who felt that they could not compete for "distinction," would not be debarred from trying to do their best on a lower level.

A policy has been recently adopted by many of the Bishops requiring the "Preliminary Examination of candidates for Holy Orders" as a *sine quâ non* test for all non-graduate candidates. From that policy I venture to express, with all respect, my dissent. I fully sympathize with the motives which prompt its adoption. To exclude men who have had little or no intellectual culture, and are not well-trained in habits of connected thought; to exclude men of indolent and feeble mental attitude who will not try to learn although they wish to be teachers; to encourage and stimulate such definite study as may enable students to shape their reading in a direction in which it might be useful for them to undergo an examination

of a general and independent character, apart from the colleges to which they belong—all this is a legitimate and useful procedure. But the "Preliminary Examination" (originally intended to be an "honour" rather than a "pass" examination) is not adapted for an exclusive test. As a matter of fact, it presses hard upon a considerable class of students (or candidates) who lie between the men who are tolerably safe to pass the examination and the men who either from indolence or incompetency should be debarred from ordination. In the examination, as at present conducted, the principle is followed of not allowing any candidate to pass if he fails in any one subject, even though he may do fairly in others. This might act well in an examination regarded as an examination for special "distinction;" but it does not allow of that principle of compensation which would naturally be allowed in a "pass" examination. Again, the cramped nature, as I must call it, of the "Preliminary" in respect of the "double" papers, where knowledge in two wide subjects is tested in three hours, is very inimical to all students who have not acquired the rare faculties of conciseness, concentration, and facility of expressing thought in short time. For the superior candidate such a test may be a good one; and for establishing a difference between those who merit "distinction" and those who do not, it is well. But the effect of it in the case of average candidates is to bewilder and to oppress; and men who might, in *one* subject taken at one time, or with a longer period for answering, answer creditably, fail. I feel tolerably confident that, if Bishops would themselves really consider the character and length of the papers which are set in the "Preliminary Examination" in Old Testament (selected subjects), in Greek Testament, and Church history, they would come to the distinct conclusion that many candidates might fail to pass in such papers who would not on that account be justly excluded from an opportunity to approve themselves at the episcopal examination in those same subjects, presented to them in a simpler form.

Practical considerations should, then, in my judgment, induce the Bishops to treat the "Preliminary" (as at present conducted) as a "distinctive," and not as a "pass," or "exclusive," test. I doubt, indeed, whether any single examination fairly tests an average man's ability; and of this I am certain, that the honest Principal of a Theological College would generally be able to reply to any inquiries of a bishop about individual students in a way which would enable the Bishop to judge for himself how far the candidate had *prima facie* claims to episcopal consideration in regard to moral, intellectual, or social qualifications. For purposes of investiga-

tion, candidates for Holy Orders may be divided into superior, average, inferior (or dubious) candidates. Let Bishops encourage the first, throw difficulties in the way of the last, but not unduly or promiscuously discourage the middle class, which, after all said and done, must be the largest class in any professional body.

I have said that I doubt whether any single examination gives a test of an average man's general ability. I have been brought to this conclusion by my experience as an examiner. A single examination can always discover evident superiority either of knowledge or of intellectual power, and it can perhaps detect hopeless incompetency; but I have found that the records of several successive examinations form a more trustworthy estimate of the general capabilities of average students than can be formed from the results of a single one; and I am quite sure that it is a more accurate estimate than can be drawn from the results of a central competitive examination like the "Preliminary."

I contend, further, that on practical grounds investigation must go beyond the mere question of position in a class list. The linguistic test, for instance, sometimes brings a man lower down on the list than his general attainments and capabilities would place him. I know of men who by knowledge of Latin and Greek have obtained a place above those who were distinctly superior as regards general qualifications for clerical work. It must be observed that I have been speaking in view of a class of students who, without being, in a scholastic sense, "superior," do by a diligent and intelligent pursuit of appointed studies approve themselves as above the blame due to indolence or inability. I dislike even to seem to depreciate the value of "a classical education" and of literary culture. I am most grateful for the knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which, under God's good providence, I have been enabled to acquire; and I could wish that many more of those who are candidates for the Christian ministry could have the same advantages which I had. But, as has been already said, "learning" and the higher theological studies for which "learning" is useful must be a department for which a comparatively small number of the clergy can qualify. And it is surely indisputable that the practical work of contending against vice and irreligion, and of evangelizing the masses, needs not only the direct exercise of sanctified learning, but also the multiplication of commissioned ministers of God's Word, who, without being in the technical sense "learned," shall have enough of trained intelligence, moral energy, and spiritual discernment, to fit them for taking useful part in the parochial and evangelistic machinery, even though they may

have less culture, less polish, and less scholarship than others, especially at the outset of their clerical career.

III. *Localization.*—The theory is much easier to state than to carry out. "To place the right man in the right place" is a prescript facile to utter, but difficult to execute. Yet this principle is one which should receive as much attention as possible from incumbents, Bishops, and patrons. An incumbent should only give a "title" to a candidate for a curacy on the distinct conviction that he is suitable to the sphere of work to which the incumbent invites him, or for which he becomes an applicant. A Bishop should require the incumbent to satisfy him that there is such a suitability in the person whom he nominates. And if the candidate's qualifications for work be of a narrow and limited nature, he should be admonished that he will not be allowed to be ordained to the "priesthood" until he has approved himself by such further tests either of a scholastic or of a practical kind, as shall satisfy the Bishop that he is fit for full clerical orders. It seems clear to my mind that, with an extended Diaconate and the necessary widening of the area of admission, the lengthening of the period of the Diaconate will have to be more generally adopted than hitherto. The late Bishop of London mentioned in a recent Charge that the Deacons, to be admitted on the new arrangements, should pass "an examination of less stringency than that which is ordinarily required" for the Diaconate, but would not be qualified for full orders till they should have ministered *at least four years* in the Diaconate, and were prepared to undergo the same examination as that which is required of all other candidates for that order.

This prolongation of the Diaconate will bring out the often-forgotten principle that the Diaconate should be regarded as a probationary period. A man can be tested in and by his work as deacon in many points in which the tests before ordination would not apply. And if it came to be generally understood that a deacon would not be allowed to obtain full orders until he had satisfied the Bishop of the diocese that he was competent for wider work and fuller authority, two beneficial results might be expected to follow. First, the candidates for Deacons' orders who intended to be more than "permanent Deacons" would be stirred up to acquit themselves well in their first episcopal examination; and secondly, incumbents would be morally constrained to allow their Deacon-curates adequate time for such study and such special work as might be required to commend them to the Bishop with a view to their being promoted to the office of Presbyter.

What kind of examinations during the Diaconate should be required, and how far the specific needs of the locality should

affect the nature of the examinations, or of the reports concerning the Deacon's work which the incumbent would be expected to submit to the Bishop, are matters which only local experience could decide.

The requirement of a longer period in one locality (say three years) might perhaps prove an advantageous arrangement to adopt in many instances of a first curacy. The curate would have time to mature in experience, and would not be restlessly seeking for new openings; and incumbents would become careful to choose a man who seemed likely to do the work which the particular district or parish demanded.

The principle of judicious localization, *i.e.*, of adjusting materials of various sorts to suitable places, is a more elastic principle than that of endeavouring to exclude all material which is not of one superfine sort. The former is a comprehensive principle; the latter a limiting one. That there must be limitation is essential, but it is not less practically important that there should be sufficient width of view to secure the required number of workmen. The field is wide, and far from uniform in its nature; the labourers needed are many; they cannot all be "skilled" workmen in the sense in which some of them ought to be so; but if they be of good character, diligent, and competent for specific work in one or another part of the field, should we not rather seek to sort the labourers wisely rather than to sift them too severely?

I shall be sorry if my meaning in writing this paper is misapprehended. In speaking as I have done with a special view to that relaxation of "scholastic" tests which any extension of the Diaconate must bring with it, I do not wish to be considered forgetful of the great need which exists both of scholastic ability and of general culture among the ranks of the clergy. But the supply of such men cannot be effected by the mere imposition of high examination tests. The Spirit of God, moving men who have had superior social and educational advantages to devote themselves to theological and clerical work, is the only power effective in this matter. Meanwhile, whether such men be forthcoming or no, the number of ministers ought to be kept up in proportion to population, and to the multiplied needs of ministration (whether homiletical or liturgical, pastoral or evangelistic) which call for an adequate supply of living agents, sufficiently instructed to do intelligent work, and animated by the spirit of devotion to Christ, and to the spread of the gospel of God's love. We are bound to meet practical needs to the best of our ability. The ideal of a clergyman's training is that he should have a general and "liberal" education (as the phrase is), followed by specific professional

training. To obtain this education *in full* is out of the reach of many, who are unable to afford the requisite expenditure of money and time. If more aid were provided to help poorer students towards obtaining a fair clerical education, good results might follow. Mr. E. R. Bernard (see CHURCHMAN, vol. ix., p. 8) has made reference to "a Yorkshire parish" which raised its contribution to a curate's stipend from £100 to £140, "on the condition that the incumbent should find them a university man." Whether the requirement in this particular instance was that of literary or of social superiority, the readiness to contribute in order to secure a competent man was very praiseworthy. But a great deal more might be done for the good of the Church if a larger amount of pecuniary aid were forthcoming for the *training* of young men who may feel a longing to enter the ministry and to fit themselves for it, but are debarred from entering a collegiate course either at the University or at a Theological College by want of sufficient means to defray the necessary expenses. A judicious system of grants in aid to applicants who, showing their need of such aid, could furnish satisfactory proofs of character and of capability for study, would prove a most useful species of assistance, not merely to the individuals aided, but to the Church at large.

W. SAUMAREZ SMITH.

ART. II.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR. III. MARCH. ANNUNCIATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

A. THE LESSONS OF THE MAGNIFICAT.

"*And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord.*"—LUKE i. 46.

THE *Magnificat* is so familiar to us that the danger of not thoroughly penetrating into its meaning, and consequently of losing part of its spiritual instruction, is a very real danger. It is true that ignorance of the meaning of Holy Scripture generally arises from an opposite cause, the want of familiarity. We are careless, and therefore ignorant: we do not study these sacred pages: and neglect brings its penalty in actual lack of knowledge. Nothing is easier than to fancy we understand a form of words, when we have long been used to listen to it, or to join in it without understanding it. And when the question of understanding such words does not arise —when the persons who use the hymn are well educated and experience no difficulty as to the meaning of its language, still there is the risk that familiarity should result in want of

thought and reflection, so that habit should become a hindrance to us instead of a help.

For these reasons we may be glad that there is prescribed for us a Festival of the Annunciation. It is quite certain that there must be much to be learnt by us from the *Magnificat*—much to elevate us, to humble us, to help us in resisting the worldly influence that deadens our life: and in proportion as we learn these lessons, our joining in this part of the service will become a reality and a spiritual benefit.

What feelings of St. Mary herself are expressed in this Hymn which followed the Annunciation? The Hymn was not simply an inspiration. It came forth likewise from her experience. It must have been, in some degree, a manifestation of her character. What features of her heart and life are to be discerned behind that beautiful veil?

It may be confidently said that three features of her heart and life can be clearly discerned: and they all furnish an example for our own hearts and lives: first, her thankfulness; secondly, her faith; thirdly, her humility.

First, her *thankfulness*. The earliest words of the *Magnificat* express, above all other feelings, a holy joyousness of spirit. This feeling, indeed, marks the tone and tenor of the whole of the first two chapters of St. Luke—chapters of special interest to us in the Church of England, because they supply to us three Canticles for our daily service. Praise is the very atmosphere which surrounds the history of the Incarnation of Christ. When the birth of John the Baptist was announced, it was said that this event should cause "joy and gladness," and that at the birth of the Forerunner "many should rejoice."[1] When the wondrous announcement was made to Mary at Nazareth, the angel's words were full of joy. "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; of His kingdom there shall be no end."[2] When Mary and Elisabeth met, such was the consciousness of the unutterable blessing that was to come, that Elisabeth said, "Lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy."[3] And when the first Christmas Day was about to dawn upon the world, the angel's voice to the shepherds spoke of "tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." In harmony with all which was St. Mary's own instinctive utterance, at the opening of this sacred hymn: "My soul doth magnify the Lord; and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour."

And where true thankfulness is, there *faith* cannot be absent. In connection with the prophecy of the birth of John the

[1] Luke i. 14. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 32, 33. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 44.

Baptist there was a lack of faith, which received its just rebuke. Not so here. No announcement ever vouchsafed to one of human race was so marvellous as that made at Nazareth by Gabriel. There was fear, and there was wonder, in Mary's mind. It could not be otherwise. But her faith was meek, submissive, and strong. It was enough for her that the thing was ordained of God. With God nothing is impossible. "And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it unto me according to thy word." And the same undercurrent of steady faith we can trace throughout the *Magnificat*, till it comes forth at the end in the clear transparent recognition of the fulfilment of the ancient promises in which all the Hebrews trusted: "He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever."

Thankfulness is no enemy to humility, but very much the contrary. For thankfulness acknowledges our dependence on God on the one hand, and our own unworthiness on the other. Nor is faith an enemy, but a friend to humility, as the very same reasoning clearly shows. Wherever faith is the simplest, humility is the deepest. Thus we are noting consistency in St. Mary, when our thoughts dwell on her *humility*. And this picture of the heart and life of her whom "all generations call blessed," is that which attracts us the most, and leaves the last impression upon us. When she has found utterance for her joy, the next thought to which she gives expression is this: "He hath regarded the lowliness of His handmaiden: He that is mighty hath done to me great things." And from this adoring expression of her own feeling, she passes to the inspired enunciation of a great principle of the kingdom of God: "He hath showed strength with His arm; He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich He hath sent empty away." It is the eternal truth of the Beatitudes: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled."

And all that we read in Scripture concerning St. Mary, and all that we do *not* read, is in harmony with this expression of humility, which shines gently through the sentences of the *Magnificat*. She is always retiring, always in the background, always womanly in the best and truest sense. At the beginning she is a lowly maiden, obscure and unknown, in a remote village of Galilee: then at Bethlehem she bears her child, in poverty, and amid neglect. With motherly tenderness she

marks the sayings of her Child, and treasures them in her heart. She is full of solicitude when she fears He may be in danger.[1] She is present at a marriage in a Galilean country village.[2] Her presence, too, is faintly indicated when the Lord is preaching.[3] At the end, she is the lonely, afflicted mother at the Cross, in a crowd destitute of sympathy.[4] After the Ascension she appears just once, in prayer, with the disciples: and then we see her no more.[5]

From our constant use of the *Magnificat* we ought certainly to learn, and to learn well, these three combined lessons of thankfulness, faith, and humility. And none of us can deny that as the days pass on, and as the festivals recur, our personal experience supplies us with ever new reasons for praising God more and more—and while we praise Him, for trusting Him more implicitly; and, with this praise and this trust, for becoming perpetually more conscious how each one of those blessings is quite undeserved.

B. FROM NAZARETH TO JERUSALEM.

"*Annas, the high priest, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, were gathered together at Jerusalem. Then Peter said unto them, Be it known unto you all, that by the Name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand before you whole.*"—ACTS iv. 6, 10.

Nazareth and Jerusalem.—These words are brought into remarkable juxtaposition in the earlier chapters of the Book of the Acts: and there is a special reason, as we shall see presently, why we should at this time mark this combination and this contrast.

Jerusalem is the scene of all that is recorded up to the dispersion which took place at the martyrdom of Stephen. In reading the later part of the book, we are much occupied with active journeys and voyages over a large space of the Gentile world—Cyprus, Athens, Thessalonica, Corinth, Rome. It is not to be forgotten, indeed, that Jerusalem continues to be, even there, in a very striking manner, the scene of sacred history;[6] but in the earlier chapters, it is almost the only scene of the recorded events, the one conspicuous centre of Gospel light: and above all we must not forget—the Christian world cannot forget—that at Jerusalem Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

And in this earlier portion of the history, *Jerusalem* is often named. After the resurrection Jesus "commanded the

---

[1] Luke ii. 40-52. [2] John ii. 1. [3] Mark iii. 31.
[4] John xix. 25. [5] Acts i. 14.
[6] Thus it is the place of very important occurrences that are recorded in the fifteenth chapter, and in the twenty-first and twenty-second.

disciples that they should not depart from *Jerusalem*."[1] After the Ascension they "returned unto *Jerusalem* from the mount called Olivet, which is from *Jerusalem* a sabbath day's journey."[2] The suicide of Judas was "known to all the dwellers at *Jerusalem*."[3] At Pentecost "devout Jews out of every nation were dwelling at *Jerusalem*."[4] The opening words of Peter's great speech at that time were, "Ye men of Judæa, and all that dwell at *Jerusalem*."[5] When the lame man was healed, it is said that this "notable miracle was manifest to all that dwell in *Jerusalem*."[6] Similarly for healing, it is said soon afterwards that "a multitude, bringing sick folks," came out of the cities round about "unto *Jerusalem*."[7] When Stephen and his six companions were appointed, "the number of disciples multiplied in *Jerusalem* greatly."[8] And when Stephen died, then we are told that "a great persecution arose against the Church in *Jerusalem*."[9] Such, during the earliest days of the Gospel, was still the position of the "city of David"—the "holy city," as St. Matthew terms it in his account of the Crucifixion and Resurrection.[10]

But *Nazareth* likewise is made conspicuous during this early history. We know how prominent it was made (by words familiar to mankind throughout all subsequent history) in the inscription on the Cross—"Jesus of *Nazareth*, the King of the Jews." These words were read by all the multitude. It was the writing placed, so to speak, over the transition from the Gospel history to the Apostolic history.[11] These words of shame must have been in the conversation of every group. And now with what pride, if we may so say—at least with what confidence and courage—the Apostles take up those words of honour! "Gold and silver have I none," says Peter to the lame man; "but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of *Nazareth* rise up and walk."[12] Afterwards, before the high priest and others assembled with him, he said, "Be it known unto you all that by the name of Jesus Christ of *Nazareth*, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, doth this man stand before you whole."[13] Once more we see how the name was at this time in familiar and frequent use by what was uttered in the Council, just before the defence of Stephen: "We have heard him say that this Jesus of *Nazareth* shall destroy this place."[14] "This Jesus of

---

[1] Acts ii. 5, 14. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 12. [3] *Ibid.*, i. 19.
[4] *Ibid.*, ii. 5. [5] *Ibid.*, ii. 14. [6] *Ibid.*, iv. 16.
[7] Acts v. 16. [8] *Ibid.*, vi. 7. [9] *Ibid.*, viii. 1.
[10] Matt. xxvii. 53.
[11] It is in St. John's Gospel (xix. 19) that we have this mention of "Nazarites."
[12] Acts iii. 6. [13] *Ibid.*, iv. 10. [14] *Ibid.*, vi. 14.

Nazareth"—it is an evident indication of the feeling which found expression in the proverb, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" And yet this word "*Nazareth*" was boldly inscribed over the portals when the Church was first built at *Jerusalem*.

Nazareth and Jerusalem.—The Annunciation and Resurrection. Here is the reason for bringing these two words at this moment into such close juxtaposition. The Festival of the Annunciation and the Festival of Easter Day are never far from one another. Last year they were absolutely coincident. It is a concurrence that cannot happen often. Previous to last year, for instance, it had not happened for forty years. Whenever it does take place it always attracts attention; and the subject has given rise to various popular proverbs. These things might be worth noting on a different occasion: but we have graver matters to think of here.

Nazareth and Jerusalem.—From lowly obscurity to world-wide and indelible renown. *Nazareth* was a village unknown to fame. In the Old Testament it is never mentioned. It was, as we have seen, a place despised: and perhaps it was justly held in dislike because of the rude character of its inhabitants. *Jerusalem* was the centre of great events—not merely great events of Hebrew history, but great events of Roman history. Just about that period the eyes of all the world were fixed upon *Jerusalem;* and the Christian world ever since has felt that *Jerusalem*, even in her decay, is still a Queen.

From Nazareth to Jerusalem.—The road was familiar to the poor and holy family, in which the childhood of Jesus was spent; for in pious obedience to the law they travelled on that road on the festivals. One instance is made known to us in the precious narrative given to us by St. Luke: "They returned to Galilee, to their own city *Nazareth* . . . Now His parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover; and when Jesus was twelve years old they went up to *Jerusalem*, after the custom of the feast." On their return, it is said that He "went down with them, and came to *Nazareth:* and was subject unto them; but His mother kept all these sayings in her heart."[1] Thus are we invited, even in connection with those early days, to think of the two places together.

Nazareth and Jerusalem.—From the shelter of infancy and boyhood to the cruel experience and bitter agony at the Cross. We are led to believe that those early days at *Nazareth* were like the early days of other children. Certainly the suffering and shame of that day of the Passion was like no other day of suffering and shame in the annals of the world.

[1] Luke ii. 39, 41, 43, 51.

From Nazareth to Jerusalem.—From the Annunciation to the Resurrection—from the weakness of infancy to the majesty of a great victory—from a cottage to a Crown—from lowly obedience to a Kingdom which shall never end. "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name JESUS; for He shall save His people from their sins . . . He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His Father David." Such words must have been incomprehensible, when they were spoken at *Nazareth*. Now at the open grave near *Jerusalem* we know it all.

J. S. HOWSON.

ART. III.—BISHOPS, JUDGES, AND "CHURCH QUARTERLY" REVIEWERS.

DR. PUSEY'S "plan of the campaign," with its dexterities and its trivialities, has distracted the attention of Churchmen from an even less scrupulous method of Ritualistic warfare, which far surpasses Dr. Pusey's in effectiveness. From Bishop Ellicott's recent pastoral we may borrow the one word that describes the tactics to which I allude; that word is the expressive term "Vilification." Tactics of which this word is, perhaps, the briefest description constitute the mode by which arguments are sometimes met which cannot safely be met in any other way. Personal defamation, combined with perversion, misquotation, and misrepresentation of statement, is employed to take off the edge of unmistakable logic and unpalatable conclusions. Any reader of the Ritualistic press must be familiar with unrefined attacks upon the Archbishop of York,[1] the Bishop of Manchester, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and indeed upon any person of prominence who obstructs the pathway of the "Catholic Movement." It is remarkable how little reverence for ordained and consecrated men, how little refinement of language, and how little accuracy of assertion, are exhibited by some persons who parade their "reverence" for sacred candlesticks, sacred brass vases, sacred stone slabs, sacred silk lace and linen, sacred bricks and mortar, and who live in devotion to the "daily Mass." From a person who believes that each morning he receives "at the altar" "the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity" of the Redeemer we

[1] In the *Church Quarterly* of last October appears an attack on the Archbishop of York: but probably everyone understands who the writer is, and the circumstances of the case give to his article a peculiar flavour.

might expect, in the conscious realization of such a stupendous responsibility, ordinary courtesy in dealing with the sayings or acts of our Bishops, whose function it is supposed to be instrumentally to confer that "grace of the priesthood" without which no "miracle of the Mass" could be performed. We are well accustomed nowadays, however, to the consistency which vigorously vituperates individual Bishops while maintaining a theoretical "reverence" of the extremest type for Episcopacy in the abstract. But at least the culture of 1885 might have spared us a tirade against the Bishop of Liverpool like that with which some anonymous writer no doubt considers he has adorned the January number of the *Church Quarterly Review.*

The fact that the Reviewer is anonymous has one advantage; it frees the present notice from the slightest imputation of personal animosity. This paper is simply a brief consideration of the animus and arguments of the Reviewer as represented by his article. That animus is revealed vividly in a sentence at the close of the review, wherein the writer, with a bluntness almost astounding, gives warning that there can be no hope for the "reunion of Christendom" until the authorities understand that "the Puritan chaplaincies" on the Continent "must be suppressed." These Chaplaincies are, of course, those served by "Low Church Chaplains," a set of evil-minded persons, it would appear, who are actually guilty of the enormity of "fraternizing" with Continental Protestants! The Colonial and Continental Church Society sends out the Chaplains, and the Reviewer would probably "suppress" that Society also if he had the power. Bishop Ryle is a "Puritan" Bishop—as Ritualists not overburdened with a knowledge of Ecclesiastical History use the word "Puritan." If "Puritan" Chaplaincies must be "suppressed," it is a reasonable inference that a "Puritan" Episcopate "must be suppressed." To accomplish this somehow in the case of the Bishop of Liverpool seems the high ambition of the Ritualistic Reviewer. To use his own quotation, this is a "large order." The reputation of an English Bishop, whose name is probably better known than that of any other living Churchman throughout the millions of the Anglo-Saxon race, will take a considerable amount of suppressing before total suppression is accomplished. The tracts of the Bishop of Liverpool have borne the name of "John Charles Ryle" to the ends of the earth. His Commentaries, Letters on Church Reform, and his historical works, are widely known. With Canon Miller, Canon Ryle inaugurated the work of special services for working men; and as a speaker and a preacher he long ago made his mark. Abroad, Canon Ryle contributed to the uprise of the Reformed Mexican Church. In thousands of parishes at home, and indeed wherever the English tongue is spoken, his name is

a household word. The life and history of Bishop Ryle belong to a cause which Evangelical Churchmen maintain to be "the defence and confirmation of the Gospel." In the conflict with Rome and Rome's imitators he has been for forty years a standard-bearer and a mighty man of renown. It were strange if among all the battalions he has led, there were not men ready and able to say "hands off" to his anonymous revilers. It will not be difficult to show, I think, that the ultra-Church Reviewer has succeeded in "suppressing" not the Bishop of Liverpool, but any reliance we might be tempted to place in the Reviewer's own accuracy, candour, and courtesy.

It is one of the commonplaces of Ritualistic reviewing to express supercilious contempt for the ignorance of their opponents. Accordingly our Reviewer, in a side reference to the Bishop of Manchester, is good enough to inform us that the Bishop's "theological illiteracy is monumental." Similarly we are not to "look for much learning" in Bishop Ryle's "Principles for Churchmen," "far less for scientific theology." If the case be so desperate with two brilliant Oxford scholars like the Bishops of Manchester and Liverpool, what must be the "theological illiteracy" of certain dignitaries destitute of university distinction who approximate more nearly to the standard of the Reviewer's orthodoxy! I would humbly suggest to the Reviewer that in his compassion for the illiteracy of the Episcopal Bench he should start a "Theological College for Bishops," of which no doubt his own infinite modesty and immense theological erudition would naturally suggest that he should be "Warden." He would then have an opportunity of giving large circulation to such precious ingots of "scientific theology" as this which I find in his article, p. 268: "Christianity *lent* the word 'Priest' to Judaism and Paganism, and did not *borrow* it from them."

The Reviewer seems to be unaware of the fact that several of the papers in the "Principles for Churchmen" were read amid much applause at meetings of the Church Congress. As everybody knows (except apparently the *C. Q. R.* writer), Bishop Ryle, for many years, has been one of the most notable and popular figures at these annual gatherings. The papers "Principles for Churchmen" were written to reach the mass of Churchmen. To make an empty affectation of learning, such as one type of extreme men delight in, with quotations in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, besides extracts from the Fathers, would have defeated the Bishop's object. No doubt some people value a sermon in proportion to their inability to understand it. And a writer who can wrap his ideas in a mist is credited by certain readers with profundity of genius and knowledge. Prebendary Sadler, to whom the Reviewer alludes with ap-

probation, has a gift in this line. His books are strewn all over with the word "must." Moral and mathematical certainty are nothing to Sadlerian certainty! Tenets of musty mediævalism are freshly served up in towering assertions that, like the tall mountains, wreathe themselves in clouds. Playing cricket in a fog is an easy exercise compared with the labour of endeavouring to see the connection between propositions which "must" follow the one from the other. That blessed word "Mesopotamia" is not to be compared in magical potency with that blessed word "must," the Sadlerian solder for welding together statements which to less gifted intelligences have no discoverable logical or necessary connection. And here I may note that the Bishop of Liverpool ventures to quote Charnock, the famous "Puritan writer," and is rebuked for quoting from a "determined enemy" of the Church by our amiable Reviewer. But the Reviewer's own model Prebendary Sadler does not hesitate to quote the "heresiarch John Calvin" (as the Reviewer calls him) in support of the Sadlerian statements about the Lord's Supper.[1] And Dr. Pusey's "last gift" to the Church of England, the choice delicacy with which he titillated the theological appetite of our Catholic "priests," was the Abbé Gaume's Manual for Confessors.

One thing may be said about the "Principles for Churchmen." The papers are written with such singular lucidity that misrepresentation or perversion of the Bishop's statements can scarcely be discharged from the accusation of being wilful. The Reviewer, for example, tells us that the Bishop of Liverpool "considers the foundations of the Church to have been laid in Queen Mary I.'s reign." Now, we will not apply the Reviewer's elegant language to himself (p. 265); this "statement, if not stark lunacy, must be shameless fraud." But we remark that the only phrase the Bishop uses which could by any possibility be twisted to such an historical blunder, is on p. 2: "The Church whose foundations were cemented with the blood of Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, and their martyred companions." This learned Reviewer does not seem to be aware that foundations are generally "laid" before being "cemented," and that they might be "cemented" many times and long after they were "laid." But Bishop Ryle left no loophole for a misunderstanding. On p. 18 of his "Introduction" he says: "She" (the Church) "survived the tempo-

[1] Of Mr. Sadler personally, I desire to speak with respect. But inasmuch as the *C. Q. R.* supposes that Bishop Ryle is ignorant of that learned writer's "The One Offering," I recall to mind and record the fact that the Bishop was present at a large clerical meeting when Dr. Boultbee read a paper of singular learning and ability, pointing out the weakness of Mr. Sadler's argument.

rary suppression of Protestantism in the reign of Bloody Mary." In the face of such unmistakable language we must apply the Reviewer's own sentence to himself. If he perverts the Queen's English and the Bishop's English in the above fashion, "he must submit to have either his intelligence or his integrity called in question." Again, twice over the Reviewer charges the Bishop with his "avowed contempt for daily service" (pp. 266, 276). In this charge, twice repeated, the Reviewer seems mentally or morally incapable of fairly representing the language of an opponent. Jacob loved Joseph better than all his children. He did not thereby "avow his contempt" for Benjamin and Judah and the remaining brethren. Lord Wolseley is said to have preferred the Nile route to the Suakim-Berber road to Khartoum. He did not thereby "avow his contempt" for the latter. Such language is an abuse of words. It is meant, of course, like all calumnies, to bring discredit upon its victim. The rubric enjoining "daily service" is an optional rubric. Bishop Ryle declines to attempt to force his clergy in large parishes to have "daily service." He thinks they may wisely spend their time in taking the consolations and ministrations of the Church to the homes of the sick, the dying, and of those who never "darken" the church doors. Bishop Selwyn, in reply to an Evangelical clergyman who queried the advisability of having daily service when nobody was present, told him that we had in church the companionship of the angels. Bishop Ryle thinks that in overgrown parishes praying in church, with good angels, may be good, but fighting with the bad angels outside is still better. He seems actually to believe that all the good angels are not imprisoned in the church fabric! There may, perhaps, be some outside ready "to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation." He would co-operate with these outside, as well as pray with others inside. But he could not force his clergy everywhere to have daily service, even if he would.[1] It is singular what stress Ritualists lay on keeping an optional rubric like that for "daily service," and how carefully they ignore the first portion of the Eucharistic Rubric which says, "The Table at the Communion time, having a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church," etc. Our Reviewer is scandalized at the "inconsistency" of the Bishop. But the Bishop has not a monopoly of that afflicting complaint.

On p. 273 the Reviewer proceeds to make another misleading statement. "Bishop Ryle," writes the Reviewer, "avows

[1] In his work "Thoughts on Low Masses," Mr. Stuart depreciates "Daily Service" and advocates "Low Mass"!

that he is against a liturgy, and prefers extempore prayers, if they could be had of good quality." Yet the Reviewer is condescending enough to admit, on pp. 275-276, that Bishop Ryle's "'Thoughts on the Prayer Book' form one of the respectable sections of his volume." The Reviewer seems surprised that "he has so much to say in favour of the Prayer Book." But the Bishop's standpoint is plain enough. He admits that ideally extemporaneous prayer may be more effective than liturgical. I presume it will be admitted that the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel is an ideal extemporaneous prayer. If it were possible to have inspired extemporaneous prayers on this model, then, indeed, might we dispense with, and even be "against a liturgy," and in favour of the free and spontaneous movement of a heart filled with the Holy Ghost, and of the language of the lips that had been touched with a "live coal from the altar." But Bishop Ryle, while admitting this, candidly says, in language one would have thought unmistakable, even by a Church Quarterly Reviewer: "My own opinion is decided and unhesitating. I am by conscientious choice a minister of the Church of England. I think it is far better to have a form of public prayer than to have extempore prayer." ("Principles for Churchmen," p. 203.)

So much for the Reviewer's attempt to raise the "odium theologicum" against the Bishop of Liverpool. I fear one of the Reviewer's quotations from the late Bishop Thirlwall is as untrustworthy as his representations of the views of Bishop Ryle. In the ninth Charge of the late Bishop of St. David's, that singularly able, judicious, and judicial Prelate expressed himself concerning Transubstantiation thus:

> The tenet of Transubstantiation, decreed as an article of faith, combines in itself the two extremes of irreverent rationalism and presumptuous dogmatism. As a speculation of the Schools, it is essentially rationalistic—a bold and vain attempt to pry into mysteries of faith impenetrable to human reason. As a dogma, it exhibits the spectacle of a Church so forgetful of her proper functions as to undertake to give a Divine sanction to a purely metaphysical theory, the offspring of a system of profane philosophy. The rationalistic dogmatism gives an imposing air of solidity and compactness to much in the Roman theology, which, on closer inspection, proves to be utterly hollow and baseless. A conclusion is reached through a process of vicious ratiocination composed of ambiguous terms and arbitrary assumptions. In itself "it is a fond thing vainly invented" (*Remains*, vol. ii., pp. 163, 164).

This is a portion of the very paragraph from which the Reviewer makes his second quotation.[1] With this scathing description of the doctrine before his eyes, how could he put into Bishop Thirlwall's mouth this statement: "Transubstantia-

[1] "Apart from the express admission of Transubstantiation, . . . I think there can hardly be any description of the Real Presence which would not be found to be authorized by the language of eminent divines of

tion may be proved by most certain warrant of Scripture" (p. 260)? It is simply incredible that the statement I have quoted, and this one which the Reviewer declares to have been made on a "public occasion," can have come from the same person—at any rate without a complete alteration of his opinions. I challenge the Reviewer to give "chapter and verse" for his quotation. I challenge him to name the "public occasion" to which he refers, and to give the setting and the context of the passage. We have not yet forgotten that Canon M'Coll circulated a charge against Bishop Thirlwall of having been "a party to the hounding of Dr. Newman out of the Church of England." The Bishop repudiated and disproved the unfounded accusation in that masterpiece of crushing argument and placid irony, his "Note C, Bishop Jeremy Taylor and Mr. M'Coll," in the Appendix to the 2nd vol. of his "Literary and Theological Remains."

Much reliance is not to be placed on the Reviewer's reference to the Bennett Judgment. He tells us that "The very tenets of Eucharistic Sacrifice and Real Presence which he (the Bishop of Liverpool) asserts to be the crucial articles of the whole controversy have been declared legally tenable within the Church of England." This statement is untrue. If by "Eucharistic Sacrifice" the Reviewer means, as the Bishop puts it "Propitiatory Sacrifice," and by "Real Presence" he means, as the Bishop puts it, a "Real Presence besides that in the heart of believers," then both these tenets were condemned by the "Bennett" judgment. Section II. of the judgment runs thus:

"The next charge against the Respondent is that he has maintained that the Communion Table is an Altar of Sacrifice at which the priest appears in a sacerdotal position at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and that at such celebration there is a real sacrifice or offering of our Lord by the ministering priest, in which the mediation of our Lord ascends from the Altar to plead for the sins of men."

"The Church of England does not by her Articles or Formularies teach or affirm the doctrine maintained by the Respondent," was the declaration of the Judicial Committee.

The Bennett judgment further on reaffirms the judgment in Westerton *v.* Liddell, in which the decision ran: "It was no longer to be an altar of sacrifice, but merely a table at which the communicants were to partake of the Lord's Supper." The word "sacrifice" being a term of various meanings, the Judges distinctly condemn the Roman doctrine, with Bishop Bull, who

---

our Church; and I am not aware, and do not believe, that our most advanced Ritualists have in fact overstepped those very ample bounds." So wrote the Bishop, as the Reviewer remarks, in 1866. In 1869 he was one of the judges who condemned Ridsdale. And in 1872 his Charge approved of the Bennett Judgment. Even in his Charge for 1866 he describes Ritualism as "a very decided and rapid movement towards Rome."

says, "In the Eucharist Christ is offered, not hypostatically, as the Trent Fathers have determined, for so He was but once offered, but commemoratively only." Bishop Bull quotes something very like Zwinglian language as to the consecrated elements. He says: "In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the Bread and Wine 'as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of His precious Body.' (They are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy.)"

Mr. Bennett (like our Scientific Reviewer) did not so definitely define and use the word "sacrifice" as to make it clear to the Judges he was in conflict with the Articles. On this point, as on others, he escaped by getting the "benefit of the doubt." He had a similarly narrow escape as to the "Real Presence." The Judges declare, that "any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiver, the Church does not by her Articles and Formularies affirm." They regret the "extra-judicial statement" of Sir R. Phillimore, in which that Judge says: "To describe the mode of presence as objective, real, actual, spiritual, is certainly not contrary to law." After such a judgment, surely, Ritualists would have found it difficult to remain in the Church but for the phrase "Privy Council judgments." To be a "tolerated heretic," as Archdeacon Denison described himself, is scarcely a desirable position.

Much reliance cannot be placed on the Reviewer's criticism *in re* the Ridsdale judgment. Of course, to him the gossip of Sir Fitzroy Kelly outvalues everything the majority of the Judges could say. He tells us the Judges acted on false law, and law which they knew to be false. He describes the finding as a "deliberate misinterpretation of the law" (p. 265). No graver charge, surely, could be brought against the Judges than this. Who were the Judges? Lord Cairns, Lord Selborne, Sir J. W. Colville, the Lord Chief Baron, Sir R. Phillimore, Lord Justice James, Sir M. E. Smith, Sir R. P. Collier, Sir B. Brett, Sir R. Amphlett, Archbishop Tait, Bishops of Chichester, St. Asaph, Ely, and St. David's. To bring against these Judges, of whom five belonged to the Episcopate, the "railing accusation" of the "Church" Reviewer, indicates a hardihood of calumny which might extort wonderment even from some of the least scrupulous of the writers of our "Society journals." No Ritualist can get over the grim fact, that from 1662, after Crown, Parliament, and Convocation had ratified the rubric which according to Ritualists legalizes the Vestments, these "everyday garments" of pagan antiquity—which had for the first half-a-dozen centuries of the Christian era no more sacred or sacerdotal signification than ulsters, mackintoshes and smock-frocks have to-day—have been left till recent times in the general disuse and oblivion which had overtaken them

in Elizabeth's reign. In order, therefore, to understand their continued disuse, we have to suppose that Crown, Bishops, priests, and people have been ever since leagued in a gigantic conspiracy to "suppress" the vestments, despite the rubric passed, according to Ritualists, expressly to enjoin, "retain," and restore them. Will the Reviewer find any dozen "beef-witted" citizens who will accept this monstrous conclusion from his premises?

But the one fact, not to be gainsaid, of the desuetude of these interesting relics of the everyday life of ancient paganism, disposes absolutely of wild assertions and reckless statements as to the legality of the Vestments. Even in his discussion of the Ridsdale Case, we are not permitted to rely on the Reviewer's presentation of facts. He tells us the Advertisements were not issued by the Queen at all, but by Archbishop Parker, on his own authority. Then they had some "spiritual" authority, but because they had not got the imprimatur of "Cæsar," because they had not, according to the Ritualistic Reviewer, "secular" authority, they are of no validity! Charming consistency this. Admirable "clearness of thought." Here is unblushing brazen "Erastianism" in the *Church Quarterly Review* itself. We were always taught to believe "Cæsar" the bugbear and bogey of Ritualism, and Erastianism the "abomination of desolation." But it appears that if "Cæsar," or anybody else, spiritual or secular, will but order, or even refrain from rejecting, in the Ritual of the Church of England, the "old clothes" of ancient lay paganism, then "Cæsar" may expect to be lauded to the skies, while Archbishops and Bishops are being pilloried and pelted by the very men who trace their "orders" to these spiritual fathers! But, alas for the Ritualistic Reviewer and his friend the Elizabethan "Cæsar"! and alas for another misleading quotation! The Reviewer informs us that Prime Minister Cecil endorsed them (the Advertisements) with the words, "These were not authorized nor published." The Reviewer does not inform us that Cecil's endorsement was only upon a draft of the Advertisements. If the Reviewer knew this, he ought to have mentioned it; if he did not know it, would it not be wiser to speak somewhat more modestly as to the "theological illiteracy" of English Bishops? The Archbishops and Bishops finally issued the Advertisements under the "Queen's authority," and acted on them. Grindal, Bishop of London, writes to the Dean of St. Paul's, charging him "with all convenient speed" to prescribe to all his staff, under pain of deprivation, to "prepare forthwith and to wear such habit and apparel as is ordained by the Queen's Majesty's authority expressed in the treatie intituled the Advertisement." Were the Archbishops and

Bishops guilty of a "shameless fraud"? And was Convocation thrice over guilty of the same, when, as Sir E. Beckett points out, in their Canons of 1571, 1603, and 1640, they refer directly or indirectly to "the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory." To assert this, in the case of anyone acquainted with the facts, would be, not "monumental illiteracy," but monumental inveracity.

If the sacerdotal vestments be illegal, it is an easy inference that sacerdotalism itself is out of place in the Church of England. The nude may be tolerated in art, but undressed sacerdotalism is intolerable in religion. If the Church of England got rid of the clothes, it follows—and the conclusion does not need a Sadlerian "must" to enforce its transparent validity—that the Church intended to get rid of the thing.[1] Bishop Ryle points out, with inexorable logic, that nowhere in the New Testament is the minister of the Gospel called a "sacrificing priest." Even Canon Carter and Prebendary Sadler admit this. *Hiereus* is absent from the New Testament, as "altar" is from the Prayer Book. The participle, indeed, is used in Romans xv. 16, but in a figurative application. He points out also that the Articles use in the Latin the word *presbyteri* for "priests," instead of *sacerdotes*, which might be supposed to indicate "sacrificing priests." The unlucky Reviewer rejoins that "Bishop Ryle does not know the Latin heading of Article XXXII. is *De conjugio sacerdotum*" (thereby identifying sacerdos and presbyter). If the Bishop does not know the heading, the Reviewer appears to be not less ignorant of the Article itself, for this shows that even the use of the term "sacerdos" does not imply the slightest sanction to the idea of a sacrificing priesthood. Under the term "sacerdos," the Article subsumes Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ("*Episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconis*"). It identifies even the deacon with the "sacerdos," and thereby annihilates any possible sacrificial signification in the former word. Indeed, into the words "sacerdos" and "priest," as into the word "villain," an evil signification has been infused. But "at the beginning it was not so." Even the very expression "Mass" seems palpably to come from *mensa*, through the French *messe;* and the "lighted candles on the altar" are a survival of the fact that originally the sacrament was an evening rite at a table! And the Roman Missal, with its "*fiat nobis*," contains in its own bosom the proof of the falsity of the superstition which has usurped the place of the original primitive and catholic doctrine. "Before shooting his rubbish on the top of the Altar,"

[1] On the subject of the Christian ministry the *C. Q.* Reviewer assures his readers that the Bishop "always talks pure nonsense." Delightfully polished method of meeting an argument, this!

to apply to the Ritualist the "cultured" language in which our Reviewer addresses Bishop Ryle, he might, as a "seeker after truth," make some slight inquiry as to the primitive meaning of theological terms and as to the primitive celebration of the Eucharist. He will find that "lights" were not used by day, and that the priestly vestments were simply the "every-day garments of the ancient world."

If the table be an "Altar-throne," did anyone ever see an earthly sovereign seated on a throne surrounded by a blaze of candles and an embellishment of brass vases? Would any earthly monarch tolerate the toys and puerilities with which Ritualists profess to show reverence to the "King Eternal"? I have seen many Continental churches whose Altars were incrusted with the *débris* of candles and of flowers, artificial and real, and dust. Verily such seemed about the last sort of throne on which any earthly potentate would take his seat! Yet "reverence" reserves such reception for "Heaven's Eternal King," and rebukes the "Veiled Deism" which would supplant the paltry idolatries of the body by the spiritual adoration of the soul.

The Reviewer refers us, as others have done, to the Apocalypse for the use of vestments, incense, and processions. As to vestments, the priests there are clad in "fine linen," which is "the righteousness of saints." The processions are led by the Lamb to the living fountains of water, and the Hand of God wipes away the tear from every eye. What resemblance can be rightly imagined betwixt these things and the flaring processions of some churches, is only to be explained by a Ritualist. One may just venture to suggest that there is little of "reverence" in the ritualistic representation of heavenly mysteries. And when the representation is repudiated by the highest authorities in the Church and State, it becomes good citizens, as well as the teachers of religion, to avoid degrading the dread pictures of the Apocalypse to the level of spectacular shows on earth. (See Bishop Thirlwall's note, *Remains*, vol. ii. p. 150.)

The Reviewer "on absolution" is as unreliable as on most other topics; but on this he boldly challenges the Bishop's "intelligence or integrity." Brave Reviewer, but somewhat uninstructed! I gather that he deduces the prerogative of absolution from the celebrated text John xx. 23. He does not seem to have heard, or he suppresses the fact, that for twelve centuries after Christ this text was not used in the ordination of any priest in Eastern or Western Christendom. This uncomfortable incident disposes of the Reviewer's "scientific theology" so far as it relates to priestly absolution. Even, however, if this text had been so used, everybody—except, perhaps, some Ritualistic Reviewers—is aware that it

has been explained over and over again as conferring simply declaratory authority, as in the case of the prophet whom God set over the nations to "root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant"—that is, to declare such things should take place. The Reviewer brings forward, with all the air of a new discovery of his own, the Presbyterian Absolution from John Knox's "Book of Common Order." It is an outrage on the part of Bishop Ryle to quote from Charnock, but our Reviewer does not scruple to appeal even to John Knox! However, his appeal is a sword of which he has hold by the blade. What Ritualists want is private auricular confession,[1] with sacramental absolution by the priest. What John Knox authorized was "Public Repentance"—public acknowledgment of wrong-doing, and public absolution by the minister with the consent of the "whole ministry and Church." Very different matters indeed! The Reviewer's quotation was long ago used by the late Canon Blakeney to vindicate the Visitation Service from the imputation of being a "Roman survival." Even the Reviewer will, perhaps, admit that there are no "priests" in his sense in John Knox's Communion. If the Presbyterian form, then, be couched in such strong language, without committing the Presbyterian Church in the slightest degree to sacramental and auricular confession, much less do the feebler forms of our own Prayer Book involve the "revived Confessional" of the Ritualists. I forbear to dwell on the style in which even the words of Bishop Jewell have been mutilated—mutilated to make him appear as an advocate of "Confession in the Church of England"—by one of its apologists. The thing is bad in itself, and its advocacy is too often tinged with a disregard of accuracy almost appalling.

One of the statements to which the Reviewer commits himself in his attack on the sixth of the Bishop's papers runs thus:

> In the paper named "Thoughts on the Church" we are treated to a long discussion of that wholly unscriptural figment, the Invisible Church.

[1] The Reviewer seems wholly ignorant that the "judicious Hooker" ("Eccl. Pol.," lib. iv., p. 168, vol. ii., Oxford ed. 1843) makes the following assertion: "I dare boldly affirm that for many hundred years after Christ the fathers held no such opinion; they did not gather by our Saviour's words (St. John xx. 23) any such necessity of seeking the priest's absolution by secret and (as they now term it) sacramental confession. Public confession they thought necessary by way of discipline, not private confession as of the nature of a sacrament, necessary." "Monumental illiteracy" as regards the writings of the great English divines seems to be the mental condition of our Reviewer. With all the courage and, perchance, fanaticism of a Soudanese Arab, he seems as ill-furnished for controversial conflict as the disciples of the Madhi for campaigning against the arms and valour of English troops.

which never appeared in Christian literature till the new sectaries of the sixteenth century were driven to invent it as a mode of escape from the difficulty of explaining how their brand-new societies could be in any sense the Church which had been set up fifteen hundred years before. The only invisible Church known to Christian Theology consists of the angels and the faithful departed; but that is not in the least what Bishop Ryle means.

On this criticism one may remark that it exemplifies the apparently hopeless incapacity of the writers of a certain school to comprehend and appreciate any theology which they cannot see with their eyes, hear with their ears, and handle with their hands. By "Invisible Church" the Reviewer seems to mean that portion of the Church which has got beyond the reach of our bodily sight. Similarly, at the end of his article, he desires that Continental Roman Catholics should have "ocular proof" of the orthodoxy (from their point of view) of the Church of England. Ritualists seem helplessly unable to grasp subjective realities which may lie outside the pale of the senses. The Evangelic doctrine of the "Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist to the soul of the faithful recipient" of the consecrated elements, realized subjectively by vivid faith, may exercise a mightier influence on the emotions and character of the Christian believer than any conviction as to an objective external presence can produce in the hearts and conduct of the devotees of externalism in religion. But to the Ritualistic temperament this potent subjectivity seems "bare," "bald," intangible, perhaps even unreal. The same incapacity affects their view of the Church. That "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" that it is an internal sovereignty swaying the hearts of men; that it is not a mere external organization; that its members and subjects are not necessarily included in all or any of the religious organizations called "Churches;" that the members of ecclesiastical organizations are not necessarily members of the true Church;—in other words, that the tares and the wheat are growing together, and that the "visibility" of real Christians is to God, and not necessarily to man ("The Lord knoweth them that are His")—these considerations, if the Reviewer could grasp them, would have prevented his historical blunder as to the origin of the idea of an "Invisible Church." If he had read Lechler's "Wycliffe" he would have seen (pp. 288, 289, Lorimer's translation) that Wycliffe anticipated "the sectaries of the sixteenth century," and that Lechler, whose learning will at least compare favourably with the Reviewer's, identifies Wycliffe's[1] doctrine with that of St. Augustine. The Bishop

[1] Wycliffe says: "This Church is mother to each man that shall be saved, and containeth no member but only men that shall be saved."

of Liverpool is in excellent company on this point,[1] and the Reviewer's remark is only another illustration of the ease with which some people mistake audacity of statement for accuracy of knowledge. Time and space forbid a more detailed examination of all the Reviewer's positions.

It is scarcely worth while entering into the personalities, not to say coarse innuendoes and insinuations, of the Reviewer's attack on the Bishop. The Bishop will no doubt value all such at their real worth. Of course the Bishop is "a failure." What other description can we expect from a partisan of the "Catholic revival"? It avails not that fresh churches are rapidly springing up in the Liverpool Diocese; that the number of candidates for the ministry has largely increased since the new diocese was formed; that the young persons confirmed by the Bishop number tens of thousands; that the diocese raises about £100,000 per annum for home and foreign objects; that the Church of England Temperance Society and the Church Missionary Society can collect "monster gatherings" rivalling Exeter Hall, under the presidency of the Bishop, in one of our largest public halls; that multitudes flock everywhere to hear the Bishop preach.[2] But moderate Churchmen have some idea also of "spiritual success" above and beyond money, fabrics, or multitudes.

I have no desire to depreciate the ecclesiastical activities of those who "serve tables" in the Church, and seem absorbed therein; but if there be one service Bishop Ryle has rendered to the Church, it is to emphasize the fact that "success" is not a matter of bricks and mortar, subscriptions and donations, numbers and notoriety, organization and machinery. Spiritual achievements: the uplifting of the masses, the conversion of souls, holiness of life, sobriety, purity of morals, enthusiasm for Missionary enterprise, the conquest of the "waste and howling wilderness" of unregenerate humanity by the ennobling and beautifying Gospel of Christ—on such aims the Bishop's soul is set intent; in such labours his life has been spent. Wycliffe and his "poor priests" did more for the moral renovation of England than cathedral-builders and machinery-mongers before and since his day. Bishop

(See Lorimer, as above.) And the heading of Cap. xxxv. Book I. of St. Augustine's "City of God" reads: "Of the sons of the Church who are hidden among the wicked, and of false Christians within the Church." (See Dod's Translation, vol. i., p. 46.)

[1] The Bishop quotes not only "Dean Thomas Jackson, of Peterborough" (*C. Q. R.*), but many weighty authorities. How strange it must appear to the Reviewer that HOOKER should have adopted the "*wholly unscriptural figment*"!

[2] Even according to the *Guardian* report, the last Diocesan Conference was a remarkable success.

Ryle, in his "Christian Leaders of the Last Century," glorifies with the enthusiasm of a spiritually-minded Churchman, the deathless achievements of "these mighty spiritual heroes" who upraised England from the slough of lethargy and practical infidelity into which the people and clergy had fallen. Yet Whitfield built no cathedral; John Wesley erected no glittering Gothic fane. But they lifted the whole moral tone of the nation, and the lives and characters of multitudes, as with the fire of Apostolic fervour, and the transforming grace of Apostolic days. Never did we more need such "success." And for this the Bishop of Liverpool cries aloud and spares not. For this his incessant appeal is "living agents." For this he toils on platform and in pulpit. For this he wields the pen of the ready writer. The measure of his success must be left to the determination of the "dawn of the eternal day." But, despite carping criticism and masked attacks, those who can appreciate the solidity and permanence and vitality of genuine spiritual work will abide steadfast in the conviction that the doctrines enunciated in the "Principles for Churchmen," and the efforts to which such "principles" lend zeal and stimulus, are destined still to permeate the Church of England with invigorating force, and to win triumphs in the untried future that shall cast into the shade even the glorious successes of the past.

Meantime we may venture to inform the Reviewer and all whom it may concern that we quite comprehend the motives of such attacks as his.

He is obliging enough, indeed, to console us with the prophecy, which he seems to make with a sigh, that the Evangelical party will probably continue to be an "integer" of the Church of England. One thing he may be sure of: neither his prophecy nor his estimates, neither criticisms nor abuse, will intimidate "Evangelicals" from claiming their due place and share in the historic and independent glories of England's National Church. Moreover, we decline to confound the historic High Church Party, rich in divines like the illustrious Bishop Wordsworth, with the quasi-Roman faction who, like the "mixed multitude" that followed Israel, hang on to the skirts of orthodox and loyal High Churchism and clamour for the flesh-pots of a superstitious æstheticism. We are not envious of the intellectual strength of the Broad Church party, and as long as these two parties remain true to the Protestantism of the Church and nation, the big words of Ritualism and the bluster of the party of noise will not terrify law-abiding Churchmen out of the conviction that the Church of England will survive the Ritualistic Rebellion as she has survived many another passing craze, and that even the "grave of the Establishment"

will take our internal foes a long time in the digging. Nay, even from the ranks of the "Catholic" movement, men of transparent candour and unquestioned learning, like the late universally lamented Rev. Dr. Mozley, may arise to lead back to the sober doctrinal standards and chaste Ritual of our Mother Church, the children now dazed and dazzled transitorily by plausible perversions and sensational ceremonies. To the candid study of such leaders, to the generous criticism of loyal Churchmen, to the warm reception of his fellow-labourers and followers, Bishop Ryle may commit his work, in the firm belief that the principles he so ably enforces will stand the test of time and eternity.

C. T. PORTER.

ART. IV.—PASTORAL AID IN OUR TOWNS.

IT is not everyone who has had the privilege of being born within the sound of Bow Bells; and those who can remember the days when legal and even fashionable society in London centred around the British Museum, close to St. Giles's and Seven Dials, are rapidly decreasing in numbers. The youth of the present generation amongst the wealthier classes in the Metropolis no doubt congratulate themselves upon the great Westward movement that has removed their homes so far from the noise and squalor of their poorer fellow-townsmen; and few of them, perhaps, think how much they have lost in not having had the poor at their doors, in those happy days when childhood's love notices neither caste nor rags nor dirt, but clings to every fellow-creature in distress, and recognises all as brothers and sisters. To come across the poorer classes late in life, when natural love has been cooled by the vanity of youth, or choked by business engagements and caste prejudices, is quite a different thing.

But if the Upper Ten amongst young London of to-day know little of their poorer London neighbours, still less do they or their fellows in the rural population know personally of the workers in our great industrial centres.

Since railways have made it so easy for men of means to live in pleasant suburban spots, far from the noise and dirt of great manufactories, how few of their children have had the opportunity, in the romance of boyhood, of wandering amidst the toiling multitudes of the black country, with its ever-rolling wheels and chains and engines, its blazing furnaces and thundering forges; or of mixing with the mill-workers and factory-hands in our Northern towns; of knowing them by name, and in their homes; of learning to look upon them not merely as

the great machinery of our commercial prosperity, but as living men and women and children, with lives and hearts and thoughts like other human beings.

It is much to be regretted that the young people of whom we have been speaking should have lost these early associations, not only on account of their value in preparing mind and body for the great struggle of life, but still more for the sake of those Christian sympathies which personal contact with suffering and hardship can alone develop.

Nothing could be more disastrous to our social welfare as a people, than that the present separation between the classes should continue to extend; and yet it becomes daily more difficult to prevent it, and to draw together those whom the increase of wealth and the rapidity of the locomotive have been steadily removing from contact with each other.

Separation of residence between the rich and poor has not only produced an abnormal state of things in Society generally, but in a great measure has affected the work of the Christian Church.

On the one hand we have thousands of persons brought up in sound Christian doctrine, with health and money and all that is necessary to make them useful in the work of mercy; and on the other, masses of human beings in temporal want and spiritual destitution. Yet, partly from ignorance and partly from the habits of society, these two classes are living practically unknown to each other: the one longing for something to do, and the other sighing for help.

It is in the midst of this that the interest and romance of Foreign Missions has to some extent absorbed the sympathies of those who have felt the need of an outlet; and whilst every Christian person must rejoice in the great increase of Foreign Mission work, it can scarcely be doubted that our home necessities have been a little overlooked.

The rapid development of geographical research has year by year made us acquainted with countries and tribes and races hitherto unknown and forgotten, whilst commercial enterprise, assisted by rapidity of communication, and pressed on by the ever-increasing needs of our growing population, has broken down barriers which in our boyhood closed more than half of the heathen world. No wonder that the Christian Church has been moved to its very heart by the cry for help from abroad!

The decay of the Mahometan Empire which so long hung as a great cloud between the East and West, the spread of civilization in America, the opening of Africa and China and Japan, have come so suddenly upon us, that every branch of Christians has had room to select its own part of the world for missionary enterprise, and the public at home have found their

liberal contributions and ready help go but a little way towards the evangelization of the world.

It is worth while to look a little more closely at what has been happening at home. The immediate result of the invention of steam was to enrich all classes of the community, and so great an increase of wealth has probably never occurred in the history of the human race. Up to the year 1873, with short intervals of depression, our prosperity in England was continuous.

The opening of foreign markets, with the increased demand for every kind of manufacture, has had the effect of centralizing the population of this and other countries in the cities, and the rapid introduction of machinery into agriculture has contributed to this result.

The consequence has been an increased crowding of population around the manufacturing centres, and an immense increase of numbers in our town parishes, particularly of the working classes.

So long as our prosperity continued, the difficulty of dealing with this population was not so much noticed; but now that a reaction of something more than a temporary nature has set in, we are beginning to realize the situation. The steam engine has taken some years to outrun the accumulated necessities of the world. The producer has at last overtaken the consumer, and there seems little prospect of the increase of population and civilization ever again outstripping the rapidity of production. The effect, naturally, is a general depression, which as it can no longer find relief by sending the working classes back to agriculture, must in the necessity of things reduce the wealth of the manufacturing classes—placing thousands among the town populations in great difficulty as to earning a livelihood, and but for the cheapness of food would no doubt reduce them within a dangerous proximity of starvation.

It is not difficult to see that this state of things has a direct bearing upon the subject before us. Christian England seems at last awakening to the fact that something must be done. Fashionable "slumming" must at least have opened the eyes of some of its worshippers; but if this were the whole result of newspaper articles, and eloquent pamphlets, it would be poor indeed. What we need is that, as soon as possible, one half of the world should know how the other half lives, what its needs are, and what is being done to supply them; and then that the men whose lives are given up to the great Home Mission work should have their hands strengthened and their hearts encouraged by the redoubled efforts of the whole Christian Church.

Let us now turn for a moment to the scenes amongst which they work.

Few things are so calculated to promote serious thought in the mind of an intelligent and Christian person as the visible increase of population within the last twenty or even ten years in London and the other large towns of the kingdom. An evening hour in the Mile End Road will give a stranger more food for thought than, perhaps, any sight in London. The unceasing rattle of vehicles; the continuous hum of human voices; the never-lessening crowd of men and women hurrying along the footways, the busy shops where every conceivable thing is sold at inconceivably low prices; the numberless gin-palaces, beer-shops, theatres, waxwork exhibitions, and penny gaffs; the rows of pawnbrokers and marine store dealers' shops; the hucksters' stalls and barrows, where all the worn and rusty remnants of modern civilization seem to find purchasers; the Cheap Jacks and costermongers, peep-shows and telescopes, and a thousand other things that contribute to the hurrying life and amusement of an enormous struggling population—these give but a passing view of life in the more thickly populated parts of the Metropolis, a scene repeated on a smaller scale and with but slight variations in every great centre of population in the country.

Such scenes cannot fail to bring the thought, "How is it possible for Christian philanthropic effort *upon its present scale* to keep pace with the temporal and spiritual necessities of so vast and preoccupied a multitude?" And who can resist the conclusion that our present Home Missionary work in the Church of England, and in all the churches combined, is wholly and utterly inadequate to the necessity of the situation? No wonder the overworked clergy and Christian workers cry out for help!

Let us probe the scene a little more deeply, and see what is meant by the temporal and spiritual necessities of the crowd around us. That respectably dressed man that passed is a shopkeeper. He takes hard views of life; his customers are not always to be trusted; their notions of the rights of property are somewhat loose, and their hands are often restrained rather by the fear of discovery than by any moral or religious motives. Many of them are ever ready to deceive him, and perhaps he is not over-scrupulous with them. Habit is second nature, and conscience becomes dull. Sharp dealing grows into dishonesty, and sin drives good thoughts from the mind until a man becomes a hard, grasping, irreligious, money-making machine. This man wants help; who is to help him? Those two men who pushed past, shoulder to shoulder, were pickpockets. A hoarding, behind which some building is going on, narrows the width of the footway, and as the passers-by draw closer together

at this point, they find an opportunity of plying their occupation. One of them was brought up amongst criminals, and the other was left on the streets when his parents died, and was soon entrapped into the same society. These men want help; who is to help them?

Over there is a poor widow who supports her three little children by such odds and ends of work as she can get—full of labour, care, and anxiety; never a day ahead of her needs, and often days behind. She wants comfort, poor thing. Who is to give it her? That rough-looking girl is a factory-hand; she can hold her own for vulgar repartee with any of the young men of her own class; but there is little enough of the grace of womanhood about her, and she wants something done for her; she might be made a very different creature. Who is to do it? This poor, besotted fool, who has just come tumbling out of the gin-palace, with those rough, violent fellows, leaving the best part of his week's earnings behind him, is an artisan—a capital workman, but a slave to drink. When he is sober, his poor wife's misery, and the sight of their starvelings of children often touch his heart, and he vows he will never get drunk again; but his good resolutions go for nothing, and as sure as pay-day comes round he finds his way into the midst of the brawling, inane crowd that are attracted to the gin-palace by the music and gas and drink and company. This man wants a friend to help him; who is it to be?

There is a man of a very different stamp! Too much of a man to sell his soul for drink, but his trouble is that he cannot be sure he has a soul at all, or that there is a God; and keenly alive to the inequalities of fortune and the inconsistencies of many who profess to be religious, he is fain to study the infidel literature of the day and to dub himself an Agnostic, to throw in his lot with pot-house politicians, and fast become a danger to himself and others. Who is to put him right?

That is a casual dock labourer over there, all rags and bones. He spends the winter between the casual ward and the refuge, with an occasional night in a common lodging-house, when he chances to pick up a shilling at the docks, wharves, or markets. Almost anyone here will tell you that he is past all help; that these dock labourers are the very lowest dregs of society, and the sooner he is dead the better. What! Is it not some one's duty to attend to him? and whose?

And here is a poor boy. His widowed mother died last year. He cannot speak of her without tears in his eyes, for he has had bitter experience of the world since then. It is almost a miracle that he is not now a thief; but he has honestly supported himself ever since her death—he scarce knows how—holding people's horses, and occasionally, when he has capital

enough, buying watercresses and lettuces for sale. He cannot afford a lodging, but sleeps amongst a heap of old timber. Who is responsible for this boy?

Ask these questions in the fashionable circles of society; ask them in the middle classes; ask them of the working-man, and the answer will be, "Go to the parson. It is his duty, not mine; that is what parsons are for!"

We do not admit it. We cannot deceive ourselves to the extent of supposing that a nation can throw its responsibilities upon the shoulders of a few self-sacrificing, devoted men; and yet who can disguise from himself the fact that, with comparatively trifling exceptions, the clergy and Nonconformist ministers and lay-workers in all our large towns are left almost unaided by the public, and but poorly supported by a large body of Church members, to combat the hydra-headed monster of neglect, corruption, and sin that is hurrying on its too ready victims to destruction.

Is it not time that we, the laity of the Church of Christ, and of the Church of England as the largest and most powerful section of that Church in this country, should come to the rescue?

Do not let us be satisfied with the thought that the great united efforts of to-day to stimulate the masses by some unusual and attractive means, such as special missions, large meetings, eloquent and earnest addresses, are all that is needed! In some sense these movements increase the embarrassment, if there are no adequate means of permanently cultivating the impressions then received. The solid and most enduring work of the Church after all must be done by the unremitting labours of those who day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year, are pressing home the gospel truths from the pulpit and in the home, and, by precept and example, leading thousands in the Master's footsteps.

Consider what a clergyman has on his hands.

In the first place, the house-to-house visitation principally, and often almost entirely, devolves upon the Church of England. Then, in addition to all the individual requirements to be provided for, of which we have selected a few examples, he has to do something for all the different bodies of persons in his parish. There are the police, the omnibus and tram and cab-drivers, the roadmen, and often operatives of particular classes. In addition to this there are Sunday and other schools, fathers, mothers, and prayer meetings, Bible-classes, indoor and outdoor services, associations for young men and young women, temperance and other societies, to be attended to; and, in addition, sermons to be prepared every week, and addresses given from time to time, thus ab-

sorbing what few hours an overworked man might fairly devote to relaxation.

We venture to think that one great cause of our pastoral work having fallen so grievously behind the necessities of our vast population is, that numbers of these noble, earnest men are being daily forgotten in the midst of louder-sounding but not more pressing claims; and this condition of affairs never demanded more than it now does the attention of the Christian public.

Let us go to Falcon Court in Fleet Street, and take a few cases from the books of the Church Pastoral Aid Society by way of example. Here is an organization the object of which is to supplement with grants of money the salaries of curates and lay-helpers in large town parishes; the greatest help an overworked clergyman, struggling with the necessities of a great population, can desire.

We find a clergyman appealing for a grant of £35 towards the salary of a curate in a new mining district in Wales, with a present population of between 3,000 and 4,000, which will soon amount to 10,000 on account of the opening of new collieries. He says there are large numbers of the present population made up of Churchmen, and he has received a petition signed by 270 adults praying him to provide them with religious services according to the forms of the Church of England. Another, single-handed in a poor parish in Birmingham, with a population of 4,500, and an income of £200 per annum but no house, begs for help towards a curate's stipend. As also does another with a parish of 5,000, and an income of £160 per annum and no house.

A grant towards a third curate in a parish of 20,000 souls is urgently asked for, the Society already contributing £120 per annum towards the stipends of two curates. A similar grant is asked for in a London parish of 7,500 persons and no curate at all. A very low seaport parish with a population of 6,000, and 25,000 emigrants annually passing through it, needs a curate. Another vicar, almost prostrate with low-fever from overwork single-handed amongst 8,000 operatives, pleads piteously for help.

An incumbent of a district in the Midlands, with an income of £256 per annum and a parsonage, asks for £40 towards a curate's stipend, and says of his population of 4,000: "All are colliers, and very poor at the present time; the moral tone of the place is very low indeed."

Take, again, some Northern cases. One incumbent with £295 per annum and a parsonage, but no curate, has a population of about 9,000, of whom he says: "The inhabitants are all operatives; or small shopkeepers dependent on weekly

wages. In consequence of the poverty of the place the calls on me are almost overwhelming." Another clergyman, whose income is only £50, and no parsonage, house or curate, describes his population as being "5,000, increasing very fast—working people, engaged at the wire trade, fustian, and every kind of petty hawking." This is missionary work indeed, and in a district which the applicant describes as having had *no Sunday or day schools.*

An applicant for help from a district in the Liverpool Diocese states his population to be 6,214, composed chiefly of labouring people, a large number of houses of ill fame, and some shopkeepers. This gentleman has no curate to help him. From the same diocese comes an appeal by a minister whose income amounts to £150 per annum with a parsonage, in the midst of a population of 5,000, consisting of manufactory, mining and agricultural persons; amongst whom, he states, there is only one influential resident. He asks for £20 per annum for two years towards a second curate.

Another clergyman in an extremely poor parish of 5,500, says that the only local help available is that of one lady, a Unitarian gentleman, and a Congregationalist. And without further multiplying cases, we will only mention an applicant from a great Northern shipbuilding centre, who has one curate in a population of between 10,000 and 11,000, which he thus describes: "No gentry in the parish—only about eight or ten families of a middle-class position, some clerks and small shopkeepers—rest all working people, some extremely low and destitute."

Such cases, taken from a daily increasing number of similar applications, speak for themselves, and show that, in spite of the work of the sister Society and the numerous Diocesan funds which have sprung up, the clergy of the Church of England are greatly in need of help from the laity to enable them to cope with the necessities of the people.

It is, however, refreshing to turn to the testimony in the records of the same Society as to the value of the work done by the very large number of curates and lay-helpers already on its books.

One vicar writes:

The good work at our Mission Room is going on steadily; it is truly a light in a dark place, for the people in the neighbourhood are very poor and indifferent to spiritual teaching.

Another says:

Be so good as to express to the Committee my grateful thanks for their continued grant; without it I don't know what I could do, except fly from the place.

Another writes:

I am thankful to be able to record the earnest and diligent labours of

my curate and lay assistant. It is not easy to visit all the population of 10,000 souls, but we have long visited our people on system.

And after stating, what is no doubt the fact, that the house-visitation is left almost entirely to the clergy of the Established Church, he says:

It is clear, therefore, that but for the aid of the Church Pastoral Aid Society many of our people would live and die without any religious instruction.

A Yorkshire incumbent in a parish of 10,000 souls states that when he went there twenty-six years ago there was no church, no school, no parsonage, no endowment: nothing but a grant of £60 a year by the Church Pastoral Aid Society. "I consider, therefore," he says, "that the Society is the founder of the parish and the whole of its organization, and to its aid the parish owes its all, as regards its machinery." There is now church, vicarage, school, and endowment of £300 per annum, in addition to a grant from the Society of £70 a year towards the salary of a lay assistant.

This case gives rise to another consideration which often escapes attention: the matter of endowments. The old mother parishes have been constantly throwing off new parishes and districts, the necessity for which has filled our Statute Book with chapters, sections and provisoes. But in one respect the Legislature has been unable to assist, and whilst the public have looked to the new incumbents for the same temporal and spiritual help they have learned to expect in the old parishes, they too frequently forget that, in the absence of endowment, the work that is done is due in a great measure to pinching self-denial in the incumbent's home, or the expenditure of his private means upon the work of his church.

These new districts are of recent growth, and are, so to speak, outside the Church's endowments. The population they contain often consists almost entirely of working people, who can only contribute to a very limited extent to religious work.

It is not an uncommon thing for applicants to the Society, particularly from the Northern districts, to state that hardly any person in the parish keeps a domestic servant, and we must leave the public to imagine the difficulty of keeping the religious work of a parish going under such circumstances.

To a certain extent the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have endeavoured to remedy this state of things by supplementing grants made by this and other societies; but even their funds are not inexhaustible, and the burden must fall upon the already overtaxed incumbents, unless the laity come forward to help them. In a large number of cases the Church Pastoral Aid Society has been the only friend through whom a vicar has been able to earn the assistance of the Commissioners.

As we look at the bundle of letters lying before us similar to those already cited, full of gratitude for help given, we can only thank God, and hope that the increased services, house-to-house visitations, and mission-rooms established by the help of the Society, resulting as they are described in largely increased interest in spiritual things—in the increase of the number of baptisms, candidates for Confirmation, and attendants at the Holy Communion — may be still further supplemented a hundred-fold.

In times of distress and depression such as our country is now enduring, discontent with all its fellow-evils is rife amongst us; and it is worthy the consideration of all thoughtful and patriotic persons what steps are most necessary to leaven the masses with moral and religious principles. But to those who believe that the only cure for all our national sin and unhappiness is the spread of the Gospel, the subject has a claim not only of duty but of love.

It cannot be right that cases such as those above mentioned should meet with the constant answer from this and kindred Societies, "We are most willing, but quite unable to help you;" and we venture to think that it is only necessary to make our fellow-Churchmen aware of this constant cry for help to secure a ready and liberal response.

W. F. A. Archibald.

Art. V.—CLERICAL REMINISCENCES.

No. VI.—Little Mike.

THE life of a London "Arab," before the introduction of Board Schools, presented features of degradation which, from their extreme deformity, almost surpassed the boundaries of belief. From the earliest moment in which his surroundings could afford him the least opportunity for reflection, sin in its most repulsive aspects presented itself to his opening mind. He seldom, if ever, went to school. All day he wandered about the streets, always in company with boys similarly circumstanced; and at night, when he did not return home, he managed to find a resting-place sometimes in a low lodging-house, sometimes, if in the summer, in a snug corner of one of the parks, or under an archway, and sometimes in the inside of a "four-wheeler," which was regarded as a great luxury in the way of "apartments." His clothes were scanty, his food precarious, and his life a scene of almost endless variety in

vice. Along the public thoroughfares, in Oxford Street and Holborn, these wild boys picked up some "coppers" by keeping up with the omnibuses and performing the gymnastic exercise of "turning a windmill," as they termed the sidelong somersault of head-over-heels, on the footpath. Thieving whenever they could, and generally with a nimble dexterity, was their main source of existence, and consequently it was not surprising to find that they were frequently introduced, without their consent, to the experiences of prison-life.

Talk of young Arabs of the desert! why, I have seen them in their native villages far more civilized in every respect than our home-bred Arabs. The latter were young savages of the shrewdest type of civilization, idle, wild, and vicious; their clothes so tattered and torn, that if once off their body, it would require all the ingenuity of their preternaturally sharpened wit to put them on again. They generally slept in their rags. As a matter of course they had no acquaintance with soap and water. Their hands and faces were black with the dirt which had been deposited on them after a long period of incrustation. Parasites of several species infested their bodies, and altogether these wild waifs of civilization were as forbidding, if not more so, in their native element, as any tribe of savages on the face of the earth. I have wandered week after week among the Red Indians in the Western States of America, and I have partaken of their hospitality in their rude wigwams. I have also had very good opportunities of becoming acquainted with the Arab tribes in North Africa; but, whether it be among the children of the forest and the prairie, or among the original Arabs of the desert, there are no worse specimens of moral and physical degradation than those presented by the once neglected hordes of children in the heart of the most civilized city in the world.

I have the photographs of little Mike and six or seven of his "pals." The pictures speak for themselves; and as "the apparatus tells no lies," we have here an exhibition of ragged life for which I do not hesitate to say a parallel could hardly be found anywhere. The lot of "the noble savage" in the forest or the prairie is superior in many respects to that of these "children of the gutter," cradled within the circle of civilization. The latter are, or were, extremely demoralized. In their appetites and passions, in their predatory habits and pursuits, in their acquired love of mischief, in the utter disregard of truth, in their ignorance of religion of any kind they could sink no lower. And when it is borne in mind that such degradation had arisen while these boys were still, many of them, under their "teens"—at ten, eleven, and twelve years old—and that even at such an early age they had been inmates

of prisons again and again, it is unnecessary to say that these juvenile specimens of the London heathen presented few, if any, traces of superiority over the wildest tribes in the most remote quarters of the world.

Mike, the boy who forms the subject of this sketch, was thirteen times in gaol before he was twelve years old—a fact which I did not accept upon his unsupported testimony, but by reference to the entries in the prison books. A large proportion of these waifs and strays were what was termed "Irish Cockneys"—that is, the children of Irish parents, born in London. They inherited the natural sharpness of their Celtic ancestors, but they acquired, with fatal facility, the bad qualities of their adopted countrymen. Their ready wit was exercised not ill-humouredly on the police, whom they instinctively regarded as their natural enemies, and, to do the latter full justice, they were not slow in acts of official reprisals. These boys did not look upon "Bobby," as they familiarly called him, with feelings of personal hostility. They were of course wise enough to know, in their own slang language, that "he who prigs what isn't his'n, when he's cotched must go to pris'n." They did not blame the policeman for doing his duty, and showed him no ill-will for it. The chief strategic point in this perpetual warfare between these Arab boys and the guardians of the law, was to keep as clear as possible of the "perlice," and to "bolt" whenever they saw any of them making their approach. Every one of these boys was known to the authorities, but their astute and ready resources, especially residing in their heels, enabled them to "move on" whenever a constable appeared upon the scene. "If you please, Mr. Perliceman, it wasn't I, but the other boy, that did it," was the ordinary form of excuse given by the least swift-footed of the gang.

"Little Mike" was born in 1842, of Irish parents, in London. His father was a tailor, who lived in Lisson Grove. There were four children—one boy, Mike, and three girls. I first made his acquaintance in the year 1854, when he was a little over twelve years of age, and under the following circumstances. One day when visiting in Portland Town, a part of the parish where I was then curate, close by the Regent's Park, my attention was attracted by four ragged boys scrambling and fighting for the possession of some carrots and turnips which had been put by a greengrocer in Henry Street outside his shop, in a basket containing refuse vegetables. Little Mike was one of these four boys, and though not the oldest or the biggest, he was unquestionably the most pugnacious. Their preoccupation over this "scrimmage" had prevented them from noticing a policeman, who came upon them unawares. Three of them managed to get away, but Mike was kept a prisoner. Watching

his opportunity, he slipped adroitly out of the hands of his captor, and made off, leaving his cap behind him.

"Who are those boys, constable?"

"They are four of the greatest young vagabonds in all this district, sir—a perfect pest to the neighbourhood. As for that young rascal to whom this cap belongs, he is a regular thief, and is well known to the police, and he has been I don't know how many times in almost every gaol in London."

A gentleman who was with me remarked: "What could you do with such a hopeless case as that?" I replied: "It seems hard, certainly; but suppose we try. Let us go to him and give him his cap." Seeing us approach, he got behind a wall, where we found him crouching down when we came up. I said, "Take your cap, my boy." But the lad replied, "Chuck it down," while he covered each ear with the back of his hands transversely—the right hand covering the left ear, and the left hand covering the right, the palms being outside. This was the usual position in which he prepared to receive any unlooked-for attack from a too powerful adversary.

"Won't you take your cap?"

"No; I don't want to. Throw it on the ground, guv'nor."

While this scene was being enacted, his companions, or "pals," as they called each other, joined him, and, on seeing himself thus reinforced by his mates, he took courage, and became somewhat personal in his remarks.

"I know who ye chaps are," he observed, looking sharply at my friend and me. "I knows your little game; but you don't go for me. Ye are in with the Bobbies. All right, 'Square-tops,' I knows ye. Have ye got a copper to give us?"

"No; I'll not give you money; but if you four boys will come up to my house to-morrow morning, at 8.30, I'll give you all a good breakfast."

I gave them my address, and told them who I was. Mike, addressing his companions, said: "Here's a lark! The guv'nor wants us to have a feed with him to-morrow! What a go! *Walker!*" I then turned away with my friend. After going a hundred yards or so we looked back, and observed the boys evidently engaged in council as to the course they should adopt.

Next morning, at the time appointed, they presented themselves at the hall door. Four more ragged little urchins it would have been hard to have found anywhere. The servant having informed me that some street boys were at the door, wanting to see me, I went out to them; and after a few friendly words in the hall, I ordered them to have their breakfast downstairs in the housekeeper's room or in the kitchen. I was reckoning, however, without my host, for the cook came

upstairs in a state of nervous agitation at the idea of allowing "such riff-raff" into the house. After hearing from me what I wanted her to do, as regarded their breakfast, she said:

"You are not aware of the kind of boys these are, sir. They are the terror of all respectable people in Portland Town; and it is unwise to let such young imps into the house at all—it is like bringing a den of thieves about the place—they'll steal the forks and spoons, and anything they can lay their hands upon! and besides, sir, they are so filthy and ragged."

Experience teaches that it is no part of wisdom to enter into argument with a woman if she is determined to have her way. Far better to yield at the beginning, and to do so graciously. There is generally a fair amount of good sense in a woman's judgment, though she may not be able to give her reasons for arriving at it. Right as to the result, but wrong as to the reasons, generally speaking, is what one notices on such occasions. Accordingly, I compromised matters by suggesting that four kitchen chairs should be placed in the hall, to act as so many tables for my four ungainly guests. Meanwhile they remained with me until a substantial breakfast made its appearance, each boy having his separate table and his own portion of food.

After my young guests had partaken of their breakfast, which they enjoyed with an unmistakable relish, I found them more disposed to enter into conversation. It appeared, assuming that they spoke truly, that each boy, except Mike, had a father and mother living in or about Lisson Grove, engaged in some small trade, too limited to do more than keep them from the workhouse. The boys had been allowed to go where they pleased, and to do what they liked, according to the bent of their own sweet will—anyhow, or anywhere. For such, London has many dangerous attractions. There is always a gang of young marauders who are ready to accept recruits into their ranks, if only they are of the stuff of which these incipient desperadoes are made. Accordingly these four belonged to a nest of thieves, with whom they co-operated from time to time in various ways in which such daring young spirits could assist them.

Of these four boys Mike had the largest experience in crime. Thirteen times in gaol seems incredible for a boy before he was twelve years old. Yet such was the fact. One time he was imprisoned for stealing a pair of boots, another time for stealing a loaf of bread, another time for robbing the "till" in a small shop, and so on. The petty larcenies in which he was found out bore no adequate proportion to those in which he was successful with impunity. He used to say that for once he was found out, he succeeded in carrying off the plunder at

least five times, so that the immunity from detection emboldened him to continue his career of vice so soon as he was liberated from prison. But although he had become an outcast, and almost an outlaw, still there was a soft spot in Mike's heart which his expression of countenance betokened. There was, in spite of all his devilment, a genial look about him. Judging from his open, boyish face, no one could ever have imagined that he could be such a young scapegrace. He had, at times, a look of simplicity, and an expression of genuine good-nature, notwithstanding all the associations of wickedness with which he had been so long conversant. As he stood before me in rags, and filth, and wretchedness, I could not help liking the little fellow. There was something or other which unconsciously conveyed the impression that down at the bottom of his heart there was some good-nature, if only it could be got at. I selected Mike out of the four, and I told him that if he wished to remain with me I should take care of him, send him to school, give him a trade, and make a man of him. He did not believe me. It seemed to him unreal—too good to be true; and, still suspecting "some dodge," as he called it, he went away, promising that he would call on me again to-morrow morning.

Mike had stated that he had not seen his father or mother for more than three years—he believed they were dead. They used to beat him unmercifully; and at last their treatment became so cruel that he ran away, after his father had almost killed him by striking him with the "board," such as tailors use in their trade. He had three sisters, all older than himself. The eldest fifteen, the second thirteen, and the third eleven, when he left home. The two eldest girls always joined with their parents in the severity which made Mike's life so miserable under his father's roof, but the youngest sister, Norah, always showed him great kindness, and was really fond of her brother.

At nine o'clock next morning a policeman called upon me, to say that "one of those boys, who was at your house yesterday, is now in the lock-up, at Marylebone Station, and will be brought before the magistrates at half-past ten this morning."

"Of what has he been guilty?"

"For being on the premises of a cab-proprietor during the night, without being able to give a good account of himself."

"But what has he done?"

"He was found asleep in the inside of a cab in the owner's yard, at three o'clock this morning. He is a suspicious character, and he could not account for his being in such a place at such a time."

"Why have you called on me?"

"The boy asked me to go to the gentleman and let him know that he could not come to him this morning as he had promised, and as I was going round to the station I thought you might like to know."

"What is your opinion of him, constable?"

"The most incorrigible young scamp in all Portland Town, sir. He is a regular thief—lives half his time in gaol—no sooner out than in again."

At a few minutes past ten I was at the Court House, and when the case of Mike was called on, I asked the magistrate if I might say a few words. Having got permission, I said:

"Your worship, it was only yesterday that I offered to take care of this boy, whom I found, accidentally, wandering about the streets. He promised to call on me this morning at nine o'clock, and having no home he got into a cab, standing at night in the proprietor's yard, and he was found fast asleep there by the constable on duty this morning at three o'clock, and he is now charged for trespassing on the premises."

Magistrate—"Is that the only charge you have against this boy, constable?"

Constable—"That is all, your worship."

Magistrate—"I think that under those circumstances, as this gentleman has promised to look after him, I may discharge the prisoner. Otherwise I should have sent him to gaol for a month."

I told the magistrate that I was afraid his companions were waiting outside the court, and if he were to go now, I might not see him again; that I wanted to get him some clothes at an outfitter's in Edgware Road, and as I could not be there before two o'clock, I should be glad if the boy were kept in the station till I could call for him. The magistrate replied that he would have the boy kept there till two, and that a constable should take him to meet me at the address in Edgware Road.

Accordingly, we met at the outfitter's shop—"Groves'." It would be impossible to convey anything like a true description of the figure Mike presented on entering the shop. Seeing the policeman, the boy, and me all coming in together, curiosity was excited, and indeed no wonder. We soon got into a quiet nook, and began to select the outfit. The first thing which struck me as somewhat amusing was the keen criticism which Mike passed on the various garments presented for our choice. Considering that he had nothing but a bundle of rags hanging in shreds all round him, and fastened by pieces of twine and pins, it was strange to notice how hard it was to please him as to style and pattern. Another thing also surprised me, and that was the complete change in his entire bearing from the moment that he realized his new position. He felt no longer

any suspicion about me or my motives, and suddenly casting aside all his reserve, he came out quite frankly, and in a natural and pleasant manner. When the outfit was complete, it was necessary, for obvious reasons, that Mike should not put on his clothes until he had passed through a careful process of soap and water. Accordingly I had all the outfit packed up, put into a cab, and off we drove to the public baths in Stingo Lane. When Mike was in his bath—the first, he told me, he had for years—I asked the attendant to take away the old rags, and if he were wise, to have them burned. In about half an hour, Mike sent me word that he was ready to dress. I had the clothes taken in, and he began to undergo the transformation scene. It was very pleasant to watch his altered manner. He examined every garment with wondering gaze, and as he put them on, he stood upon a table before a large looking-glass, with delight in his eyes and joy in his heart. One by one, his garments were being duly arranged, until at last he gave the finishing-touch to his necktie, and turning to me with a clean and shining face, he remarked:

"I think now, sir, the dogs won't know me." It was worth anything to watch the new sensation of delight and surprise which insensibly stole over Mike's features. With his new face, and his new clothes, he really looked quite another boy —and by no means an unprepossessing boy. "The Bobbies, sir, in Portland Town, won't know me now. What a go this is, sir! Will you walk with me through the streets on our way back, sir?"

"Certainly, Mike; by all means."

"Then we'll have fun, sir, I can tell you."

Home we returned, Mike becoming very communicative. Just as we were coming up to the door, he said: "I think Cooky won't mind my going into the kitchen now, sir."

True enough, when we got in I sent for her, and said that there was a young lad whom I wanted her to take care of, and get him something to eat. At first she did not recognise him, and addressing Mike kindly, asked him to go with her. After a few seconds, she exclaimed:

"Why, there, I do believe that this is the same boy who had his breakfast here the other morning! Well, now, surely he is the same lad, isn't he, sir?"

"Yes; the same, and yet not the same. You need have no fear now of the forks and spoons; take him, and look after him."

The cook was a kind woman, but cautious in her estimate of my young friend. Still, he looked so clean, so cheerful, and almost shy, that the cook overcame her scruples, and led him downstairs.

The changed demeanour of Mike was what struck me most of all. From being sullen and rude, he became open-hearted, truthful, and as polite and kindly-spoken as he possibly could be; and this, too, in the space of a few days. His shrewd powers of perception very soon convinced Mike that he was among friends, and, instantly laying aside his defensive tactics, he allowed the long-disused portion of his better nature to come to the surface, and be seen. From that day, Mike became very tenderly attached to me. He was ever on the look-out to show his gratitude by many little attentions, all the more pleasing because of the suddenness of their development. The servants, too, relaxed their pardonable suspicions, and even the cook herself was forced to admit that "she never saw a better-behaved boy, nor one who was so obliging in every way."

By day he attended the National School of the parish, and at night he lodged with the sexton and his wife. The spare hours when not at school he spent in my house. One day, I came upon him somewhat suddenly as he was sitting alone in the housekeeper's room, with his head and arms resting on the table. He had not heard me coming, and I was pained and surprised at seeing him look so sad, and as if he had been crying.

"Hallo! Mike, my boy, what's up now?"

"Oh, sir, I didn't know you was here. Nothing, sir; only I've been just a-thinking what a bad boy I've been all these years—and all the lies I have been telling—and all the times I have been in gaol; and I have been thinking how I have been deceiving you, and you don't know how wicked I am—and it's the kindness that makes me cry, sir."

"Come, come, Mike," I replied, "that won't do; you must cheer up—you must try and forget the past, Pray to God, and ask Him to make you good for the time to come."

He then told me about his companions, and their ways.

"I soon began to be as bad as they were. I used to steal things out of the shops; and after a while I would join them in robbing the 'tills.' I had to do it, sir, or the fellows would have beat me."

"How did you manage to get at the 'tills,' and people going in and out of the shops?"

"It was like this, sir. In Lisson Grove and thereabouts there are several shops kept by old ladies, and they do be sitting in the inside parlour of a winter's evening when it be's cold. The door is half of it like a window in the top part, and they do keep it shut, and they can see through into the shop when a customer comes in. These old ladies do be knitting or reading,

and we would have three or four boys on the watch, at the shop-doors in the street, to see if any of the old ladies would go to sleep over the book they was reading, and then the boy would give a whistle which we all knew. Then, as I was the smallest boy, I had to crawl in on my hands and feet and go round to the 'till' and rob it, or anything I could get hold of."

"But would not the noise wake up the woman?"

"No, sir; I used to put indian-rubber shoes on my feet, and I could walk just like a cat."

"Were you never found out?"

"Yes, sir; it was for trying to rob a 'till' this way that I first got into trouble with the police."

"How old were you when you first went to gaol?"

"I was about ten years old, sir. The other boys used to call me 'The Crawler,' because I could crawl into the shops so nicely without being heard—because I had on the indian-rubbers."

Having ascertained that Mike had parents living, and that it was more than three years since he had seen them, I proposed that we should go and call on them. He consented, and gave me their address. It was arranged that we should go the next day. Accordingly I called a cab, and off we went together. I told Mike to remain in the cab when we arrived at the house of his parents, and that I should go up first and speak to them. Having found the house—a very small one, in Exeter Street, Lisson Grove, as was indicated to me by Mike—I went up, and on the second-floor front I knocked at the door. It was opened by a woman who seemed to be about forty years old. I inquired if a man of the name of Thornton lived there; and having been answered in the affirmative, I asked if I might see him.

"There is Mr. Thornton, sir," said the woman, pointing to a man sitting tailor-fashion on a long table, engaged at his work. His wife had some cloth in her hand, and before I appeared she had been sewing. Apologizing for my sudden intrusion, I explained the object of my visit.

"I have called to know whether any such persons lived here or not, and the reason I will briefly state. Before doing so, may I be permitted to ask, How many children have you?"

"Three, sir," was the prompt reply. After a short pause the woman added: "We had four—but now there are only three. We had another—a little boy—and he went away from us more than three years ago, and I've heard that he is as good as dead."

"What do you mean by saying 'as good as dead'?"

"We were told that he was taken up by the police, and was put into prison; and we never heard anything of him these

three years. We couldn't manage him at all, at all; he wouldn't go to school, and he was always keeping bad company. One day his father gave him a beating, and he ran away from home, and we have never seen anything of him since."

"Would you know him, do you think, if you were to see him?"

"Oh! yes, sir; of course I would."

Before leaving the cab, I had arranged with Mike that he was not to stir till I whistled for him, and then he was to come up without delay. Accordingly I opened the window, and gave the signal, without saying a word to either the father or the mother. In a few seconds the door opened, and in walked Mike. He looked shy and indifferent, and said nothing. Looking at his mother, I said: "Is that your son?" At first his parents did not seem to recognise him, but after a while the mother said: "Sure enough that's Mike." She then went up to him and kissed him. The father got off his table, and in his turn approached his son, kissed him, and said: "Bedad, Mike, is it yourself that I see before me? And it is us that are glad to see you back again. Where have you been, and what have you been doing all this long while past, asthore?"

Mike said nothing yet. He fiddled with his cap, kept his eyes fixed on the ground, looked embarrassed and sheepish. Presently his eldest sister came into the room, a girl about eighteen years of age. She threw her arms round his neck, and uttered some words of welcome. It seemed strange to me that Mike was not impressed by any of these tokens of affection. I was surprised and disappointed at his stolid indifference. A few minutes later a younger sister came in, and when she saw her brother, she ran to him with her arms wide open, and, folding them wildly round his neck, kissed him again and again, sobbing and crying bitterly. Then she broke out, and said: "Oh! Mikey dear, my own Mikey! and have you come back to us?" This was too much for Mike. Down dropped his cap from his hands. He threw his arms round his sister's neck, and cried in real earnest. There they stood with their arms round each other's neck. Then the father and mother began to cry. We all cried a bit. I ended the scene by telling the parents that I had found their son by accident, and I was glad to be able to bring him home again. I then said to Mike that I should leave him there for the present, and I suggested that they should celebrate the young prodigal's return by a good dinner, and furnishing the needful supplies, I returned to the cab, and drove home.

Next day at half-past twelve o'clock Mike called, having been at school as usual at nine o'clock. He gave me a grand account of the evening at home—the first after a more than

three years' absence. It was a very happy meeting. To do his parents justice, they uttered no words of reproach. They were over-joyed to see their son, who had been lost and was found, and they made merry and were glad. He continued to sleep at home, and dined every day with me. This went on for a few months, when I began to think that perhaps Mike would be better if he were learning some trade and attending the night school in the evenings. I asked him what trade he liked best.

"A sailor, sir; I would like to go to sea."

He was now over thirteen years of age, and so I thought he would do well for a cabin-boy; but he was under-sized for his age, and looked unfit for sea-life. The following Saturday we went to the London Docks, and we applied to captain after captain, but to no purpose. One of them said with a grin:

"You had better send his mother with him to keep him in bread and milk."

We had to return home disappointed. A few days afterwards we started for the St. Katharine Docks, and though we boarded about twenty ships, there was no vacancy for a cabin-boy. And a second time we returned, having discovered nothing. I then applied to my friend Mr. Tebbs, of Highgate, told him my case, and what I wanted. Through his kindness I had a letter of introduction to a friend of his in Leadenhall Street, a ship-owner, and in a few days Mike and I started off to see him. I presented the letter, and I was soon ushered into the private room of the head of the firm. After some preliminary observations, he inquired if the boy had accompanied me. Mike was called in, and the gentleman said:

"Well, my lad, do you want to go to sea?"

"Yes, sir."

"You will have rough work, you know, and you are not very strong."

"I like work, sir, and I can work better than I looks."

"Well," said this gentleman, "I think there is a ship at Ipswich, the *Tam o' Shanter*, bound for Taganrog, in the Black Sea, and it is possible the captain may want a cabin-boy. I will inquire, and you shall hear from me in a few days."

So home we came again, this time with more hopeful anticipations than after our two former experiences. After the delay of a week, I received a letter in which the boy was ordered to go immediately to Ipswich, and to present himself to the captain of the ship already named. After breakfast we went to an outfitter's, and rigged up Master Mike in full sailor costume, everything included.

Next day, Mike took leave of his father and mother, who were glad and sorry at his departure. They knew that London

was no place for him, and that the life of a sailor would have the effect of getting rid of his former associations. The following morning, before starting, Mike looked very depressed—quite out of spirits; and after a little while he came to me and said:

"I hope, sir, you'll let me have your likeness, that I may take it away with me to sea."

"Certainly, Mike. We shall go at once, and you must have yours taken at the same time."

So off we went, had the photographs taken, and spent the remainder of the day going about and showing Mike some of the London sights. That evening, when he was in my study, the poor boy, with tears in his eyes, said: "I'll be lonesome enough, sir, on the big ocean; but I hope you'll often think of me. Oh! you don't know how sorry I am in my heart, going away from you."

Having given him some good advice, and exacted from him a promise to read every day some portion of his Bible, and to pray some of the little prayers I gave him, we knelt down together for the last time. It was getting late, and we were obliged to start very early next morning, so as to arrive in Ipswich by eleven o'clock. Before he went to bed, I had the following conversation with him:

"Mike, tell me, how was it that you were first led to pick ladies' pockets, as I understood you to say the other day?"

"Pick ladies' pockets, sir! Oh no, sir! I never was so bad as that. How could I be so wicked, sir?"

"Well, but you robbed the 'tills,' didn't you?"

"Oh yes, sir; but then I didn't rob them for myself. I had to do it, or the other chaps would beat me. I never went about to pick pockets, sir; that is what only the regular thieves do."

"But did you not steal boots and bread?"

"Yes, sir; I wanted the boots to put on my feet, for I had nothing to wear; and I wanted the bread to eat, for I used to be at times dying with hunger."

"Then you never were with any gang of burglars, or other men of that kind?"

"Oh no, sir! I only went about with a lot of more boys older than myself, and we used to go about the shops and places when we had a chance. Most of the time I was in gaol was for stealing small things out of the boxes outside the shops. There used to be constables in plain clothes dodging about and watching us, and whenever I bolted off the constable would give chase and pin me before I went very far."

It was curious to notice the delicate shades of distinction which Mike drew between the different forms of robbery. Yet, he really felt distressed at the idea of being suspected of

engaging in such a low pursuit as that of picking pockets—an occupation, in his notion of things, belonging only to the worst class of thieves.

Next morning we left home. On the way to the station Mike cried bitterly, and nothing that I could say to him seemed to pacify him. I confess that I was astonished to witness so much affection in a boy whose life never had any sunshine, and to whom "home" and "father" and "mother" were unknown experiences, at least so far as the emotions of the heart were concerned. Everyone who became acquainted with Mike after his coming under my notice was greatly pleased with him. The ladies in the parish used to have him now and then to spend the evening with the servants, whom he greatly amused with his Irish drollery and humour. He was a very affectionate boy, and, what is not very common, most grateful for what had been done for him.

We arrived in due time at Ipswich. We soon found our way to the ship, and introduced ourselves to the captain, a kind-hearted man, bluff and sailor-like. After a few minutes' conversation he asked me to "go below with the boy" before I left. When we were alone poor Mike fairly broke down, and wept like a child—for indeed he had the heart of one, in spite of all the hardening experiences of his life. He kept crying, till I had to remind him that if any of the sailors were to see him, they would never give him any rest on the voyage, laughing at him and so forth,

"I can't help it, sir; it's the kindness that makes me cry—and who will be kind to me any more?"

Poor boy! my own heart was full when parting from him, and it would have been more than full had I then known that I was never to see him again on earth. The *Tam o'Shanter* sailed to Taganrog, where it arrived in safety. After discharging her cargo, she took another of grain, I think, and sailed to Galway, on the west coast of Ireland.

Now, if this narrative were to appear in a novel, no one would believe it possible that a wild, ragged boy, accidentally picked up in the streets of London, should *par la force des circonstances*, first go away to the very East of Europe, and then go back to the very West of Europe—to the very town where my own friends, dearest and most loved, were living—and that this boy should die, carefully tended up to his last hours by the loving attention of the wife of the Warden of Galway—the Very Rev. James Daly. Yet such is the fact—stranger than any fiction. When I heard that the *Tam O'Shanter* was bound for the port of Galway, I wrote to Mrs. Daly, and asked her to allow Mike to call on her. She knew his history from me previously. Accordingly, when the

ship arrived, about Christmas, Mike soon found that he had friends on shore, who asked leave from his captain to allow him to spend an evening now and then with the servants. Mike danced hornpipes for them, told them yarns, and kept them in good-humour by his funny stories. All was very pleasant, and everything seemed just what one would like to be. However, there is nothing more certain than the unexpected. A few days after he had been at the Warden's house, Mike was engaged one day in helping to unlade the ship. He was very tired, and as the ship lay in the docks, he went on to the quay, and walked about. Being quite done up, he soon fell asleep, and when he awoke he felt ill and unable hardly to get back to the ship. Next day he had to go to the fever hospital, where he was visited by my wife's aunt—Mrs. Daly—and, in spite of all that kindness and skill could do, poor Mike, after all his wanderings and chequered experience, breathed his last in a hospital in a port in the far west of Ireland.

The moral of the whole case is plain enough. There are children among the poor, who from neglect and harsh treatment are driven from home, and from sheer force of sympathy join with others of the "criminal" class, who soon educate them in the ways of vice. If only they could be adopted by some one who might be able to surround them with "home" influences, their lives might be made happy, and their career in guilt cut short. But it must be personal and individual sympathy. It will not do so much good to send such a boy to a reformatory, though of course that is excellent in its way, and I should be sorry to say a single word against such places for recovery. Still, it is not the best plan for all cases. There are training ships at Liverpool and on the Thames, and several reformatories. In these a lad has every facility for recovering lost ground. I should be sorry to leave my readers under the impression that I disparage these admirable organizations. They are good, and very good, but the softening charms of home-life are not—and from the very nature of the case cannot be—brought to bear upon these young outcasts in any public institution, no matter how well conducted it may be. Unless the waif and stray feels something of the instincts of home and its loving associations, the better part of his nature is not called forth. The heart-culture does not go on to the same extent as when the boy feels the warm grasp of a loving hand, and the kind and cheery influences of fellow-feeling. The electrical influence of heart and face and voice tell their own tale, and unconsciously exercise their power on those who come within their reach. "I was a stranger, and you took me in." The personal patronage of

these waifs and strays is apparently superior to any system of reformatory routine, however excellent, and even necessary under existing circumstances. All I contend for is simply this—the boy or girl who may become an outcast from home, from whatever cause, is more likely to be softened into gentleness and gratitude and love by being adopted into some family, and cared for as if he or she were part of the household, than if they were provided for under the strict discipline and barrack regulation of any public institution, however good. It is not that I like these refuges less, but that I like the former plan more.

G. W. WELDON.

ART. VI. — PRIVATE JUDGMENT: ITS SCOPE AND LIMITS.

THE right of Private Judgment in matters of belief is, to some extent, pretty generally admitted. It inheres in our moral constitution; it follows from that liberty of choice or free-will which distinguishes mankind from the lower orders of created life. Why should we be denied the exercise of our reason upon the worthiest and noblest of all subjects, religious truth? In the world of nature there is a perfect correspondence between our organs of vision and the light of the sun. Is there not as undoubted a correlation between reason, the eye of the soul, and the light of Divine truth?

The very existence of faculties whereby men reason upon that truth, proves the indefeasible right of exerting them, just as truly as to have been born with eyes, confers upon the individual the right to see. The eye has to be trained, and so become adjusted to objects about it. In many cases it is defective. We do not, therefore, bandage every man's eyes or put spectacles upon him because these are required by certain persons. The maxim *Abusus non tollit usum* obtains here. Persons have grievously abused their right of private judgment; it does not follow that they should be deprived of it. It would be safer to infer, that the faculty for forming such judgments imposes upon them the duty of using it. In the great day of account, the servant who wraps his talent in a napkin and buries it in the earth, will be found to fare no better than he who shall have appropriated or misused his Lord's goods.

The Church of Rome denies to her children the use of their private judgment; she cannot, therefore, be expected to urge upon them the duty of it. Hence the revolt of the Teutonic races at the Reformation; hence, too, the wide-spread alienation from her fold of the educated laity in countries like Italy, France, and Spain. We shall see presently, how she is compelled to grant the right of private judgment in a way fatal to her own consistency.

The late Bishop Thirlwall, in one of his Charges, wrote thus: "The strength of the Papal Church lies in the weakness of human nature, such as: (1) its slavish readiness to accept without inquiry any pretensions, however unfounded, if they are only put forward with a sufficient degree of confident assurance; (2) the cowardice with which it shrinks from the burden of personal responsibility, and is anxious to shift it upon another; and, (3) the intellectual sluggishness which makes it impatient, as Thucydides observed, of the labour required for the investigation of truth." These are undoubted hindrances to the right discharge of private judgment, whether we agree with the Bishop or not in accounting them the secret of the success of the Roman system.

Again; a large mass of language in Holy Scripture is beside the mark, if the right of private judgment be denied, and if it be not upon the contrary a positive duty to exercise it. "If I speak truth, why do ye not believe My words?" To *what*, if not to private judgment, does our Lord appeal here, and throughout the whole of His controversy with the hostile Jews, in the Gospel of St. John? "By manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God," and the exhortation, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good"—what meaning can such words have, if they do not set us about the investigation of religious truth, and hence in some shape the use of our private judgment?

It has been alleged that the Church of Rome substantially admits the right which she formally denies to her children. The late Canon Mozley has very acutely demonstrated the truth of this allegation. He does it in this way. When a Roman controversialist tries to bring us over to his way of thinking, he plies us with certain well-known texts of Holy Scripture, such as, "Thou art Peter," etc. He seeks to convince us by means of these that the Pope is infallible. He thus appeals to our private judgment: if we give it in his favour, we must swallow whole the entire Roman scheme, and as we do so, we are bidden to surrender for ever our private judgment. It is enough for us henceforth to believe what the Church tells us, and to believe it, too, solely because she does tell it us. The flaw, however, lies just here: if my private judgment be

untrustworthy, can I be sure that it did not mislead me when I took the Roman view of certain texts? Is it not a sandy foundation for so imposing a structure? On the other hand, if my private judgment be thus far valid, why must I give it up henceforth and make no more use of it?

The right, then, being conceded, the question arises, What is its scope, and what are the conditions under which it may be used with safety? If it be not kept within bounds, the danger both to the Church and to the individual will be very great. We must arrive at a satisfactory, a workable adjustment between it and the counterbalancing principle of authority in matters of belief. The mind must keep in its normal position by a harmonious balance between these forces, which singly would carry it violently into one or other of two extremes, viz., of superstition or of scepticism; just as the earth revolves in its orbit by means of a similar adjustment between opposing forces.

Very much may be said, it must be admitted, in favour of the principle of Authority. We have to do with fallen humanity. The Fall has affected every department of man's being; it has unfitted him for arriving at religious truth, if left to himself. The eye of the soul must be purged by faith and love before it can see aright. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned." Men of the world ignore altogether this cardinal truth: they presume to form judgments about religious truths in utter unconsciousness that they need illumination from above. Hence the devastation wrought by such persons in their incursions upon the sacred domain of theology. From the Christian point of view, those who deny certain fundamental truths—the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection of our Lord, Original Sin, and the rest—are hopelessly in the dark in their speculations about the teachings of Holy Scripture. However much the light of natural science, of Greek culture, of critical and grammatical learning, such as modern writers bring to bear upon the Scriptures, may aid the devout student, it should be remembered that the natural man possessed these qualities in large measure when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthian Church, and that he can no more now, than he did then, "know the things of the Spirit of God."

Our Lord sent forth His Apostles to teach all nations, and thus to remedy those defects inherent in fallen humanity whereby, despite its wisdom, "it knew not God." The light was revealed from heaven, but it was through the Church: it shone *through men to men*. The Holy Ghost was given that men might have "a right judgment," that they might be re-

newed in knowledge, "that they might attain unto the full assurance of understanding."

At first there was no variance between the two principles of Authority and Private Judgment. The selfsame Spirit Who spake by the Apostles and prophets, wrought secretly in men's hearts, illumining their understandings and inclining their wills to embrace the truth. Should not this be the case now? Whilst we apply ourselves to search with all diligence after the truth, may we not reverently and thankfully recognise the Church as the means whereby, under God, the truth has been made known to us? As "a Witness and a Keeper of Holy Writ," she gives it into our hands, and bids us to study it for ourselves, with her Creeds and Articles as guides and landmarks. The Church has trained many generations for heaven. The questionings and doubts and difficulties which have perplexed the minds of her children now, were known and experienced long ago; and such difficulties must ever and anon arise, even to the end. The Church has laid down doctrines to be received, and counsels us to submit our judgments to what is prescribed, upon the warrant of Holy Scripture. If men will but wait patiently, the light will shine upon their obscurity. The Church would have us grow up into the truth, and to hold it with the full and loyal assent of our judgment, for thus only shall we be equipped to fight her battles and our own. She rejoices when her children can say, with the Samaritans of old, "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."

The English Church was clearly guided by the Spirit of Truth in the course she took at the Reformation. As against Rome, on the one hand, she declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith or be thought requisite to salvation." As against the ultra-Reformers, on the other hand, she lays down, *credenda*, things necessary to be believed. In this way she upholds the principle of authority in controversies of faith. She leaves such as wilfully cling to their own opinions to find out their errors, "in meekness instructing them, if peradventure God may give them repentance to the acknowledgment of His truth." He who holds to his own conclusions in the face of the "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" is very bold; he must go his way whilst we go ours. Only, we must remember that he uses his own prerogative as against us, even though he may be misusing it. We should regard misbelievers with sorrow and anxiety, not with bitterness or

any desire of coercing or browbeating them into our way of thinking. Failure here, lies at the root of much party rancour and strife; we take it ill that anyone should differ from our own, or what we conceive to be the Church's, beliefs.

We may not now pursue a very interesting branch of our subject, viz., that which deals with the relations between the Church and Holy Scripture as guides to religious truth. Canon Westcott somewhere co-ordinates the two as authorities by a very beautiful adaptation of Isaiah's words about the voice which the child of God may expect to hear: "And thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way: walk ye in it, when ye turn to the right hand or to the left." He supposes a two-fold voice: one the Church, the other the Bible. At the Reformation, as the present Dean of St. Paul's has pointed out, the Reformers appealed from the authority of the Church, as it then existed, to Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church, not from authority to private judgment. As sons of the English Church we cannot but admire the wisdom wherewith she gave its proper scope to private judgment, whilst strenuously asserting the principle of authority. Other Christian bodies dealt with the difficulty in various ways, though none, we venture to think, so successfully as the Church of England.

In conclusion, it is to be hoped that some principles have been laid down which may help us, whilst we acknowledge the right of private judgment, and even the duty of exercising it, to confine it within due limits. Church history has its solemn warnings for us: we must beware lest we suppress the healthful working of those faculties whereby men grow up into the full knowledge of the truth. The Nemesis of schisms and strifes has dogged the steps of that Church which has striven to keep back men from error by violent means. Those will be safe who remember their shortsightedness and infirmity, and are ready to hail the light from whatever quarter of the heavens it may come. Their path will be that of the just, "which shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

May God grant to all who teach in His Church that they may help His people to see the reasonableness of the truths taught them! Inquirers should be led to the door of the Temple of Truth, and be bidden to kneel reverently and knock for admission. And let us all remember the exhortation, "to sanctify the Lord God in our hearts, so that we may be ready to give to every man that asketh, a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear."

F. K. AGLIONBY.

Reviews.

The Spirits in Prison, and other Studies on the Life after Death. By E. H. Plumptre, D.D., Dean of Wells. Isbister. 1884.

THE Dean of Wells is widely known as an enthusiastic student of Scripture, and as an acute though somewhat speculative investigator of abstruse points of Biblical study. He is thoroughly clear and outspoken; and if he handles Scripture critically, he never does so irreverently. His classical lore and his patristic studies add much to the weight of his words; moreover, he is thoroughly fair, and never overstates his own case or understates the position and arguments of those from whom he feels compelled to disagree.

The book now under review runs to 416 pages, of which the first 30 contain the sermon on "the spirits in prison;" the rest of the book is made up of critical and doctrinal papers on "Life after Death," "The Descent into Hell," "The Salvation of the Heathen," "Prayers for the Dead." "Purgatory," and "Conditional Immortality." There is a great deal of repetition in these studies, and long letters and articles are inserted which do not appear to add force to the Dean's position; in fact, the book might have been considerably reduced and condensed with advantage. Taking the work, however, as it stands, it will be read with deep interest by those who have made eschatology a special study, whether they agree with the author or not.

Dealing in the first place with the subject of our Lord's preaching to the spirits in prison, the Dean follows on the line of Bishop Horsley, whose sermon seems unanswerable. It is strange that any other view can have obtained currency in the Church; strange to imagine that our Lord's entrance into the world of the departed should have produced no effect on its inhabitants. The Dean does not seem to know of Mr. Stratten's paper on this subject; nor does he refer to the view of Owen, whose work on the Hebrews is cited by Mr. Stratten; nor does he fully grasp the reason why the Apostle Peter specially refers to those who were disobedient in the days of Noah, though that reason is not hard to specify. The Dean sometimes neglects the use of the LXX. as a connecting link between the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New; it is through this apparent negligence that he has missed the true interpretation of the word translated "quickened" in 1 Pet. iii. 18. The Dean rightly refers to the first issue of the Articles as containing the view of the Reformed Church on our Lord's visit to the nether world; but why does he give these Articles the date 1542? (p. 6, note). Probably this is a misprint. The book, it may be said in passing, is generally printed with great care, always excepting the Hebrew, which the Dean might as well have left out.

The author refers to 1 Pet. iv. 6 as bearing out the true interpretation of 1 Pet. iii. 18; but it is not easy to follow him here. Neither text nor context seem to be fully grappled with. Other subjects which he touches lightly in the sermon are discussed at greater length in the "Studies;" and to these the reader's attention is now invited.

Prayers for the dead, we are told, were at the time of our Lord's ministry offered in every synagogue (p. 65). For proof of this assertion the Dean refers to his "Study" on the subject. Those who have any acquaintance with the Jewish Prayer Book, will turn with interest to the "Study;" but what will be their disappointment at finding only this addi-

tional information: "There can scarcely be a shadow of doubt that such prayers were offered in every synagogue, *or* repeated by mourning kinsmen to whom the duty of right belonged, during the whole period covered by the Gospels and the Acts"! This is indeed a feeble proof of the Dean's assertion.

The Dean seems to have mixed up three things: Wishes for the Dead, Remembrance of the Dead, Prayers for the Dead: moreover, in giving the authority of the early Liturgies, he has not sufficiently considered the fact that these Liturgies have probably not come down to us in their original condition. Scanning the New Testament, we find at most but one wish for a dead person. If prayers for the dead ought to be offered by the living, would the writings of the Apostles have been so barren on the subject? It would be easy to put one's finger on certain passages where such prayers would be referred to; but they are conspicuous by their absence.

The discussion on the Lord's descent into Hades will be read with profit. In dealing with the apocryphal correspondence between Abgarus and Christ, the Dean does not refer to the lately discovered Syriac MSS., which push back the correspondence to an early date, though it is of course apocryphal; nor does he deal with the Hebrew original of Psalm xvi. which St. Peter quoted on the day of Pentecost.

One of Dr. Plumptre's essays is on "The Wider Hope"—that is, the prospect of those who have not yielded to the Gospel in this world through ignorance or indifference rather than through active opposition. The Dean passes under review various doctrines and theories, ancient and modern, including the speculations of Mr. Birks, whose views were not passed over quite so lightly as the writer supposes. It is surprising that no reference is made by the Dean to the interesting and elaborate book by E. W. Grinfield, entitled "The Nature and Extent of the Christian Dispensation with reference to the Salvability of the Heathen," published in 1827, and dedicated to the S.P.G. The Dean does not appear to have established his view of this subject on a sufficient induction of the facts and truths bearing on it, especially as regards the constitution of human nature; so at least it seems to one who has thought and written on the question for the last twenty years.[1]

In dealing with the word "eternal," though the Dean has not gone fully into the Old Testament usage, he is eminently fair, distinguishing the various senses of the word, and while recognising the impossibility of knowing what *time* will be (or what mode of consciousness will be substituted for it) in the next world, yet endorsing the *primâ facie* interpretation of the term "eternal" as applied to existence after death.

The doctrine of "annihilation" is passed under review by Dr. Plumptre and dismissed as untenable, the writer forcibly urging that "destruction" according to Scriptural usage means "ruin," and that "death" when applied to the human being signifies a very different thing from "death" when it is used of a plant or an animal.

The Dean next discusses the doctrine of "Conditional Immortality" as put forth by Mr. White. This he rejects on the same grounds as lead him to dismiss "annihilation."

With regard to our choice of terminology when speaking of the punishment of the wicked in hell, the Dean is faithful and careful. "It must be admitted," he says (p. 59), "that the teaching of the Gospel sanctions the appeal to the fear of hell, even in the form from which we often shrink as too strong and coarse for the refinements of a later age. It was

[1] See "Dies Iræ" (Hatchards) and "Synonyms of the Old Testament, their bearing on Christian Doctrine and Practices" (Longmans).

true then, as it has been since, that that fear might be the first step to eternal life. The preaching of mendicant friars, of Jesuit missionors, of Anglican revivalists, of Wesley and Whitfield, of the Salvation Army, so far as it is addressed to those who are in the same spiritual state as those who listened to our Lord, may legitimately appeal to the sanction of His authority. They cannot be altogether wrong if they speak now as He spake of old."

It would have been well if the Dean had gone a little deeper into the grounds of the "Great Decision," and had pointed out wherein man's responsibility and sin lies, especially in view of the proclamation of the Gospel. The mass of people in our country have feeble views on sin, partly because they have so little knowledge of the nature and claim of God, and partly because they have such a low idea of the position and possibilities of human nature. Alas! in many cases it is not to be wondered at.

Passing over some minor points, such as the confusion between the words *paideia* and *kolasis* (p. 61) and the reference to what the Dean calls the *term* "restitution of all things," without limiting it by its context, it remains that some notice should be taken of what seems to be the main doctrine of the book, viz., that men will have an opportunity for repentance after death.

The Dean is very guarded on the subject; and no one who carefully reads what he has written would go away with the idea that we might as well live in sin in this world as we shall all have another chance afterwards. It is not plain that the Dean thinks that *all* will have another chance; but he opens a wide door of opportunity. In his correspondence with a Roman Catholic the point at issue is this: Is there *probation* in the next world? Here the Dean seems to be worsted; but he candidly prints the letters, that everyone may judge. The Roman Catholic holds, what most of us hold, that *probation* is over in this life, whilst acknowledging that *enlightenment* may take place in another. The Dean holds that increase of light involves extension of probation. The point under discussion may be illumined, if not determined, by our Lord's remarkable words in Matthew xi. and xii.—see especially Matthew xi. 20-24. Our Lord does not say that Tyre and Sidon and Sodom will have further probation, but that if they had enjoyed the advantages which Capernaum had received they would have repented long ago. Not they *might* have repented, but they *would* have repented; not a new chance would have been offered to them, but the new enlightenment would have been welcomed by them.

Supposing, then, that the Dean has failed to convince us as to the doctrine of a further probation, it yet remains to inquire, first, how far the enlightenment hinted at in Scripture as the divine bestowal on the nether world will tend to *purify;* and secondly, what classes of persons it will reach. The Dean touches on both these subjects, and what he says is instructive, but he will not satisfy the mind of the thoughtful inquirer. How can anyone do so? The subject is really beyond our reach.

Dr. Plumptre rightly holds the continuity of character after death; but he does not go thoroughly into the springs of character, or deal with that text which Mr. Drummond makes so much of in his book on "Natural Law," viz., "He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Until we recognise the full force of this passage, we cannot tell how much of what we call "character" will be thrown off with the flesh, and how far in the article of death we shall burst our bonds and enter into the full realization of the goodness and faithfulness of Him Who is "the Lord of the dead." Take the case of the penitent thief, for an example, or the case of some dull cottager who

could not write out the Apostles' Creed to save his life, but who is resting on Christ in his simple way. One feels how impossible it is to say what "the day after death" is to such an one. Nor is it needful. Instead of speculating on such cases, it seems wiser to search into what is told us of the character and proceedings of Him Who will pass under review the circumstances and history of every soul. We know more, in a certain sense, about the Judge than about the judged. We cannot decide the destiny of a single soul, not even of our own soul; and this is well. The work of judgment is to be carried on by One Who combines the real spirit of humanity with the attributes of Deity; Who will penetrate all disguises and admit of no subterfuges; Who will not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax; and Who can detect the undeveloped germ of faith or loyalty beneath the hard thick husk of ignorance and dulness. The Heart-searcher will be the Administrator, and under His control each man will find his future decided for him by a law as unerring as the law of gravitation. As there is every variety of character and circumstance here, so there will be every variety of position hereafter, whilst yet there will be a dividing line drawn without fault or flinching by the hand of One Who cannot make a mistake. We think of the myriads of dull, ignorant souls who dwell under the shadow of our churches; we think of the infants who have died before they could tell their right hand from their left; of those who have been bereft of reason; of those whose existence has been wrong and wretched from the time they drew their first breath; and we say, How will it be with them hereafter? The answer lies in the name and character and dealings and words of Christ, as reported in the Gospels and as illustrated by the Epistles. We leave these difficult cases with Him in thorough confidence. We do not forget His tears over Jerusalem, the "*ye would not*" which put a bar in the way of "*how often would I.*" We do not forget how Paul warned every man night and day with tears, as if he recognised the peril of those who heard the glad tidings and put it from them. If he had thought that all his hearers would have another chance after death, would he have been so urgent? If the truth was not revealed to him, has it been revealed to anyone else? Can it be inferred from a fair induction of Scripture? Dr. Plumptre, with all his acumen, has failed to find "a second probation" in Scripture, either for the believing or for the unbelieving. The words of Justin Martyr (quoted by the Dean) seem to be a safer guide and resting-place for the mind, when he says, "The righteous die no more; the wicked are punished *so long as God wills both their being and their punishment.*" We know nothing of the physical constitution of the lost in the age to come, nor do we know for what period their existence is decreed, nor do we know what relationship there is between time and eternity in a state of being where perhaps there is no succession of events. Thus we come back, as Dr. Plumptre does, again and again to this: we are ignorant. But we come back at the same time to another thing: Those of us who are ministers are to preach and teach God's Word as it is plainly written, neither adding to the promises, nor taking from the threats, nor disregarding the conditions, nor shutting our eyes to the revealed attributes of Him Who has given us the Scripture.

It would be easy to select many interesting passages from the Dean's book. Enough, however, has been said to indicate its excellences; and if in this brief review an attempt has been made to indicate what seemed to be its defects, it is done in the consciousness that the critic is dealing with one whose writing it is a pleasure to read, and whose spirit every Biblical student would do well to emulate.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

Songs in Many Keys. By the Rev. CHARLES D. BELL, D.D. James Nisbet: London.

The title of Canon Bell's new volume of verse gives a just description of its contents. This fresh collection of his graceful compositions is an evidence of the great variety and versatility of his poetical gift. We have here narrative poems, such as the touching "Story of the Crimean War," which opens the volume, and the "Wigton Martyrs," condemned to be drowned in the rising waters of the remorseless tide; Scripture studies in thoughtful blank verse, such as "Christ before Pilate" and "Judas;" patriotic poems, like the "Night Charge at Kassassin" and "Tel el Kebir;" a number of lyrical pieces full of the sweetness of Nature or the tenderness of religious feeling.

Canon Bell's mastery of melodious language may be seen in "Sea Voices":

Nature has many voices for the ear,
Of accents diverse, yet melodious all:
Some soft as lute, and some as clarion clear,
Others as thrilling as the trumpet's call.

The winds make music as they wildly sweep
In fitful gusts across the stormy sky;
So doth the thunder when white lightnings leap
In blinding flashes 'thwart the dazzled eye.

Waters make cadenced music as they run:
Rush of the river, ripple of the brook,
Brawl of the stream, in shadow or in sun;
The song of tinkling rill in leafy nook.

In truth, this happy earth is never mute:
The hum of bees is heard in honeyed flowers,
And mating birds amid the branches flute
And warble love-songs thro' the enchanted hours.

How sweet the bleating of the flocks in June,
The far-off lowing of the pastured herd,
And hum of insects in the sultry noon,
When in the woods no sleeping leaf is stirr'd!

But Nature has no music for my ear,
Whether low murmuring winds, or rush of streams,
Or song of birds in spring-time of the year,
Or crash of thunder when the lightning gleams—

Sweet as the anthem of the sounding sea,
The plaintive plash of waves against the strand,
Or dash of waters as in sportive glee
They break in silver ripples on the sand.

How grand the diapason of its storms,
When the great deep resounds from shore to shore,
And the white billows raise their threatening forms,
And then plunge back with long tumultuous roar.

I love the very sea-song in the shell
Which holds a strange sweet music for the ear;
Deep in its chambers ocean murmurs dwell,
And chimes of surging waters, faint but clear.

A constant joy thou art, majestic sea!
Girt with thy guardian cliffs or ring'd with sand;
A fresh delight I ever find in thee,
Whether by tempests stirr'd or breezes fann'd.

And when, dear friends, there comes that hour to me,
When voices of the earth shall all be o'er,
Place me, I pray, near the sonorous sea,
Where I can catch the rapture of its roar;

And hear it sweetly blending with the notes
Of harpers harping on the sea of glass ;
That as the music downward to me floats,
My soul upon the stream to heaven may pass.

There is a soothing poem in the same measure on "Ambleside Churchyard at Eastertide," which ends with these beautiful verses—alluding to the daffodils planted on the graves :

Fair daffodils ! whose pensive petals hold
The shimmering dews and drops of tender rain,
Within your deep-fring'd chalices of gold,
To shed sweet tears upon the earth again ;

Ye tell of love that stronger is than death,
Of faith that soars triumphant o'er the tomb ;
And hopes ye give, the buried seed beneath
Shall break and bud into immortal bloom.

O Christ, Who lovest well each living thing,
Glory of flower and joyous grace of bird,
Let the world's winter melt into a spring,
Which shall eternal blossom at Thy word !

In pity look upon this weeping earth,
Grave-covered, wet with many a mourner's tears ;
Long has she travailed. Why delay the birth ?
Give full fruition to the hopes of years !

Perhaps not the least striking feature of Dr. Bell's "Songs in Many Keys" is the group of twenty-seven Rondeaux, which occupy the centre of the volume. He has taken up this new form of verse, and shown himself able to cope with and overcome its difficulties, and has once more proved that this measure, formerly dedicated to light French strains, is capable of being applied with great effect and sometimes pathetic force to solemn and devout subjects. We close our notice with one specimen :

Clear-sighted Faith ! how all things lie
Changed and transfigured 'neath her eye :
A rainbow on each cloud appears,
A glory shines through mists of tears,
And cloudless blue through clouded sky.
When winds blow fierce and waves are high,
Through spray and foam she can descry
His hand Who safe the vessel steers,
Clear-sighted Faith !

Content to live—content to die,
Calmly for her the days go by,
And, dwelling in the upper spheres,
Above the reach of cares or fears,
She sees more cause to sing than sigh—
Clear-sighted Faith !

Short Notices.

Drifting Away. A few Remarks on Professor Drummond's Search for "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." By the Hon. PHILIP CARTERET HILL, D.C.L. London : Bemrose and Sons, 23, Old Bailey ; and Derby.

This pamphlet will be read by many with lively interest. We may quote a specimen passage. The author refers to moderate, religious, half-way evolutionists ; and he proceeds thus :

"To what startling results this half-way evolutionism may lead, we "have only to look at the conclusions arrived at by Darwin himself. In "his 'Descent of Man' he teaches that man's moral nature has been "evolved by slow degrees from the social instincts common to many "animals. 'Lower animals,' he says, 'especially the dog, manifest love "reverence, fidelity, and obedience; and it is from these elements that "the religious sentiment in man has been slowly evolved by a process "of natural selection.'

"These are the views of Darwin; but, it may be fairly asked, are they "the views of Professor Drummond? To which it may well be replied, "that without evolution he is nothing: he would have no *locum standi;* "nearly all his arguments are derived from its existence and assumed "operations as incontrovertible facts. Thus, as to its existence, he speaks "'of the greatest of modern scientific doctrines, the evolution hypo-"thesis.' And again he says, 'The strength of the doctrine of evolution, "at least in its broader outlines, is now such that its verdict on any "biological question is a consideration of moment. And if any further "defence is needed for the idea of a third kingdom (the Spiritual King-"dom or the Kingdom of Heaven), it may be found in the singular "harmony of the whole conception with *this great modern truth.*' It is to "be noted that he not merely speaks of evolution as 'the greatest of "modern scientific doctrines,' but as 'this great modern *truth*,' thus dis-"tinctly assuming it as an established and incontrovertible law.

"In speaking of the ultimate results of the theory, he uses language "attributing to it the most remarkable inherent powers. 'It is, perhaps, "impossible,' he says, 'with such faculties as we now possess, to imagine "an evolution with a future as great as its past. So stupendous is the "development from the atom to the man that no point can be fixed in "the future as distant from what man is now, as he is from the atom.' "While in another chapter he approaches perilously near the borders of "profanity when he states that 'the goal of evolution is Jesus Christ'!"

The Apostolic Fathers. The Epistles of S. Clement, S. Ignatius, S. Barnabas, S. Polycarp. Translated, with an introductory notice, by C. H. HOOLE, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 2nd edition. Rivingtons.

A new edition of Mr. Hoole's volume scarcely calls for comment. There are 70 pages of introduction and 240 of translation. A translation of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" has been added; and we remark with surprise that the opening of chap. x., *μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε*, is rendered: "But *after it has been completed*, so *pray* ye." Surely, instead of "after it has been completed" it should be "but *after being filled*;"[1] and instead of "pray" the word should be "*give thanks.*" Mr. Hoole, in the very next sentence, renders the verb "we thank." And why, at the opening of ch. ix., *περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε*, "but concerning *the giving of thanks*, after this manner *give thanks*," does he render "concerning the Eucharist"? In section 5, "Eucharist" is, of course, a proper rendering.

The Pulpit Commentary: I. Chronicles. Exposition by Rev. Professor P. C. BARKER, M.A., LL.B. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co.

This is a good volume of the Commentary, which seems to be growing more and more "popular," as we predicted it would. Professor Barker's Introduction is ably written, full enough, and very satisfactory. The Homilies, by various authors, so far as we have examined, are sound and suggestive.

[1] See CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 318.

The literal translation of the Hebrew title of the "Chronicles" is "Verba dierum" (Jerome); "*sermones* dierum," wrote Hilary; idiomatically, "*acta*, or *res gestæ* dierum." But the Septuagint gave as a title *παραλειπομένων* (*βιβλίον*); the book of things *omitted* (Jerome), *pretermissorum*. Our English title, as every student knows, came from Jerome's *Chronicon*; and "Chronicles" does very well. The Hebrew title could hardly have been any portion of the original work. Who the author or compiler was is an undetermined question; but we agree with Professor Barker that evidence points to Ezra; for ourselves, we should be inclined to say "*strongly* points." In another section the Professor writes thus: "It may be affirmed safely that the most candid, and at the same time the most searching examination of the objections made to Chronicles on the score of authenticity, by such opponents as have been under notice, leads to the conviction that not one of these objections can hold its own."

The Joy of the Ministry. An endeavour to increase the efficiency and deepen the happiness of Pastoral Work. By the Rev. F. R. WYNNE, M.A., Canon of Christ Church and Incumbent of St. Matthias, Dublin. Pp. 200. Hodder and Stoughton.

Canon Wynne is known to many of our readers, no doubt, as the author of "Spent in the Service," a Memoir of Dean Daunt. His present work will assuredly not diminish his reputation. It displays ability, shrewd common-sense, insight, earnestness, and, above all, a fervent and affectionate spiritual-mindedness. Any devout and thoughtful minister of Christ will read it with interest and profit. "Hints for the Study," "The Sermon Matter," "The Manner of Preaching," "From House to House," are excellent chapters; while in the chapter headed "On the Knees" we find the link between outdoor work and indoor work, and the secret of power in the "house of prayer."

The Life of John Janeway (Seeley and Co.) is recommended, in a prefatory note, by the Rev. J. VENN; a cheap and interesting little book. John Janeway, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, died in 1657, when only twenty-four years old; and Richard Baxter, in the original preface to this brief biography, speaks of Janeway and Alleine as "by overdoing" in Christian duties, cutting short their lives.

The Gospel Plan, in Easy Texts, a manual, by the late Rev. H. TAYLOR, M.A., has reached a third edition (Elliot Stock); printed in large clear type and cheap, it will be found widely useful; it is one of the very best books of the kind, so far as we know.

Paul Rabaut, or "The Desert Pastor," is No. 15 of the R. T. S. new Biographical Series; and an admirable tract it is, meriting wide circulation. Rabaut was born in 1718, and died in 1794. Such Pastors of the "Churches under the Cross" should ever be held in honour.

A helpful "handbook" for the present time is *The Antiquity and Genuineness of the Gospels*. (W. H. Allen and Co.) A good deal of ability and sound judgment is displayed in this thoughtful little volume.

Church Work in some Parishes of "Outcast London," by a LAY WORKER. Revised, and reprinted, by permission, from THE CHURCHMAN. (Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.) We heartily recommend this pamphlet. We wish a copy could be placed in the hands of every layman of piety and influence throughout the Church. Many a leading London layman might do much, in his own way, to make it known, with little trouble.

The thirty-fifth thousand (carefully revised and much enlarged) of Dr. Littledale's *Plain Reasons* has just been issued by the S. P. C. K. It is in its way—as we have always said—a wonderful little book.

Life and Writings of Charles Leslie, M.A., non-juring Divine. By the Rev. R. J. LESLIE, M.A., Vicar of Holbeach St. John. Rivingtons. 1885.

This volume of some 500 pages will be deemed, we think, by many readers, dry and dull. The author has evidently spent much time and labour upon it; and to one class of students its information may prove of interest.

We are pleased to invite attention to *The Annual Report for the Parish of St. Mary, Whitechapel.* The "Report" contains "a brief account of the various works carried on in connection with the Parish Church." 1884. (London: School-Press, 18a, Great Alie Street, Whitechapel, E.) The "Report" is really very interesting, and the Rector, the Rev. A. J. Robinson, shows in many ways how a great work may be carried on. The population of the parish is 14,000. The average attendance during 1884, we observe, is as follows:

Sunday morning	400
„ afternoon	200
„ evening	900
Thursday evening	180

As to "Communicants," the statistics are these:

Largest number present at any one time	298
Average attendance: at 9 a.m.	27
„ „ at 11 a.m.	47
„ „ at 6.30 p.m.	158

Church Reform. Cathedral Reform; Deans and Canons; Clerical Incomes; Church Preferment; The Bishop's Veto; Clerical Discipline; Revision of the Liturgy; Church Legislation. By the Hon. and Rev. E. V. BLIGH, M.A., Rector of Rotherfield, Sussex, 1856-65; Vicar of Birling, Kent, 1865-75. Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row. 1885.

Some of these "Church Reform" essays have already been published as letters in the *Times.* But the author has not merely dealt with Deans and Canons, Clerical Incomes, Church Legislation, and the Bishop's Veto; he has touched upon the subject of Liturgical Revision. Many zealous Church Reformers will read the pamphlet with interest. We thoroughly agree with Mr. Bligh that, as to reforms much needed, "*Lay* action is the only reasonable ground of hope."

Aunt Frank's Bible Studies (Elliot Stock) is a well-meant effort after the style of "Line upon Line." Some of the sentences are too long for children, and the style is scarcely simple enough. Here is a parenthesis: "and prophetically realizing that this numerous progeny should ultimately inherit the land of Canaan."

Communion with God, "Morning and Evening Prayers for a Month for Private Use," a pleasing little volume, is commended by the Rev. J. DAWSON, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Torquay (Suttaby and Co.).

Some of our readers may be glad to hear of a *Handbook of the Theological Colleges of the Church of England and the Episcopal Church in Scotland.* 1884-85. (Rivingtons.) There are twenty-one Theological Colleges in England, it appears, and two in Scotland. A good deal of information is given in this little pamphlet.

Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, an old favourite, keeps up well its reputation, political and literary. The February number has "From Gemai to Korti in a Whaler;" and part ii. of "Life in a Druse Village." In a paper which will have a peculiar interest for many, "A Black Year

for Investors," we read: "Merchants and manufacturers complain loudly of what in many cases is merely diminished incomes, but a bad year among investors may mean no income at all, and more or less complete sacrifice of capital. 1884 was such a year. Following on a series of sharp catastrophes in the leading investment markets, it found investors poor, and it left many of them in despair." "Foreign and Colonial Failures" is ably written, and most readers probably will say "Too true!" While *Blackwood* condemns the Cabinet as a whole, it is very severe on Lord Derby and Lord Granville. In an article on "The Life and Letters of George Eliot" appears much of clever criticism and literary interest. Miss Evans's connection with Mr. Lewes is—naturally enough—very gingerly passed over. Her great friend Mr. Herbert Spencer introduced her to Mr. Lewes. Whether the world has "gained" by her forming "this union with Lewes," a "step of the first importance in the development of her genius," is matter of opinion. As to the Positivists, we are told, what many of course well knew, that Miss Evans was only in unison with them up to a certain point:—

> While they have, for the manifestation of their religion, a sort of liturgy and a church, there is no evidence that she ever considered humanity to be a proper object of worship.

In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* appears "Recollections of South Indian Missions;" very interesting.—The *Church Sunday School Magazine*, a very good number, has a paper on Jewel's "Apology," by Archdeacon Murray; and papers on the Religious Instruction of the Upper Classes, by Miss Arnold-Forster and Lord Cranbrook.—In the *Church Worker*, the Rev. J. F. Kitto writes of a terrible winter (1866) in the East End: cholera, and the paralysis of the shipping trade. Mr. Kitto concludes:—

> How we started our first soup-kitchen; and our dinner-table for the sick and for the children, which we have maintained ever since; and our penny dinners, about which so much has been written at this time, as if they were an entirely new discovery; how all the machinery of parochial work had to be created amidst the constant turmoil of public discussions on distress and its causes, and relief committees and the visits of newspaper reporters; and how every fresh demand seemed only to draw forth new energies and new workers, binding us all together in the close bonds of common interest and common sympathies and common love.

A quarto edition of the *Oxford Bible for Teachers*, for family use, has just been printed at the University Press (in pica type), and published by Mr. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, Amen Corner. A handsome volume. It is admirably bound, having a brass clasp; it is very strong, and will endure the wear of reverent use for an indefinite period. It contains several excellent engravings, and there is a family register. The "Helps to the Study of the Bible," so well-known and so greatly valued—Index, Dictionary, Concordance, and Maps—form an Appendix of 300 pages. We heartily recommend this noble edition of the *Oxford Bible*. It will travel well in its neat box-cover.

In the last CHURCHMAN was noticed Dean Stanley's "Essays on Church and State." The fourth edition of the Dean's *Christian Institutions*, a companion volume, has just been published by Mr. Murray. It is highly interesting; in some respects, even more interesting than the other volume. "Absolution," "Ecclesiastical Vestments," "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," are some of its chapters.

In the *National Review* appears a timely paper on "Stimulants and Narcotics," by Mr. Percy Greg. With all that is advanced many readers will not agree, but everybody will admit that narcotism is more dangerous and destructive than intoxication. The demand for sedatives is apparently increasing.

THE MONTH.

KHARTOUM has fallen; Gordon is no more. Such were the startling tidings which surprised us on the 4th. "Too late!" was the cry throughout the country; the disappointment was bitter and profound. Never since the time of the Indian Mutiny has England been so stirred. Regret for the hero, so long neglected, the brave man alone at Khartoum (as Canon Hoare said at the C.M.S. anniversary last May), was keenly felt; but sorrow, admiration, and pity—lamentation befitting the loss—were accentuated by the complaint, "Too late."[1]

The *Record* says:

But what of the causes of this terrible disaster? This, simply, that from first to last, every one of them was, humanly speaking, preventible. Had we realized our duty after Tel-el-Kebir, the Mahdi would have remained a myth. The Arab sheikhs had then no blood-feud with us, and infinitely preferred the rule of such men as Gordon to that of the Pashas. Had Gordon been despatched to the front immediately after the defeat of Hicks Pasha's force, all might have been well. We know by what he accomplished when he did reach Khartoum at the eleventh hour, how much more he could have done earlier. Had his entreaties, when he got there, been listened to in time, Khartoum would never have fallen. There are those who assert that, had Sir Charles Wilson's force been in sight but two days earlier, the city would still be safe. Be that as it may, the fatal "Too late" will be indelibly branded upon every line of the pages which will hereafter record the history of the English occupation of Egypt. We were too late to stop the massacre at Alexandria, too late to save Sinkat, too late in the despatch of Gordon, too late to save Khartoum. Heavy indeed is the responsibility which attaches to those who, in spite of every protest and every warning, failed to grasp the situation.

On Jan. 26th, through treachery, Khartoum was taken. On Jan. 28th, a body of English, under Sir C. Wilson, in one of Gordon's own steamers, drew near Khartoum, only to be met with a heavy fire.[2]

---

[1] At Dublin, Mr. Plunket said that on every crisis of the business was written that terrible refrain, "Too late, too late," and proceeded to quote the passage from Shakespeare's "Richard II.," which begins:

> Discomfort guides my tongue,
> And bids me speak of nothing but despair.
> One day too late, I fear, my noble lord,
> Hath clouded all thy happy days on earth.

[2] From an "In Memoriam," in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, we take the following: "It is difficult for those of us who knew Gordon as a man and as a friend to speak without tear-dimmed eyes and choking utterance of him whom we shall now see no more. None of those who knew that noble heart, so tender and true, who have felt the warm grasp of that generous

The small force sent by Lord Wolseley from Korti across the desert to Metemneh, fought, on two occasions, against overwhelming numbers with dauntless resolution. The commanding officer, Sir C. Stewart, was severely wounded, Colonel Burnaby met his death from an Arab spear, and Mr. Cameron the well-known correspondent of the *Standard*, was shot. The force under General Earle, at Dulka, proved that British troops have lost none of their dash in attacking a strong position. The loss of officers was heavy; the gallant general in command fell at the head of his troops.

The Ministry, it is said, have decided to support Lord Wolseley in whatever measures he may deem necessary. Seven thousand troops are being sent to Suakim.

Lord Rosebery has accepted the office of Lord Privy Seal. As the noble Earl lately admitted that a clearer and more courageous course might have been adopted by the Government, he may be of special service in the Cabinet just now.

Two men (American-Irish) are in custody, charged in connection with the dynamite explosions in the Tower and elsewhere. The repairs in Westminster Hall and the House of Commons, rendered necessary by the explosions, are nearly completed.

Bishop Temple has been translated, as we expected, from Exeter to London: a worker of singular skill and self-denial, and of great administrative power. Mr. Bickersteth, instituted as Dean of Gloucester, was, after a few days, announced as the successor of Dr. Temple in the See of Exeter. Canon King, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Oxford,[1] is the successor of Bishop Wordsworth. The *Record* well remarks:

That a High Churchman, in many ways so extreme as to stand en-

---

hand now cold in death, who have been gladdened by the radiance of his ready smile, or inspired to striving after nobler things by the glowing ardour of his simple faith, can dissociate their keen sense of personal bereavement from those more general considerations which must necessarily be before the nation to-day. There was no one who knew him but loved him." Testimonies to the influence of the great Christian hero —most gratifying—are met with in every quarter.

"Where faith is genuine and supreme," says the *Guardian*, "it has lost none of its old efficacy." That Gordon's "last sacrifice has been offered in vain," says the *Guardian*, "reflects, not on his single-hearted enthusiasm, but on the lukewarmness and hesitation of those who might have supported him and did not."

[1] A review of two publications of Canon Elliott (Vicar of Winkfield), a divine of ability and learning, singularly free from "party" prejudice, appeared in the second number of this magazine. One of these publications is entitled "Some Strictures on a Book entitled 'The Communicant's Manual,' with two Prefaces by the Rev. E. King, D.D." The third edition of Canon Elliott's "Strictures" was published by Mr. Murray in the year 1879.

tirely aloof from the historical High Church party, should be chosen for the oversight of one of the largest, and not the least important diocese in England, is, we feel bound to say, a great misfortune. . . . [Yet] although his own views are well-known and pronounced, there is no member of the more extreme High Church section who has shown himself so capable of appreciating, we might almost say of sympathizing with, Evangelical views as Canon King.

The *Guardian* also speaks warmly of Professor King's spiritual influence and sympathy.

On the satisfaction with which the tidings of Mr. Bickersteth's appointment to Exeter have been received, very generally, throughout the Church, we need not remark. A divine, a poet, a preacher and pastor, in the front rank—a critic of culture and ability—Mr. Bickersteth has been known for his deep spirituality of tone and fervent Missionary zeal.

The Right Rev. Dr. Hellmuth, late Bishop of Huron, has been presented by the Simeon Trustees to the living of Bridlington, made vacant by the death of the Rev. Canon Blakeney. The Rev. Frederick Head, M.A., Vicar of Charles, Plymouth, has been presented, by the Prime Minister, to the benefice of Christ Church, Hampstead (Mr. Bickersteth having been appointed to the See of Exeter).

Bishop Walsham How has been doing a good work while the guest of Dr. Swainson at Cambridge.[1] The annual gatherings of the C.M.S. at Oxford have been remarkably successful. Professor Ince, at Mr. Christopher's annual breakfast-party, spoke with his usual point of the honoured host. Truly, with much to discourage and perplex in these days, there is very much to stimulate and strengthen—abundant cause for thankfulness and hope.

The Convocation of Canterbury has been in Session. Speeches, expressing regret at the loss by death of Bishop Jackson, and by retirement from ill-health of Bishop Wordsworth,[2] have been read with interest. Bishop Temple received

---

[1] The Cambridge correspondent of the *Record* (Feb. 11th), says: "The Bishop of Bedford spent last Sunday here as the guest of Dr. Swainson, at Christ's Lodge. He gave four separate addresses within the day; preaching in the College Chapel at morning service, addressing the choristers' Sunday-school (a branch of 'Jesus Lane') a little later, preaching at St. Mary's at two, and speaking to a very large gathering of University men in the small Guildhall at nine in the evening. The sermon at St. Mary's was on the text 'To the poor the Gospel is preached,' and it was an earnest and noble plea for the use of the old weapon of Gospel preaching, in simplicity and truth, as the great means of reaching the vast masses of the poor."

[2] The See of Lincoln became vacant on the 9th, when the Archbishop of Canterbury formally accepted the venerable prelate's, Dr. Wordsworth's, resignation.

the warm congratulations of his brother prelates on his translation to the Metropolitan See. Special prayers for the crisis were drawn up by the Archbishop. In the Lower House, a resolution in favour of a House of Laymen was debated and carried.

The Right Hon. Sir. R. J. Phillimore, Bart. (Dean of Arches from 1867 to 1875), died on the 4th. He was born in 1810. The *Guardian* says:

> In him the country has lost a disinterested and able public servant, the Church of England a most devoted son, and his many friends one whose friendship had a charm that was all its own, and whom they will never remember while life shall last without deep and affectionate regret.

The West London Mission has opened with much of promise. Westminster Abbey has been crowded with clergy and laity about to engage in a ten days' warfare against indifference and irreligion as teachers and preachers of the truth as it is in Jesus. The Bishop-designate of London, Dr. Temple, gave an address in the Abbey to the Missioners, clergy, and lay-workers on Saturday, the 7th. On Sunday, the Archbishop of Canterbury preached.

The Archbishop of York, speaking at a Blakeney Memorial Committee,[1] referred in felicitous language to the character and labours of the greatly lamented Dr. R. B. Blakeney.

With reference to Professor Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," an esteemed correspondent, whose opinion in such matters has special weight, writes to us as follows:

"Professor Drummond is not aware of whither his doctrines would lead. Nor does he seem conscious that the fundamental principle of his book is utterly wrong. On page 11 he states: 'The laws of the invisible are the same laws, projections of the natural, not supernatural.' Now, in reality, there is no natural law in the invisible, meaning by that the spiritual world. On the contrary, natural things and natural laws are the product, the manifestation of the invisible, the spiritual. The natural is not the working energy of the invisible, but the invisible is that which rules all."

[1] We invite attention to this Committee. Many influential Churchmen may be glad to hear of such an opportunity to show respect for the labours of so devoted and disinterested a writer. For ourselves, we can hardly write too warmly as to the character and services of so loyal a Churchman, so modest, devout, and zealous a follower of Christ, an always affectionate friend.

INDEX TO VOL. XI.