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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

PREFACE.

THE leading question of the day, coming more into prominence, is the Maintenance of the National Church. Other great questions, political and social, as well as religious, are closely connected with this.

The Bishop of Rochester, in a letter addressed to the lay-members of the Diocesan Conference and the lay-electors, has pointed out how important are the issues of the present agitation, and how urgent is the call to loyal members of the Church of England to bestir themselves, and exert their best endeavours in defending so grand and beneficent an institution.

Church Defence and Church Reform—reforming in the spirit of adaptation—are wise watchwords for thoughtful and earnest maintainers of the principle of a National Church; and whether the campaign in our country against the so-called Liberationists and their allies be short and severe, or protracted, tedious and vexatious, such guiding thoughts may prove, in the good providence of GOD, a blessing to our children's children and to the peoples of other lands.

An error of judgment among certain devout Churchfolk, here and there, is not unlikely, as it seems to many, to weaken the influence of the great body of defenders of the Church. Churchmen who live in towns, and see new parishes without endowment, vigorous and flourishing, may take, as is natural, a congregational rather than a parochial view of our ecclesiastical polity, and they may in such sort affirm their belief that

if the banded opponents of the Establishment should prove successful, the Church, disestablished and disendowed, would still remain "the Church of England," great, and prosperous, as practically to ignore the losses which the country as a whole would inevitably sustain, and also to discourage and embarrass their fellow-Churchmen at a critical moment.

To the miserable plea, "the spirit of the times seems to be against us"—not seldom advanced by those who are politicians first and Churchmen second—a courageous and statesmanlike policy will give no heed.

For ourselves, as from the first, we shall associate in THE CHURCHMAN the thought of really conservative reform with that of principle-holding, resolute and hopeful defence.

The completion of the Twelfth Volume of the Magazine calls for an expression of hearty thanks to the contributors who have enriched its pages, and to friends who have helped us by counsel and encouragement. THE CHURCHMAN has prospered, we gratefully acknowledge, and is steadily gaining influence. True to its title-page, a periodical of the laity as well as of the clergy, it will continue in many ways, we trust, to do good service; and no pains will be spared to increase its efficiency.

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1885.

ART. I.—AN OFFICER'S EXPERIENCE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.

"MISSIONS are all bosh, and Missionaries are all humbugs." Such were the words one of the senior subalterns of my old regiment whispered into my ear while we sat in the Garrison Chapel at the Curragh Camp listening to an appeal in support of Foreign Missions. I then held the distinguished position of a junior ensign in the regiment, and never having been abroad myself, naturally looked on my seniors as most reliable authorities on all foreign questions. Still, as one who had been brought to realize the constraining love of Christ, I could not accept this view of Missions as correct. I certainly could not believe that men who spoke of themselves as devoted Christians would rob the poor of England to spend the money on themselves, under the pretext of preaching the Gospel to the heathen. I therefore asked my brother officer why he had made the remark. His reply was, that he had been on an Indian station for five years, where there were some Missionaries, and he had never seen a convert, and consequently concluded the Missionaries did absolutely nothing. On afterwards mentioning this to an old clergyman, he advised me to suspend my judgment till I could see for myself. In the course of time my regiment was ordered to a station in India, about five hundred miles up the interior. One of the first people I met was an intelligent native Christian, and on asking him where he had been baptized, I was told, strange to say, that it was in the very place where my friend who so summarily characterised Missionary work had been stationed for five years. The coincidence was noteworthy, as the two stations were in different Presidencies, were in no way connected with each other, and were nearly a thousand miles apart. The

native assured me that at the place where he was admitted to Christian fellowship there was a most flourishing little congregation of native Christians, numbering from five to six hundred members. Exactly ten years afterwards, it was my lot to be stationed for a short time in that very cantonment, and I can bear out most fully what that native Christian told me as to the satisfactory condition of the native church, and the earnest devotion of the two English Missionaries there at work. On repeating this conversation to my military friend he told me he had had no intention of deceiving me, but he had seen nothing of the work referred to. I then asked him, "Suppose you went home from this station in which we are now in, what would you say regarding it?" He replied that his experience of it would be much the same as his experience of the former place, and admitted that he did not know of any Missionary work going on. He seemed quite surprised to hear that there was as flourishing a church and as large a body of native Christians there as in the other station. This officer, I may add, was one of the best-hearted fellows in the world, and one of the last to wilfully misrepresent anything that was good. I believe his original statement was, like that of many others, founded on ignorance of the actual state of affairs.

Ignorance on the subject of Mission work, however, is by no means confined to one profession. Not long ago I heard a clergyman relate a story of another member of his own cloth who had gone to a Missionary meeting at which a great deal was said about work in the Zenanas. At supper afterwards, this clergyman remarked that he wished the Missionary had told them *where* the Zenanas were, as he could not find them marked on the map. His wife promptly said, "Oh, my dear, don't you know? Why, of course they are in Africa!" Whether it is at home or whether it is abroad, the universal rule is, that ignorance on the subject of Mission work arises from indifference. So soon as an individual begins to take an interest in it, he finds that his knowledge increases at a wonderfully rapid rate.

My own experience on the subject was acquired between 1871 and 1881, during most of which period I was in India, with intervals spent in Burmah and South Africa, having travelled altogether some 40,000 miles. In my humble opinion, our Missionaries are doing a great and a noble work, and I always feel sorry for those, whether connected with the army or any other profession, who come home and disparage either the work or its results. That there are no flaws to be detected in their operations I do not for a moment contend. Our Missionaries are, after all, but human beings, and therefore have their share of human shortcomings.

Even were the results far less than they are, surely we ought to recognise with thankfulness that God has so blessed the cause we have espoused as to give us so many souls. Even were Mission work the failure it is often alleged to be, it would still be our duty to fulfil our Saviour's command and follow apostolic example. What right have we to dictate to the Creator of the universe what the immediate results shall be? He might be testing our obedience, or He might be gradually permitting us to prepare the ground for future harvests. I think no better reply could be given than was supplied by the Duke of Wellington in answer to the sneer of an Indian Chaplain about the folly of English people sending out Missionaries like Carey to teach the highly-educated Brahmin. Turning to him, the Duke said, "What are your marching orders, sir?" The astonished Chaplain, not understanding him, asked what he meant, when the Duke said, "Are they not 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel?' The results rest with the Great Commander, who gives the order, who alone is answerable for the campaign. The individual soldier's duty is to obey."

For my own part, I fail to see that the results are so utterly inadequate to the means used. On the contrary, I cannot help thinking the richest nation in the world has every reason to thank God that, while they have spent such a very small amount of money on the Mission-field compared to the money lavished on luxuries and art, He has so wonderfully blessed the little given. Not much above £1,000,000 per annum is spent on all the Missionary Societies put together, while considerably over £26,000,000 is paid to our Excise for intoxicating drinks alone, which does not represent one-fifth part of the amount of money wasted on that particular form of self-indulgence.

When we turn to India, including Burmah and Ceylon, we find that in 1881 (three years ago) there were 528,590 native Christians. Yet, as is well known, the majority of the Missionaries have not been at work in India for more than half a century. The very existence of 528,590 professing Christians is, therefore, very encouraging. It is, however, still more encouraging when we look at the rapid rate of increase during the last thirty years. In the year 1851 there were 102,951 native Christians; in 1861, ten years after, the number had increased to 213,370; in 1871 it had risen to 318,363; and in 1881 it reached a total of 528,590. It will be observed that, roughly speaking, the first two decades mentioned gave an increase of 100,000, and the last decade an increase of 200,000. That is to say, the increase has been exactly doubled during the last ten years. As our Missionaries get to under-

stand the natives better, and the number of qualified native workers increases, the ratio in coming decades should be even greater than in the past. When we compare these figures with the spread of Christianity during the first century, we have no reason to be dissatisfied with the results. It is generally believed that there were not more than 100,000 professing Christians at the close of the first century; and though the Christians were a strong, influential body in the cities and large towns at the time of Constantine's conversion, some three centuries afterwards, the truths of Christianity cannot be said to have spread throughout the Roman Empire. The traditional schoolboy, who has studied the etymology of the word "pagan," will know that many centuries elapsed before the inhabitants of the outlying districts became even professedly Christian.

It may, however, be urged that the native Christians are of a very inferior type. Vague charges of this nature, that deal in generalities only, are very difficult to meet. Having, however, seen a great many native Christians, I can speak from actual experience. When I read of charges made by the Apostle Paul against many of the professing Christians of his time, I cannot help thinking that the native Christians of India in the nineteenth century compare very favourably with those of the earliest Churches. That one has no right to judge these natives, who have just come out of the impurities of heathenism, by the same high standard that he would apply to the spiritual qualifications of an English parish, must, I think, be generally admitted. But, humiliating as it may be to us, the comparison, if made, would in some respects tell in favour of India. The proportion of communicants to mere adherents in India is certainly considerably larger than in England. In 1881 there were 417,372 professing Christians; and the number of communicants for that year was 145,097, or about 34 per cent. Yet, be it remembered, the Missionaries are very strict in admitting communicants to the Lord's Table.[1]

A child was once asked what foreign country he would like to see. After a moment's reflection he answered that he would prefer going to Siam, because there he might see a lot of Siamese twins. One may smile at the simplicity of the little one believing that *all* the inhabitants of Siam have the mis-

[1] They cannot help the baptized children of Christians turning out badly, and often disgracing the cause that their parents have espoused; and, in exceptional cases, even those who have been baptized on their own profession, after enduring all the persecution such a step entails, do sometimes turn out badly.

fortune to be born in couples linked together; but Englishmen really act on a principle hardly less ludicrous than this. They hear of a few eminent converts; possibly, even, they may have seen one or two of the more superior class of native Christians who have visited England; and forthwith they go out to India themselves with the idea that *all* the converts are like the one or two they have either seen or read of. Finding that this is not the case, a reaction sets in, and they denounce the whole work of Missionaries as a sham. The truth of the matter is, that the fault does not rest with the Missionaries, but with the fault-finders themselves, who started from a wrong assumption. I have met in India native Christians quite equal in mental culture and spiritual tone to any English Christians I have ever met at home. A converted Brahmin used to come and stay in my house, to preach to the English soldiers in my old regiment, who flocked eagerly to hear him. A more courteous, or a more cultured gentleman, I have never met. I should, however, be very sorry to hold him up as a specimen of native Christians, as he is undoubtedly head and shoulders above the average. At the same time, I think I may fairly adduce him as an example of what a native Christian may become.

Nor is this the only testimony to the reality of the profession of the native Christians. The money given may be no test of the truth of the cause supported, for false worshippers, in their ignorance, often most generously contribute to the maintenance of the principles they have espoused. But generosity is to a very great extent a proof of the strength of the convictions that a body of people hold. The Nationalists of Ireland erroneously think that the English oppress them, but the enormous sums they have subscribed lately towards the attempt to coerce the English Government into severing the Union, show how strongly they feel on the subject. In the same way, the fact that the very poor native Christians of India annually contribute Rs. 120,000 towards the support of Christianity, shows that it has obtained a considerable hold on their convictions.

It is not, however, to statistics and figures that I would appeal, valuable as proofs though they may be. Statistics cannot and never will show the enormous amount of good done by Christian Missions. I had not been long in India before I was appointed to take command of a small fort, held by some fifty men detached from the regiment. The agent of the native contractor who supplied us with our daily provisions used to call on me each day with papers to be signed. Noticing that he was a very intelligent Brahmin, I said to him one day, "I am surprised to find that a man of

your apparent intelligence can believe that the world is flat, and that these lumps of clay are gods." He replied at once, "Oh, Sahib, I do not believe in such things." I then asked him what he did believe, and was told that he was convinced the Christian religion was true. He went on to say that he was one only of hundreds of young men who had received a good education in a Mission School, and had completely given up all belief in Hindooism. He fully believed in Christianity, but did not feel sufficiently interested in the subject to face the tremendous opposition of his ignorant relatives and others who continued to have faith in Hindooism. Subsequently, in travelling through India I found an enormous number of such young men.

One of our C.M.S. Missionaries lately told me a story of a Brahmin, of some position, who bore the highest testimony to the work of Mission Schools in a speech which was intended to be in opposition to them. He said, "I have been brought up in a Mission School, and have received much damage. I can never become a believer again in the Hindoo deities. And yet—I cannot become a Christian!" He meant to say that the Christian Missionaries robbed him of his belief in idolatry, but unless they gave him something better they were doing harm. So far he was right. It is to be feared that the secular education our Government is giving to India is producing a nation of atheists, as no educated man can believe in Hindooism. The actual converts who have become bold enough to come forward and confess Christ are comparatively few as compared with the enormous number who have renounced Hindooism. Possibly the time is not far distant when some native Christian, towering high above the crowd, a born leader of men, may arise to preach the Gospel, and be followed by thousands, infected by his enthusiasm. What John Wesley did for Christian England, so may a native convert, filled with the power of the Holy Spirit, yet do for India. Meanwhile, our Missionaries are slowly but none the less surely working on through good report and evil report.

Many who have never even seen a Missionary have cause to thank God for the blessings Christianity alone has brought to India. To take the women alone, no amount of figures will show the blessings, direct and indirect, that they have reaped. Every one has doubtless heard of the little English girl who, when asked what she was going to be when she grew up, replied, "I think I will be a widow." One may, however, venture to think that this young lady, who so coveted the independent position a widow is permitted to enjoy in English society, would have doubted that the choice was altogether a wise one had her lot been cast in the gorgeous East. Suttee

was abolished through the courage of Lord William Bentinck, an enlightened Governor-General and an earnest Christian man, who was urged to take this step by some of the Missionaries; but comparatively few Englishwomen, I believe, have any idea of the awful sufferings endured by their sisters in India, especially those who have had the misfortune to be left widows.[1]

Till quite lately a harsh custom existed in India, which made it illegal for a widow to remarry. As a comparatively small percentage of widows in England ever marry again, this may at first sight seem to be a very slight grievance. But when it is remembered that girls are married when only one or two years old, and that often they are widows before they have even lived with their husbands—there being upwards of sixty-three thousand widows in India at the present time under ten years of age—we get a fair idea of the terrible wrong thousands of Indian women are suffering under. Though but few have availed themselves of the new law, still, to the honour of our Missionaries must it be said, it was due to their efforts that widows can now, at all events *legally*, be remarried. We must trust to the further spread of Christianity, and of enlightened principles the indirect results of Christianity, for social ideas to be gradually so improved, that the re-marriage of widows will no longer be looked on with repugnance.

It is useless to expect much of any nation in which the women are degraded and looked down upon. God made the woman to be the man's companion and friend; and if the manhood of a nation combine to degrade her, and treat her as little better than a slave, sooner or later the inevitable law of retribution will demand a penalty. It is doubtless to this cause that the low moral atmosphere pervading India is to be traced.

The Koran never speaks of a woman as if she had a soul, and indeed never alludes to her except as a means for the gratification of passion, either in this world or in the world to come. The Bible, on the contrary, makes so many allusions to her, and speaks of her so tenderly, that a poor woman in

[1] To such an extent is this ill-treatment carried, even now, in some parts of India, that it is very questionable if the abolition of Suttee, though a right thing, was altogether a merciful one. An unpleasant reflection is forced on Englishmen on the spot, that if widows were allowed to destroy themselves on their husband's funeral pile, it would be a less evil than having to eke out a miserable existence, which is nothing better than living death, for many years, as is too often the case at present. At all events, the widow could be treated no worse if she had been the actual murderer of her husband.

a zenana is reported to have said that she felt sure the Bible must have been written by a woman![1]

But in spite of all that our Missionaries are doing, there yet remains much to be done for the women of India. What can some 500 Missionaries do in a country containing 250,000,000 people? To this present day it is an insult to ask a native gentleman about his wife. Even the more enlightened would infinitely prefer that their wives should die rather than have European medical attendants. In the same fort in which I was holding a subaltern's command, to which I have already referred, there was a young surgeon who was sent for by a Rajah, who lived in the neighbourhood, to attend his wife. When the young fellow got to the Rajah's palace, he was informed that the most he could be allowed to do was to feel the poor woman's pulse, her hand being extended through a hole in a purdah (curtain). Finding that the pulse showed the woman to be in the last stage of exhaustion, the doctor insisted on seeing the patient. He was, however, informed that such was contrary to all the customs of the country. Even his representations that she must die unless he could personally administer restoratives, only produced the stereotyped answer that the customs of the country must not be infringed. Needless to say she died.

I remember hearing Sir Bartle Frere tell a story which, with the same features of Asiatic immobilty, had a happier termination. In this case it was a Scotch doctor whose services were requested. When he appeared, he was informed that he was sent for to be consulted, but that he could not even enter the room in which the patient lay. On his insisting upon being allowed to feel the pulse of the sufferer, he was told that such a thing was out of the question; but that, if he liked, he might feel the pulse of one of the servant-women who attended her! The Scotchman, however, not being satisfied with such a second-hand diagnosis, remonstrated, and with more success than my friend; for with that national characteristic, with which Scotchmen in general are endowed, of pushing their way in the world, he forced himself into the sick-chamber, and was the means of saving the woman's life.

---

[1] The two great Societies that have undertaken this work are the "Church of England Zenana Mission" and the "Zenana, Bible, and Medical Mission." Owing to the jealous way in which all natives of India guard their women, Englishmen can do no more than repeat what they have heard; but, from all accounts, these two great Societies are doing a glorious work. Wives of officers, and other English ladies who would be permitted to enter the apartments of women in India, should make a point, as many do, of visiting with the English lady Missionaries, and seeing for themselves what is being done.

In speaking of the results of Missionary work, one must always bear in mind the deep-seated prejudices that exist in almost every foreign country against innovations of any kind. I remember reading in one of the secular papers a story of a native gentleman, who, when asked why he did not have his sons educated, replied: "Why, my brother had his boy educated, and he died of small-pox; I don't want my son to die." I have also heard it said, regarding the Medical Dispensaries, that the Government had hired Missionaries to convert the natives, and had promised them so much per hundred; but that finding they did not get on fast enough, they were going to introduce doctors, who, by means of Christian medicines and charms, would succeed much quicker in the work. In China a Missionary one day found his school was unattended, and on inquiring into the cause, he found that a report had been circulated that the English were bent on kidnapping children wholesale! As each decade passes away, however, such prejudices happily show a tendency to die out under the influence of accomplished facts.

The natives who circulate reports to the detriment of the Missionaries little know how they are injuring the cause of their best friends. I am not one of those who are ever casting a slur on the character of the British official abroad. There are, doubtless, some black sheep among them; and many years ago there were, doubtless, many more than there are now. On the whole, however, I venture to say that the Government officials who represent our country abroad are quite equal if not very superior to the representatives of any other country. I believe there is no example in the entire history of the world of a conquered country having been ruled by such a high-minded body of foreigners as are the present generation of officials in India.

In spite, however, of the high tone that exists among our officials generally, there can be but little doubt that so long as human nature is as it is, there is great need for the existence of Christian Missionaries among the natives, quite apart from the direct spiritual teaching they give them. They are the moral police of the countries in which they labour. They there represent the conscience of England, and obey the instincts of her better nature. England is a great trading nation, and too often her wealth-acquiring propensities overpower higher principles. Public opinion, as such, does not exist in these conquered countries. "Who cares what the nigger thinks?" is an expression which too often falls from the lips of the conqueror. Englishmen, as a rule, consist of two classes, viz., the Government official and the merchant. It may be said of both that when away from

the restraining influence of a healthy public opinion the tendency is to deteriorate. Even the wisest of the officials sometimes do not understand the people they govern. This is not unnatural, as they live very much apart from them, and as a rule are only approached through the medium of native officers. Consequently, injustice and wrong exist, and are perpetuated, which would not be tolerated in this country. The Government official is a servant, and, naturally, does not care to speak out against his superiors, more especially when it is very doubtful what amount of good he may do the cause he wishes to further, and may probably do himself an injury. One Commander-in-Chief in Madras, Sir P. Maitland, resigned his command rather than give orders that a salute should be fired in honour of a Hindoo deity. Such examples are, however, too few and far between to have much weight with a Government interested in a time-serving policy, endeavouring to please the natives at the expense of the consciences of its own representatives.

As for the merchant, the planter, and others of the trading community, though there have been noble exceptions to the general rule, they do not cry out unless their own interests are at stake. As this class, however, increases in numbers and importance, there exists every sign that they will gradually make their voice heard on points of public interest other than the mere selfish one of the accumulation of wealth.

Regarding the Missionaries, however, let it be said to their honour that before the present generation of high-minded officials existed they alone represented the conscience of England in her foreign possessions. Independent of Government, warmly attached to the native, they have ever been the first to raise a voice against the existence of cruelty and injustice. Some of the best Viceroys and Governors we have had have been men who made friends with the Missionaries, and ever lent an open ear to those whose sacred profession stamped them as the friends of the native.

I have often heard it urged by so-called philanthropists that it would be far better if Christian people gave up subscribing to Missions, and directed their money into channels for sending out doctors, schoolmasters, and other agencies for the amelioration of the sufferings of the human race, and for spreading civilization. This has always struck me as a very paltry and contemptible form of argument, utterly unworthy of true philanthropy. It amounts to this: these seeming benefactors are not sufficiently in love with the cause they have espoused to support it with their money; at the same time, they want their principles advocated; so, not being sufficiently generous to do it themselves, they wish it to be done

by others. Those who advocate the cause of Missions have not a single word to say against philanthropists subscribing as much as they like—the more the better—to send out doctors and schoolmasters. The Missionaries would be the first to welcome such valuable aids to their work. Strange to say, however, much as one hears of the "schoolmaster abroad" when in England, such an individual, representing English philanthropy, is painfully conspicuous by his absence in foreign parts. With the exception of Government schoolmasters and Government doctors, I have never yet had the pleasure of meeting one who represented any voluntary society at home that was not connected with Christian Missions.

There is no divorce between true Christianity and true philanthropy, though fortunately a very wide gulf separates so-called philanthropists from the friends of Christian Missions. The Founder of Christianity was the greatest philanthropist who ever came into this world, and His servants in the Mission-field have, in spite of all their failings, always attempted to follow His example. Who that knows anything of the lives of such men as the present Bishop of Lahore, Bishop French[1] (late of the C.M.S.), Bishop Patteson, Livingstone, Henry Martyn, Moffat, Judson, Duff, Wilson, and Gordon, can doubt that such men were philanthropists and heroes of the very noblest types. These are only a few of the well-known names, but they represent hundreds who have worked nobly for the cause they had at heart, and have passed away unknown to the world at large. Their names may not be recorded in any list of this world's worthies, their lives may never have been written by the pen of a human biographer; but we may rest assured that One has watched their work and labour of love for the poor ignorant native, and recorded their names in that book of life containing the list of those of whom this world was not worthy.

Though the supporters of Christian Missions do not make the spread of civilization their *primary* object, there cannot be a doubt that Missionary Societies are a great civilising agency throughout the world. In that very valuable book, "Thirty

[1] It is not generally known in this country that when Bishop French was only a simple Missionary of the C.M.S., he came, with a body of Christian natives, during the Indian Mutiny, to the gates of the Agra Fort. He was told by the officer in command that he would be admitted, but that they could not let the natives in. The English Missionary pointed out that the Christian natives, if left outside, would all be massacred. Still admittance was refused. The Missionary then said, "Very well; I will remain outside with them, and share their fate. I will not take shelter and leave them to die." Fortunately, the General changed his mind and admitted all, or another hero would have been added to the list of martyrs of the Indian Mutiny.

Years of C.M.S. Missionary Work in the Punjab and Sindh," by the Rev. Robert Clark, it is mentioned that at a single Medical Missionary Station under Dr. Downes[1] in one year (1882), there were 30,000 visits registered in the Mission Hospital, 8,000 new cases entered, to whom 24,000 visits were paid, more than 1,200 operations performed, 1,000 in-patients received into the wards, and 16,000 meals supplied. Quite apart from the spiritual results of such a work as this, which is of course the primary object, who can doubt that such an agency has a great effect in civilizing the natives, and certainly of ameliorating the sufferings of humanity. Those who do not believe in distinctly spiritual work, but who do believe in supporting philanthropic work, ought surely to feel called on to support such an agency as this. Even to take the lowest view of the question, they cannot think that the inculcation of the principles of One who even by sceptics has been admitted to have been the holiest, the purest, the noblest that this world has ever seen, can detract from such a self-sacrificing work. Those principles which have permeated the most civilized nations in the world, have given sufficient proof by this time that even if they are not the means of elevating nations, they do not, at all events, drag them down; nay, are generally found in combination with the highest and most advanced views of human enlightenment.

The question has often been put to me since I have been in England, "Which of all the Missionary Societies is doing the best work, and which is most deserving of our support?" I have generally contrived to avoid answering the question by asking the interrogator which of the Societies he subscribes to, and when he answers, telling him that he had better continue to support it. A little competition among our different Missionary Societies is a good thing, if carried on in a friendly spirit. At all events, it would be utterly unworthy of any great Society did its friends attempt to increase its income at the expense of any other Society. All of them are doing good, and room still exists for many more; or, what is still better, for an increase in the support that each now gets from the public. As, however, there is a very large majority who do not subscribe to any Mission agency, I may give my reasons for naming the Society I think most worthy of support by Englishmen in general.

A story is told of some Grecian generals who had to select one of their number, according to his merits, to have precedence. It was agreed that each should have two votes, which

[1] Since this article was written a very interesting paper, by Dr. Downes, on "Medical Missions," has appeared in THE CHURCHMAN.

were to be given to different men. When the votes were counted, it was found that every man had voted for himself *first*, and for Themistocles *second*. As the first votes were thus equally distributed, it was decided that Themistocles was the elected chief. I have often been reminded of this story when I have spoken to different Missionaries about the relative advantages of the different Societies. Each one naturally gave his own Society the preference; and I think they would have been unworthy servants if they had not done so. But I have almost invariably found that each was willing to accord the second-best place to the C.M.S. I remember once asking an S.P.G. Missionary which he thought best, and received the reply I anticipated. But when I asked which he thought the second-best, he said that only one other Society of any position had Apostolic orders. In the same way the Nonconformist accords the first place to his own Society; but when asked which is the second-best, invariably replies, "The great Church Missionary Society, which proclaims the same simple Gospel message that we do, is the *second*-best."

The position of the C.M.S. is quite unique in the Mission-field. It is the one rallying-point for all Mission workers and supporters. While the S.P.G. and the Nonconformist Missionaries have ever been very shy about uniting together for concerted action, both have always evinced great willingness to unite with a common friend. I was at a great Episcopalian Conference in Madras once, where we had three Bishops, and representative clergy from the chaplains and the two great Missionary Societies. I need hardly say that the C.M.S. men quite held their own. At another Conference of Missionaries in the north of India, at which none of the S.P.G. attended, there again our great Church Society mustered in large numbers, and held a prominent position throughout the proceedings.[1]

What better rallying-point can be desired than the wide platform of the C.M.S.? It appeals to those who have High-Church tendencies and a love of ceremonial services. It offers them all they can ask, in a chain of unbroken orders and traditions from the Apostolic age downwards. In return, it only asks them to put externals in their right place, and to make the preaching of the simple Gospel the aim and end of their work. It appeals to the Broad Churchman on the catholic basis, that it extends the right hand of fellowship to all who love

[1] My own opinion is that the native Christians of India do not attach much importance to the wretched little differences of opinion that divide earnest Christians in England. Even now there are strong symptoms of this healthy current of Christianity setting in amongst ourselves.

the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth; and while preaching Christ and Him crucified, has ever allowed great latitude of opinion on secondary matters. It appeals to the Evangelical, inasmuch as its one great aim is the salvation of souls through the precious blood of Jesus Christ. It appeals to the Nonconformist, by recognising all that is good, noble, and right in their work; and, while maintaining for itself the advantages of Apostolical succession and traditions of the glorious historic past, it does not exaggerate these, but recognises all Christian missionaries who have not maintained this succession as fellow-labourers in the same vineyard.

Lord Palmerston used to say of Mr. Venn, the late honorary secretary of the Church Missionary Society, that he was the greatest statesman among the clergy that he had ever met. It is to that master-mind the public of England are indebted for the statesmanlike principles on which their largest Missionary Society has been based. The English public, with all its faults, is essentially liberal and big-hearted, and recognising that this great Society has incorporated into its principles all that is right and good, while rejecting all that is exclusive and narrow, has very wisely given it the warmest support. Not only is there no other Missionary Society in England that has received so warmly the support of the public, but it stands without a rival in any country.

While the Church Missionary Society pleads for free-will offerings with which to send out agents, and to support them when sent out, it is not money alone that it wants. It is said that money is one of the greatest powers human nature knows; but there is a greater, and that is a power that the poorest and the humblest can avail themselves of—the power of prayer. If every one who systematically sends his annual contribution, would as systematically devote a few minutes each day or each week to prayer for the cause, the blessing on the work of Foreign Missions would assuredly be greater than it has ever been. A Bishop once remarked to me that the Church of Ireland [1] is the only Church that possesses a liturgy in which

[1] *For Christian Missions.*—"Almighty God, Who by Thy Son Jesus Christ didst give commandment to the Apostles that they should go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; grant to us whom Thou hast called into Thy Church a ready will to obey Thy Word, and fill us with a hearty desire to make Thy way known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Look with compassion upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and on the multitudes that are scattered abroad as sheep having no shepherd. O Heavenly Father, Lord of the harvest, have respect, we beseech Thee, to our prayers, and send forth labourers into Thine harvest. Fit and prepare them by Thy grace for the work of Thy ministry; give them the spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind; strengthen them to endure hardness; and

a distinct prayer for the work of Christian Missions has been inserted. That prayer has only been introduced in modern days. The only similar prayer in our Church liturgy is that used on Good Friday, for "Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics," written long before Christian Missions, organized as they now are, were thought of. It is probably a relic of the Crusades, when the only dealings that the Christian Church had with other religions were battles with the Turk in Palestine, the land of the Jew. It is well known that the Mahommedan calls everyone an infidel who has not embraced the creed of Islam. The word "infidel" placed so closely after "Turk" suggests a *tu quoque* taunt. Considering that Jews and Turks together number a very small percentage of either Hindoos or Buddhists, of whose creeds our forefathers were probably ignorant, the Church of England might very well in these more enlightened days either adopt the prayer of the Irish Church or improve its own, and use it oftener than once a year! Meanwhile, it rests with each individual, in private and in his family, to supplement the prayers of his Church by obeying the commands of the great Founder of Christianity, Who said to His followers, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that He would send forth labourers into His harvest."

SETON CHURCHILL.

ART. II.—CHURCH DEFENCE AND RURAL PARISHES.

THE PROGRAMME OF THE LIBERATION SOCIETY: "WHAT ACTION WITH REFERENCE TO IT IS DESIRABLE IN RURAL PARISHES?"

RECENT circumstances make the programme of the Liberation Society of importance to the whole Church. But the question here proposed appears especially important, as the action of the Society is to be directed especially to rural populations.

Towards the end of last year the Executive Committee of the Liberation Society passed and published the following resolutions:

1. "Having regard to the fact that the Bill for the extension of the Parliamentary franchise in the counties has now become law, and that the Bill for the redistribution of Parliamentary seats will probably be

---

grant that Thy Holy Spirit may prosper their work, and that by their life and doctrine they may set forth Thy glory, and set forward the salvation of all men; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."—IRISH CHURCH LITURGY.

passed in the coming year, the Committee are of opinion that the time has arrived when the question of Disestablishment may be resolutely pressed upon Parliament, upon the constituencies, and upon the country at large, as one which demands early legislative settlement."

2. "They are further of opinion that, as early in 1886 the enfranchised classes and the new and altered constituencies will be called upon to exercise their electoral rights, energetic measures should be immediately adopted by the advocates of religious equality for securing, in every case in which it may be practicable, the choice and the return of candidates favourable to their aims."

3. "The Committee will themselves forthwith take steps for giving effect to the foregoing resolutions by action both in Parliament and in the constituencies, and they urge their supporters throughout the kingdom to consider without delay how they may best advance the movement in their several localities."

This action the Society followed up by summoning a Conference, which took place on the 13th of January last, at which similar resolutions were passed.

The Committee have further addressed a circular to the officers of all Liberal Associations throughout the kingdom.[1]

The immediate occasion of intensified action on the part of the Society is the coming extension of the Franchise in 1886. The circular is an effort to secure the co-operation of Liberal agencies *everywhere* in returning candidates who shall go to Parliament pledged for Disestablishment and Disendowment. It will be observed, however, that the "Liberation" leaders, in appealing to their political allies, aim particularly at influencing county constituencies; but they urge their friends to adopt the means which seem most suitable for every several locality.

The principles and mode of action were expanded in the speeches at the Conference held in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, on the 13th of January, to which I have alluded. The Chairman, the Hon. E. Lyulph Stanley, M.P.,

[1] The following is the main portion of the circular: "The Executive Committee will feel much obliged by your bringing the subjoined resolutions under the notice of the Liberal organization with which you are officially connected. At the last General Election the advocates of Disestablishment refrained from generally pressing their views, lest the success of the Liberal party should be endangered at an important political crisis. But at the next election the way will be comparatively clear for dealing with a question in regard to which public opinion has of late been rapidly ripening, and which has now obtained a firm hold on the Liberalism of the country. They therefore consider that they are entitled to urge that a reform to which they attach the highest importance should form part of the Liberal programme. That does not, however, involve the adoption by them of an inflexible rule in all constituencies; but is compatible with a due regard to local circumstances, and especially to their own electoral strength. In some cases it may be their duty to support candidates whose political opinions are less advanced than their own; in others, it may be no less their duty to press the claims of candidates who sympathize with them, and to claim for them the support of their Liberal allies."

insisted that the "time for *action* had come." Another M.P. said, "That if the Liberation Society did not make itself felt in the General Election of 1886, it would lose its political influence for ever." The Chairman referred to the two millions of new voters as involving "a new section of voters altogether —viz., the great mass of *rural* occupiers." Mr. Stanley said:

> In the counties there has not been much opportunity to push the matter forward, because the mass of the electors in the counties had had no voice in the elections; but when they looked at those who were to be voters—*agricultural labourers*, mechanics, and artisans, and small shopkeepers—he was sure the Liberation Society would be able to tell them, in spite of opposition, they had held successful meetings and had the sympathy of the *rural population*. He could not imagine any class who ought to be warmer friends to the Liberation Society than the poorer classes of the population. There was no class that had been more completely handed over to the united Church and State, represented by the squire and the clergyman, and there was no class who had been more kept down by its united influence.

The policy he recommended was to test by energetic action the opinion of the majority of the future constituencies, which he hoped would be found in accordance with Liberation principles. But if *not* found so, then to "work by agitation and education to convert that uneducated majority and to bring it over." He urged the "setting forth to the people of the *material* advantages of the policy of Disestablishment and *absolute Disendowment*." "He would have them know that there is six millions of national property misapplied; and set forth before them the many useful ways in which it might be made to serve the public. For instance, if applied to support free education, it would at once deprive the Church of an unfair influence, and win over farmers and shopkeepers to Liberal principles by relieving them of an educational rate."

Another speaker maintained that the question was "secular rather than theological—there was a national estate to be devoted to the good of the people." Mr. Howard Evans "warned his sympathizers not to take it for granted that Liberals would promote their views [all 'Liberals,' *i.e.*, are not Liberationists]; they must exert themselves, and that in the most practical way." Mr. Whitworth, M.P., insisted that "agitating at the beginning of 1886 would be too late, and the Society must do its work thoroughly in the present year before that time came.

Upon one point it seems there is a difference of opinion. Some Liberationists spoke in favour of a gradual accomplishment of their ends, *e.g.* by taking successively—the removal of the Bishops from the House of Lords; Disestablishment in Wales, next in Scotland, and finally in England. Others were for a complete and drastic measure which would sweep

away, *with* the whole, every one of the so-called minor abuses.

I have sufficiently indicated, probably, the programme of the Liberation Society. But a summary of the information which I have gathered may not, to some at least of the readers of THE CHURCHMAN, be without interest, at the present moment.

The Liberation Society, with an income of £8,000 per annum, and a strong corps of practical agitators both in and out of the House of Commons, is roused by the prospect of the enlarged Franchise to strain every nerve to secure the new constituencies and their future representatives for carrying Disestablishment and Disendowment through Parliament. They have already taken their first steps; and they propose to agitate everywhere in accordance with local circumstances. They have a special eye to counties and to rural constituencies. They consider that their ultimate success hangs upon their efforts in the current year. They do not think that treatment such as the Irish Church had, of assigning certain funds to a Disestablished Church as a corporate body, is at all satisfactory. They go in now for "*absolute* Disendowment;" and intend to hold out before the voters the tempting prospect of the assignment of the Church's property (after meeting vested interests) to their own appropriation. The artisan or agricultural labourer is to have his child educated without school fees; the ratepayers will be free for ever from educational rates; and the whole of the Church's property[1] will be applied to whatever purposes Parliament by a general measure, or local boards of Government in detail, may deem "most useful to the public."

If any one will buy their "Case for Disestablishment," and also the tracts advertised at the end of it, he will see the complete statement of the views held by the Liberationists, and the manner in which those views are to be propounded among the constituencies by agitators and by circulated pamphlets.

Thus I have almost anticipated the first answer to my question, "What action is desirable in rural parishes," whether to the incumbent or to the loyal laymen, which is this: Order the above-named "Case" and tracts through your bookseller, and carefully read them, unless you are sufficiently acquainted with the tender mercies of the Disendowers. Churchmen

[1] The recent replies of such Liberal leaders as Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville to questions about the "*State-paid* Church" may, perhaps, discourage a few of the Liberationists. Mr. Gladstone, *e.g.*, informed the querist that "the Clergy of the Church of England are *not* State-paid." Lord Granville wrote that "tithes existed before Acts of Parliament."

cannot afford to remain ignorant of the efforts to weaken the position and alienate the property of the Church. Let us learn a lesson from the fate of the Church of Ireland, and be awake.

My second answer, and no less, I am sure, important, is: Get and read our literature on Church Defence. Many timely books and tracts have been recommended in this Magazine.[1] For instance, "The Englishman's Brief on behalf of the National Church" (S.P.C.K.) and "The Dead Hand in the Free Churches of Dissent."

And if this earnest exhortation at the present crisis, may well be addressed to the rural clergy, I would venture to address it also to loyal brother Churchmen of the rural laity. The Church's gifts for usefulness are really your heritage. The vested interests of the living clergy are proposed to be protected. But when the old clergy are passed away, where will be the provision for the spiritual wants of yourselves, your children, your tenantry, your labourers? Certainly *you* need to be "up" in this question; and *your* defence of the Church's position will be the more telling because you have no personal pecuniary interest immediately at stake, as we beneficed clergy apparently have.

Of course, I assume that readers of THE CHURCHMAN are acquainted with the help they may get from the Church Defence Society, and with its monthly organ, *The National Church*, and that they support the Society and read the paper.[2]

I remark, *thirdly*, that we must not under-rate the force of the attack on our "Sion," nor over-rate our security in the consciousness that right is with us. Let us remember Mr. Evans's warning to the Liberationists, and *take nothing for granted*, but remember that *energetic and practical action* is the recipe for a successful defence. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*

Neither (*fourthly*) let us give way to despondency. To be always groaning out that Disestablishment must come some day, and is only a question of time, is "giving up the keys." Such prophecies work out their own fulfilment. There is much to encourage us. Out of 32,516 religious marriages in last year, in 29,696 cases the couples and their friends chose the

---

[1] Lectures such as Sir John Conroy's "Church Endowments," and "Church Property not National Property," and "The Church of England, Past and Present," by the Bishop of Carlisle, may be named; also "The Church of England not Established by Law, and not Endowed by the State," by the Rev. J. Hamilton; also Professor Freeman's treatise, "Disestablishment and Disendowment;" also "The Established Church Question, How to Deal with it."

[2] See "The Church Defence Institution and its Work," by Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P., THE CHURCHMAN, vol. iv., p. 401.

old Church of England, and only 2,820 went to Nonconformists, including Roman Catholics. The vast sums by which every cathedral has been restored; numerous churches are yearly built; new sees are erected, and new parishes set going, testify to a vast love to the Church beating in the heart of England. We have only to *be true to ourselves.*

Fifthly, about *Modes of Action.* From my own happy experience I say, get a good lecturer into your parish. This awakens interest. Then have your Church Defence pamphlets ready. I found them not only *taken*, but sought for. And I suppose we must be prepared to meet the agitator when he comes, and to follow the circulation of Liberation by Defence literature; perhaps, best of all, from our own pens, if we have a "manifold writer."

I beg further to suggest an effort in each Ruridecanal Conference to establish a common understanding and action in the matter of recovery of tithes. It is hard that any clergyman should be left alone and without manifest sympathy if he be driven to the invidious necessity of distraint. And yet in many parishes in the hop-districts it *may* be a necessity to distrain, if the parson is to live. The so-called "extraordinary" tithe is at present the stalking-horse for the general attack of the agitator. It is often overlooked that this is a complete misnomer. A tithe can only be a tithe; but the tenth of more valuable produce must of course be greater than the tenth of less valuable. And it was at the urgent *request of owners and cultivators* that the tithe of more valuable crops was not laid by average calculation over the whole farm, but reserved to be paid separately according to the actual acreage of more valuable crops. This is what is called the "extraordinary" tithe; and it was arranged at the desire, and in the interest, of *the payer*, and not of the receiver. Still, if this *vexata quæstio* could be amicably arranged, the gain would be great. The farmer and the country parson should have nothing to alienate them one from another; and if the parson has a struggle to get on, he must (and does) sympathize with the farmer, who, at present, has the same. The Council of the Farmers' Alliance have lately resolved that it is most desirable that the tithe rent-charge should be paid direct by the owner. Every clergyman would rejoice at this. Some competent judges think that the averages of the extraordinary tithe were set too high. Every clergyman would rejoice that if there be an overpressure, it should be removed. I would venture to suggest for consideration, whether a longer interval between planting and extraordinary-tithe paying might not be fixed, so that the farmer should have full time to turn himself round after the cost of new cultivation. It

would be well if landowners, farmers, and clergy could take amicable counsel on these points, and agree on any principles for legislation. There is much ignorance in the matter, and some hot feeling, and of these the agitator makes capital, to the injury of those really concerned.

In conclusion, let us remember that the Church's property is in local corporations, and it is proposed to hand much of it over to local bodies. Let us, then, shew the laity what is before them. No Parson to minister to them; no Parsonage as a house of sympathy and help; the Church in the hands of a Board, who may use it as they like, or *sell* it for a barn. Let us tell our landowners that Radicals are avowedly seeking to level the "inequalities" in the property of the Church of England, because they are such a powerful precedent or "inequalities" in landed property generally.

Let us tell our Nonconformist parishioners that Liberationists are now avowing that this is a question of *secularities;* and that if Secularists succeed in secularizing "Church" property, they may step on to secularize Nonconformist property, if they find it worth diverting from the "useless object of religious teaching," to matters "really useful to the people." Let us at the same time beware of bitterness in regard to Nonconformists; let our rivalry be one of good works in love and devotion; let us try to get the good among our Nonconformist brethren to perceive that it is the means of making Christ and His salvation known throughout the land, which is really being attacked by Secularists of various shades. Let us, Churchmen, strive not to exaggerate but to minimize our differences; and at least join heart to heart and shoulder to shoulder in defence of the National Church.[1] Let us remember that no other influence on earth so binds a man to his fellow-man, or to a system, as the influence of grateful love for having been brought to a conscious acceptance of Christ, and so to peace —permanent and perfect peace. Therefore we clergy may be assured that in the truest living for our people, and labouring for bringing them, one by one, and family by family, to Christ as their Saviour and Master, we are most surely binding their hearts to the Church to defend which, as the great means of doing Christ's work, we have now to gird ourselves.

CLEMENT F. COBB.

---

[1] Some Churchmen, who complain of Erastianism, may be reminded that if the National Church should be disendowed, still the State will have all the same power to interfere with whatever property may be left us or we may acquire, and with our *teaching* in accordance with the trusts on which we shall hold it, which she *now exercises* over Nonconformists' property, teaching, and trusts.

ART. III.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR. IV. APRIL. ST. MARK THE EVANGELIST.

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

"*The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.*"—MARK i. 1.

THE figure of St. Mark being that which stands in the memorial-niche of the present month,—and St. Mark, besides being a Scripture character delineated for our religious benefit, being also an Evangelist divinely appointed for the perpetual instruction of the Church, it is obviously natural to consider, in the first place, the characteristics of the Gospel which bears his name.

Though the shortest Gospel in length, yet in another sense, and a very true sense, it is the most copious of the four. No explanation of its character could be more inadequate and incorrect than that which used to be accepted, and which indeed was sometimes set forth in books published for the use of the Clergy, namely, that St. Mark's Gospel is an abridgment of St. Matthew's. Its tone—its temperament, so to speak—is different; and even an attentive listener in Church to the reading of the Lessons must be conscious of this, though he may not be able at the moment to state the reason for this impression. Some part of the explanation of this impression may now be given—very briefly indeed, yet so as to be clear and conclusive.

In the first place, there is a quick determined movement in this Gospel—a rapidity and energy, not to say impatience, which becomes apparent on close examination. In a case of this kind much may depend upon a single word. Now there is in the original text of this Gospel a phrase perpetually recurring, and denoting promptitude and immediate action, which only is not perceived by the English reader because it is translated differently (to take instances merely out of the first chapter) by the phrases "straightway," "immediately," "anon," according to that unfortunate fancy of the translators, which led them to think that variety would be always desirable, even when the absence of variety in the original was characteristic. To say that the phrase in question occurs in St. Mark's Gospel far oftener than in all the other Gospels put together, would be much below the truth.[1] Other illustrations could be given of

[1] The exact statistics of the case may be conveniently seen in Bruder's "Greek Concordance," who prefixes here to his list of references the expressive words, "Marco frequentissimum." In St. Matthew the phrase καὶ εὐθέως is used 9 times; in St. Matt., 29 times; in St. Luke, 3 times; in St. John, 3 times.

this peculiar characteristic of St. Mark's style; but strict brevity being imposed upon us here, it may be well to pass at once to another point.

This is what may be termed a general liveliness of narration —as though the writer were speaking to us, while we read his sentences. This is a feature kindred to the former, but not quite identical with it. Only one exemplification shall be given here, but it is a very solemn one. St. Mark notes the gesture, the manner, the countenance of Christ in a degree which is by no means observable in the other Evangelists. He "took" the little children "in His arms" when He blessed them;[1] when the rich young ruler came to Him, He "beheld" him; when He admonished His disciples of the danger of riches, He "looked round about" upon them; when the woman who touched His garment was healed by the way, He "looked round to see her that had done this thing."[2]

Once more, there are minute touches in Mark's narrative which we do not find in the other Gospels. It is as though the presence of an eye-witness were with us while we read. Thus, to take the last four chapters, he alone names Andrew as being present on the Mount of Olives, when the Lord's discourse concerning future judgment was spoken.[3] He alone quotes at the end of the discourse the searching words, "What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch."[4] We may remark, by the way, for a reason which will be seen presently, that Andrew was Peter's brother, and that the admonition to watch was specially applicable to Peter at this time; again, in the account of the Passion, Mark alone names that strange incident of the "young man" with the "linen cloth" about him, who fled in the crowd;[5] he alone says that Simon the Cyrenian, who bore the cross, was "the father of Alexander and Rufus."[6] And with the same kind of result we might turn to the first four chapters. Here only we find the phrase "stoop down" when John the Baptist expresses by a lively image his lowliness in his Master's presence;[7] Mark only it is who says Jesus, when tempted in the wilderness, was "with the wild beasts."[8] In "the house of Simon and Andrew," when the sick woman was raised from the fever, it is he only who says that Jesus "lifted her up" by the hand; and be it remarked that this sick woman was the

---

[1] Mark x. 16. See ix. 36.
[2] *Ibid.*, x. 21, 23; v. 32. See iii. 5; viii. 33.
[3] *Ibid.*, xiii. 3. [4] *Ibid.*, xiii. 37.
[5] *Ibid.*, xiv. 51, 52. Surely the only satisfactory solution of the difficulties which arise here is in the belief that the "young man" was St. Mark himself.
[6] Mark xv. 21. See Rom. xvi. 13. [7] Mark i. 7.
[8] *Ibid.*, i. 13.

mother of Peter's wife.[1] When the healing of the paralytic at Capernaum is described, with the story of the letting of the sick man down through the roof, it is here only that we learn that he was "borne of four."[2] And when they entered into the ship, after the long teaching by parables, here only we are told that the disciples took Him into the ship "even as He was," that when the storm was at its worst, He was asleep "on a pillow;" here only are words quoted which probably none but Peter would have dared to utter: "Lord, carest Thou not that we perish?"[3] And let it be noted that in this scanty enumeration only half of St. Mark's Gospel has been touched, that eight chapters still remain; and it may confidently be stated that a similar examination of them would bring precisely the same feature to view.

Now all this points to one conclusion—to the presence of an eye-witness, pervading, if we may say so, the composition of this Gospel. Surely it is not so much Mark that speaks to us in these pages as Peter. Already some observations have been made which lead our thoughts to this conclusion; but in proportion as this theory is put to the test by minute examination, the evidence becomes more conclusive. This evidence divides itself into two sections. First, there is a tendency in this Gospel to sink, or to hide, what is creditable to St. Peter, and to call attention to that which is humiliating; and secondly, circumstantial facts appear in this narrative which, in the most natural way, bring Peter before our thoughts. Thus, as regards the former class of evidence, in the account of the memorable conversation at Cæsarea Philippi, the glorious testimony to Peter's confession is omitted, and the severity of the rebuke he received is made conspicuous.[4] It is in this Gospel too, and in this only, that the information comes to us that the cock crowed *twice*.[5] Under the other head we may just note these two circumstances, that here only, in the account of the Transfiguration, we find the words, "*He wist not what to say;*"[6] here only the words of the angel at the empty sepulchre, "Go, tell His disciples *and Peter* that I go before them into Galilee."[7] Internal evidence comes abundantly out of this Gospel to meet the wide-spread tradition of the early Church. There is really no doubt of the meaning of the phrase in Eusebius, which has led to so much discussion: "Mark was the interpreter of Peter."[8]

---

[1] Mark i. 31. See ix. 27. [2] *Ibid.*, ii. 3. [3] *Ibid.*, iv. 36, 38.
[4] Compare Mark viii. 27-33 with Matt. xvi. 13-23.
[5] Mark xiv. 30, 68, 72. [6] *Ibid.*, ix. 6. [7] *Ibid.*, xvi. 7.
[8] It is important to observe that, as regards the relation of Peter and Mark, the accord of tradition comes from without in the most decisive manner to meet the strength of internal evidence.

B. THE OPPORTUNITIES OF YOUNG MEN.

"*Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.*"—2 TIM. iv. 11.

If a very strict order were followed, this paper on St. Mark ought to have preceded the other. The man comes logically before the writing. But this is not a case where chronology need be very exactly observed. Each of the present series of short essays is intended to have a distinct topic of its own; and there is some advantage in turning back to consider what manner of man St. Mark was, after having carefully noted some characteristics of the Gospel which he was inspired to write. Let us now, therefore, very briefly follow the footsteps of his biography, as given to us in the New Testament, keeping in view one particular aspect of the subject which may serve as a very useful and suggestive thread for binding the whole together.

The two earliest occasions on which St. Mark appears before us in the sacred narrative, convey, beyond any doubt, the impression that he was then *a young man*. The first is in the twelfth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where we find a large body of the early Christians assembled in his mother's house, at an anxious time, and engaged in prayer. St. Peter had been put in prison, and was in danger of execution. He was delivered, as we remember, by an angel; and on being thus rescued, he proceeded "to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together in prayer."[1] The mother of Mark, then, was a religious woman: the house in which he was brought up was a house of prayer; it was a place, too, where help was given to others at a season of distress and trouble. To Mark it was a great blessing to belong to such a household. He was surrounded by good influences in his early days; and, of course, for his use of this advantage he was responsible. And surely it should be suggested to young men, when they read this passage of Sacred History, that all who dwell in religious homes, especially all who have had godly mothers, that this is an infinite blessing—that they cannot value it too highly—that they ought to pray for grace to use it fully—that God will hold them accountable for so great a benefit. "To whom much is given, of them shall much be required."

The next passage to which reference is to be made, is in the latter part of the twelfth chapter, taken in conjunction with the earlier part of the thirteenth; and here again the distinct impression is conveyed that St. Mark was a young man. We

[1] Acts xii. 12.

now see him in association, not with St. Peter, but with St. Paul. That Apostle, along with Barnabas, had been on a charitable errand to Jerusalem; and when they returned to Antioch, where very active preaching of the Gospel was taking place, they brought with them—no doubt with his mother's full approval—"John, whose surname was Mark."[1] Presently Paul and Barnabas were sent forth from Antioch on the first Christian Mission to the Gentiles. They proceeded to the island of Cyprus; and there it is said, they had John "for their minister," or assistant.[2] Now, therefore, we can see this son of a religious mother appointed, at a very critical moment in the history of the Church, to a most important post, viz., to help the first Missionaries that ever went out to preach the Gospel in the Gentile world. No doubt St. Mark's position was subordinate. But he had a great opportunity of gaining experience; and he had a great opportunity too of being useful. And when we consider all that required attention on the Mission, in making arrangements for addressing public audiences, in instructing those who anxiously inquired concerning the Gospel, and in baptizing new converts, we feel sure that he was very useful, to say nothing of the comfort his presence afforded to his older companions. And to young men it should be said very firmly that they will have (and possibly may very soon have) opportunities of being thoroughly useful. They will be able to afford help and comfort to those who are older than themselves. Hence they should be urged in one sense—not in every sense—but in a very true sense, to believe in their own importance. They will have power to be useful; and in endeavouring to be useful they will gain experience that will be of value during their whole future lives.

But when the Missionary party leaves the island of Cyprus, a sudden change comes over the prospect, a cloud falls upon this fair promise of a young man's usefulness. We are now thinking of the thirteenth verse of the thirteenth chapter. Paul and Barnabas were proceeding to the mainland, and preparing to enter upon longer journeys; and at this point it is said, that "John departing from them returned to Jerusalem."[3] It is evident from what follows that Mark was to blame. But the journeys in prospect were fatiguing and dangerous; and probably some ship sailing for Syria presented to him an opportunity for returning home, and so he went. He gave up this enterprise which he had begun; he left Paul and Barnabas without the help which he was able to give, and which they so much needed. No doubt this was

[1] Acts xii. 25. [2] *Ibid.*, xiii. 5. [3] *Ibid.*, xiii. 13.

very natural; but it was not very spirited conduct on his part. We should expect a young man to have more courage, to say nothing of the duty of abiding by an undertaking, if it is a good undertaking, to which we have once committed ourselves, especially if our devotion is likely to involve serious inconvenience and discomfort to others. To young men we therefore say, "You too will probably be placed—in fact you are sure to be placed—in a position where you will be tempted to inconsistency and weakness, and when, if you yield, you will be very much ashamed and the cause of great harm."

Now let us note part of the harm that did result in this instance. Paul and Barnabas completed their first Missionary journey—returned to their starting-point—and then proposed to enter on a new Missionary journey. This we find recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts: "Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark; but Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them, and went not with them to the work; and the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from the other."[1] Now we need not inquire whether Paul or Barnabas was in the right. Perhaps they were both, more or less in the wrong. The point for us to observe at the moment is that Mark was the cause of this contention and separation, and that this contention and separation was a very great evil. When good men publicly disagree, much harm commonly results. Thus Mark's weakness and inconsistency led to scandal in the Church, attenuated the force of Missionary operations, and produced coldness between two warm friends. Such is the mischief that may be done by a young man without the commission of any positive crime. Many a misunderstanding has been caused among elder people (and good people, too) by the misconduct of those who are younger; and such misunderstandings are lamentable events.

We now lose sight of Mark for several years. How he was employed during that interval we do not know. He may have suffered much from that loss of character, that forfeiting of confidence, which is the proper penalty of those who have failed to act with courage and firmness at a critical time. We begin, however, to obtain some information concerning Mark again in Epistles written by St. Paul from Rome, at the close of that voyage which is related near the end of the Acts of the Apostles. St. Paul tells Philemon that "Mark, his fellow-labourer, salutes him."[2] From the Epistle to the Colossians we learn something more. Here he speaks of Mark as one of those "fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, which had been a

[1] Acts xv. 37-39. [2] Phil. 24.

comfort to him."[1] Thus it is evident that Mark was at this time with St. Paul in Rome, and that he had returned to his old office of helping the Apostle, and of being a really useful and serviceable man; and that St. Paul now placed full confidence in him once more. It was one of those cases of recovery over which we always rejoice, because we recognise in them the action of the grace of God.

We must pass over several years again before we come to the next, and the last, information in Scripture concerning St. Mark. The latest letter which St. Paul wrote was the Second to Timothy; and the verse prefixed as a motto to this paper makes known to us what he said of Mark then. He sends for him, with a special desire to have him near himself, because of his great power of being useful. "Take Mark, and bring him with thee; for he is profitable unto me for ministering."[2] Thus we see that Mark was now consistent; that with the continued supply of God's grace he remained steady in his duty, and was trusted by St. Paul to the very last.

J. S. HOWSON.

ART. IV.—COWPER'S LETTERS.

Letters of William Cowper. Edited with Introduction by the Rev. W. BENHAM, B.D., F.S.A., Rector of Edmund the King, Lombard Street. Macmillan and Co. 1884.

WE have to thank Mr. Benham for this compact edition of Cowper's Letters. He has given us in this little volume all that is best worth preserving in the correspondence of the poet of Ouse and Olney. There is not a letter in this book that is not worth reading, and that will not repay the reader. We are all familiar with Southey's judgment of Cowper as a letter-writer. "He was," he says, "the best of English letter-writers"; and certainly his letters are as charming as they are delightful. They are as artless as they are graceful; as humorous as they are varied in matter, and clear in style. They combine with a keen sense of the ridiculous and with a deep knowledge of human nature, a transparent simplicity which reveals the goodness of the poet's heart, and his singleness of purpose in lashing the vices, and satirizing the follies

[1] Col. iv. 10, 11. In these two passages the original word translated "fellow-worker" and "fellow-labourer" is the same; and it is worth while to observe that it includes the significant word "work" which we find in Acts xv. 38.

[2] 2 Tim. iv. 11.

of mankind. The object of his satire is not to wound or to pain others, but to induce them to amend and reform. He hurts only to heal. He probes the sore, but it is that he may cure. Mr. Benham must have found the task of "collating those letters with the original manuscripts, where they have been within his reach," a pleasant one, and a pleasant duty also it must have been to "restore much which had been suppressed." We all know that "the labour we delight in physics pain;" and Mr. Benham must have found it to be so in his labour of love.

The arrangement he follows in his edition is the simplest, namely, the chronological order; and he has wisely supplied in his introduction all that is needed for the full understanding of the letters, having "for purposes of convenient reference, set down the main heads of the poet's life, and given short notices of the friends to whom letters are addressed."

In a former paper of THE CHURCHMAN, we gave a sketch of his simple yet most pathetic life—a life often shadowed over by dark clouds, but whose very shadows were lighted up by bright gleams of comfort, and by the rays of the "hope that maketh not ashamed." Nothing could be well less romantic than the flow of his everyday life, or less remarkable than the society in which he passed his days; and yet, there is something full of a fascinating interest in a career that presents such a series of sharp contrasts as his. The little child—object of his mother's fondest care; the shy and brilliant schoolboy at Westminster; the attorney's office, where he and the celebrated Thurlow were employed "from morning to night in giggling and making giggle;" his residence and membership at the Nonsense Club; his youthful love which touched another life beside his own; his nervous fever in prospect of an examination for the clerkship of the House of Lords; his madness; his attempt at suicide; his residence at St. Albans under Dr. Cotton; his recovery, and reception of peace through the Gospel of the grace of God—all form the record of a life which combines in a high degree both interest and pathos. And so to the very end of his days—his friendship with Newton, with Mrs. Unwin; the charm brought into his life by Lady Hesketh; his intercourse with the Throgmortons, with Hayley; his latter days clouded over by darkness, by distressing dreams and visions; and yet through all, "the hopeless hand" seen "clinging to the Cross of hope"—is a story that has a romance of its own.

Of the poetical work of the sweet singer of Olney; of its reaction from the artificial and classical school; its love of nature; its purity; its nobleness, and simplicity, and scorn of the mean; its hatred of the wrong, and withal its humour

and tenderness; and of the manliness of tone which characterizes him everywhere; of his power to move to tears and to laughter—of this we have written in THE CHURCHMAN before. It is to his letters that we now desire to direct the reader's attention; and we hope, even before this paper is finished, he will be grateful to us for so doing. But let us carry with us the thought that these letters are the spontaneous outcome of Cowper's feelings; they flow from the heart, and are the direct expression of his mind. They were not written for publication. He never supposed, when his pen traced the characters on the paper, that any other eyes should rest upon them save those of the person whom he addresses. He is beyond all things real and sincere. He puts down on the page whatever is uppermost in his mind—whether grave or gay, whether humorous or sad. There is much in them that throws light upon the incidents of his life; and in this respect they afford ample materials for a biography of the poet; though there is much in them besides this—opinions on men and manners; a real love of fun; sympathy with the joys and sorrows of his friends; outcries of depression at his own miserable state of mind; and references to the origin of his poems, and to the literary pursuits in which he was engaged. And these letters are all written in pure and beautiful English; there is nothing in them affected or rhetorical; the words are "exquisitely sought"—drawn, not from the treasury of classical lore, but from "the well of English undefiled," with all its strong and racy idiom. His thoughts flow from his pen in the easiest, sweetest, simplest manner, and the very act of writing seems to carry him out of himself, and away from himself,—a proof of the pleasure and enjoyment he had in composition.

But the reader will thank us for giving some passages from his letters in proof of the praise we have bestowed on their gracefulness and delicacy of expression.

The following letter (Huntingdon, 1765) is, what many of his letters are, biographical, and refers to the attack of insanity which prevented his going in for examination for the office of Clerkship of the Journals:

DEAR JOE,—The only recompense I can make you for your kind attention to my affairs during my illness is to tell you that, by the mercy of God, I am restored to perfect health, both of mind and body. This, I believe, will give you pleasure, and I would gladly do anything from which you could receive it.

I left St. Albans on the 17th, and arrived that day at Cambridge, spent some time there with my brother, and came hither on the 22nd. I have a lodging that puts me continually in mind of our summer excursions; we have had many worse, and, except the size of it (which, however, is sufficient for a single man), but few better. I am not quite alone, having

brought a servant with me from St. Albans, who is the very mirror of fidelity and affection for his master. . . . The river Ouse—I forget how they spell it—is the most agreeable circumstance in this part of the world: at this town it is, I believe, as wide as the Thames at Windsor; nor does the silver Thames better deserve that epithet, nor has it more flowers upon its banks, these being attributes which in strict truth belong to neither. Fluellen would say they are as like as my fingers to my fingers, and there is salmon in both. It is a noble stream to bathe in, and I shall make that use of it three times a week, having introduced myself to it for the first time this morning.

What delightful humour there is in this letter to the same correspondent (Joseph Hill):

Whatever you may think of the matter, it is no easy thing to keep house for two people. A man cannot always live upon sheep's heads and liver and lights, like the lions in the Tower; and a joint of meat, in so small a family, is an endless encumbrance. My butcher's bill for last week amounted to four shillings and tenpence. I set off with a leg of lamb, and was forced to give part of it away to my washerwoman. Then I made an experience upon a sheep's heart, and that was too little. Next I put three pounds of beef into a pie, and this had like to have been too much, for it lasted three days, though my landlord was admitted to a share of it. Then as to small beer, I am puzzled to pieces about it. I have bought as much for a shilling as will serve us at least a month, and it is grown sour already. In short, I never knew how to pity poor housekeepers before; but now I cease to wonder at the politic cast which their occupation usually gives to their countenance, for it is really a matter full of perplexity.

He had received but one visit, he adds. "I don't mean that I have refused any, but only one has been offered. This was from my woollen-draper—a very healthy, wealthy, sensible, sponsible man, and extremely civil. He has a cold bath, and has promised me a key of it, which I shall probably make use of in the winter. He has undertaken, too, to get me the *St. James's Chronicle* three times a week, and to show me Hinchinbrook House, and to do every service for me in his power."

Here is an interesting account of his daily life with the Unwins (letter to his cousin, Mrs. Cowper, 1766):

As to amusements—I mean what the world calls such—we have none; the place, indeed, swarms with them, and cards and dancing are the professed business of almost all the *gentle* inhabitants of Huntingdon. We refuse to take part in them or to be accessories to this way of murdering our time, and by so doing have acquired the name of Methodists. Having told you how we *do not* spend our time, I will next say how we do. We breakfast commonly between eight and nine; till eleven we read either the Scripture, or the sermons of some faithful preacher of those holy mysteries; at eleven we attend divine service, which is performed here twice every day; and from twelve to three we separate, and amuse ourselves as we please. During that interval I either read in my own apartment, or walk, or ride, or work in the garden. We seldom sit an hour after dinner; but if the weather permits, adjourn to the garden, where, with Mrs. Unwin and her son, I have generally the pleasure of religious conversation till tea-time. If it rains, or is too windy for walking, we either converse within doors, or sing some hymns of Martin's "Collec-

tion :" and by the help of Mrs. Unwin's harpsichord make up a tolerable concert, in which our hearts, I hope, are the best and most musical performers. After tea we sally forth to walk in good earnest. Mrs. Unwin is a good walker, and we have generally travelled about four miles before we see home again. When the days are short, we make this excursion in the former part of the day, between church-time and dinner. At night we read and converse, as before, till supper, and commonly finish the evening either with hymns or a sermon, and last of all the family are called to prayers. I need not tell *you* that such a life as this is consistent with the utmost cheerfulness ; accordingly we are all happy, and dwell together in unity as brethren. Mrs. Unwin has almost a maternal affection for me, and I have something very like a filial one for her ; and her son and I are brothers. Blessed be the God of our salvation for such companions, and for such a life ; above all, for a heart to like it!

In another letter (Olney, 1769) he shows that suffering from mental depression as he often did, and himself in need of consolation, he knew well how to console others, and to point them to the true source of comfort. And surely we must believe that he who could so tenderly point others to the source of Christian hope must have felt, perhaps unconsciously to himself, the sweetness, the consolation he conveyed to them. He was not as the marble fountain that we have all seen, from which flow streams of refreshing water, but which knows nothing itself of the refreshment ; but rather as the living man who holds the sweet cup to the lips of a thirsty friend, having first drunk the cooling beverage himself. Cowper writes :

MY DEAR COUSIN,—A letter from your brother Frederic brought me yesterday the most afflicting intelligence that has reached me these many years. I pray to God to comfort you, and to enable you to sustain this heavy stroke with that resignation to His will which none but Himself can give, and which He gives to none but His own children. How blessed and happy is your lot, my dear friend, beyond the common lot of the greater part of mankind, that you know what it is to draw near to God in prayer, and are acquainted with a throne of grace! You have resources in the infinite love of a dear Redeemer which are withheld from millions ; and the promises of God, which are yea and amen in Jesus, are sufficient to answer all your necessities, and to sweeten the bitterest cup which your heavenly Father will ever put into your hand. May He now give you liberty to drink at these wells of salvation, till you are filled with consolation and peace in the midst of trouble!

Let us now look at our poet as a critic, and see how with unsparing pen he censures Dr. Johnson's treatment of Milton. Johnson had written a biography of the great poet, which Mr. Unwin had sent to Cowper (1779).

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I wrote my last letter merely to inform you that I had nothing to say, in answer to which you have said nothing. I admire the propriety of your conduct, though I am a loser by it. I will endeavour to say something now, and shall hope for something in return.

I have been well entertained with Johnson's biography, for which I thank you : with one exception, and that a swinging one, I think he has acquitted himself with his usual good sense and sufficiency. His treatment of Milton is unmerciful to the last degree. A pensioner is not

likely to spare a Republican, and the Doctor, in order, I suppose, to convince his royal patron of the sincerity of his monarchical principles, has belaboured that great poet's character with the most industrious cruelty. As a man he has hardly left him the shadow of one good quality. Churlishness in his private life, and a rancorous hatred of everything royal in his public, are the two colours with which he has smeared all the canvas. If he had any virtues, they are not to be found in the Doctor's picture of him, and it is well for Milton that some sourness in his temper is the only vice with which his memory has been charged; it is evident enough that if his biographer could have discovered more, he would not have spared him. As a poet he has treated him with severity enough, and has plucked one or two of the most beautiful feathers out of his muse's wing, and trampled them under his great foot. He has passed sentence of condemnation upon "Lycidas," and has taken occasion from that charming poem to expose to ridicule (what is indeed ridiculous enough) the childish prattlement of pastoral compositions, as if "Lycidas" was the prototype and pattern of them all. The liveliness of the description, the sweetness of the numbers, the classical spirit of antiquity that prevails in it, go for nothing. I am convinced, by the way, that he has no ear for poetical numbers, or that it was stopped by prejudice against the harmony of Milton's. Was there ever anything so delightful as the music of the "Paradise Lost"? It is like that of a fine organ; has the fullest and the deepest tones of majesty, with all the softness and elegance of the Dorian flute: variety without end, and never equalled, unless perhaps by Virgil. Yet the Doctor has little or nothing to say upon this copious theme, but talks something about the unfitness of the English language for blank verse, and how apt it is, in the mouth of some readers, to degenerate into declamation. Oh, I could thrash his old jacket till I made his pension jingle in his pockets!

In a letter to the Rev. John Newton (1781) we discover that what looks prose to the eye is rhyme to the ear. The reader will thank us for giving it in full, and will derive from it some amusement if he reads it aloud:

MY VERY DEAR FRIEND,—I am going to send what when you have read you may scratch your head, and say, I suppose, there's nobody knows whether what I've got be verse or not: by the tune and the time it ought to be rhyme; but if it be, did you ever see, of late or of yore, such a ditty before?

I have writ *Charity*, not for popularity, but as well as I could, in hopes to do good: and if the reviewer should say, "To be sure, the gentleman's muse wears Methodist shoes; you may know by her pace, and talk about grace, that she and her bard have little regard for the taste and fashions, and ruling passions and hoydening play of the modern day; and though she assume a borrowed plume, and now and then wear a tittering air, 'tis only her plan to catch, if she can, the giddy and gay as they go that way, by a production, on a new construction; she has baited her trap in hopes to snap all that may come with a sugar-plum."—His opinion in this will not be amiss; 'tis what I intend, my principal end; and if I succeed, and folks should read, till a few are brought to a serious thought, I shall think I am paid for all I have said and all I have done, though I have run, many a time, after a rhyme as far as from hence to the end of my sense; and by hook or crook, write another book, if I live and am here another year.

I have heard before of a room with a floor, laid upon springs, and such like things, with so much art in every part, that when you went in you were forced to begin a minuet pace, with an air and a grace, swimming

about, now in and now out, with a deal of state, in a figure of eight, without pipe or string, or any such thing; and now I have writ, in a rhyming fit, what will make you dance, and as you advance, will keep you still, though against your will, dancing away, alert and gay, till you come to an end of what I have penned; which that you may do, ere madam and you are quite worn out with jigging about, I take my leave; and here you receive a bow profound, down to the ground, from your humble me, W. C.

In a letter to the Rev. William Unwin (1783) Cowper gives his friend an account of the Rev. Mr. Bull of Newport, from whose acquaintance he derived much pleasure and profit. The latter paragraph of this letter, in which the writer alludes to Mr. Fytche, contains some sentiments which are not inapplicable to the Church, her ministers, and bishops, at the present time.

. . . You are not acquainted with the Rev. Mr. Bull, of Newport; perhaps it is as well for you that you are not. You would regret still more than you do that there are so many miles interposed between us. He spends part of the day with us to-morrow. A Dissenter, but a liberal one; a man of letters and of genius; master of a fine imagination, or rather not master of it—an imagination which, when he finds himself in the company he loves, and can confide in, runs away with him into such fields of speculation as amuse and enliven every other imagination that has the happiness to be of the party. At other times he has a tender and delicate sort of melancholy in his disposition, not less agreeable in its way. No men are better qualified for companions in such a world as this than men of such a temperament. Every scene of life has two sides, a dark and a bright one, and the mind that has an equal mixture of melancholy and vivacity is best of all qualified for the contemplation of either. He can be lively without levity, and pensive without dejection. Such a man is Mr. Bull. But—he smokes tobacco—nothing is perfect:

Nihil est ab omni
Parte beatum.

I find that your friend Mr. Fytche has lost his cause; and, more mortifying still, has lost it by a single voice. Had I been a peer, he should have been secure of mine; for I am persuaded that if conditional presentations were in fashion, and if every minister held his benefice, as the judges their office, upon the terms of *quamdiu bene se gesserit*, it would be the better for the cause of religion, and more for the honour of the Establishment. There ought to be discipline somewhere; and if the Bishops will not exercise it, I do not see why lay patrons should have their hands tied. If I remember the state of your case (and I never heard it stated), my reflections upon it are pertinent. It is, however, long since we talked about it, and I may possibly misconceive it at present; if so, they go for nothing. I understand that he presented upon condition that if the parson proved immoral or negligent, he should have liberty to call upon him either for his resignation or the penalty. If I am wrong, correct me.—Yours, W. C.

The letter from which I now quote will please all who have the poet's vein, and also every one who loves all things great and small, especially birds, those beautiful creatures which flit among the branches, or soar to the skies, and delight us with their songs:

The ballad is a species of poetry I believe peculiar to this country, equally adapted to the drollest and the most tragical subjects. Simplicity and ease are its proper characteristics. Our forefathers excelled in it; but we moderns have lost the art. It is observed that we have few good English odes. But to make amends, we have many excellent ballads, not inferior perhaps in true poetical merit to some of the very best odes that the Greek or Latin languages have to boast of. It is a sort of composition I was ever fond of, and if graver matters had not called me another way, should have addicted myself to it more than to any other. I inherit a taste for it from my father, who succeeded well in it himself, and who lived at a time when the best pieces in that way were produced. What can be prettier than Gay's ballad, or rather Swift's, Arbuthnot's, Pope's, and Gay's, in the what-do-ye-call-it—"'Twas when the seas were roaring"?

So much for ballads and ballad-writers. "A worthy subject," you will say, "for a man whose head might be filled with better things"—and it is filled with better things, but to so ill a purpose, that I thrust into it all manner of topics that may prove more amusing; as, for instance, I have two goldfinches, which in the summer occupy the greenhouse. A few days since, being employed in cleaning out their cages, I placed that which I had in hand upon the table, while the other hung against the wall; the windows and the doors stood wide open. I went to fill the fountain at the pump, and on my return was not a little surprised to find a goldfinch sitting on the top of the cage I had been cleaning, and singing to and kissing the goldfinch within. I approached him, and he discovered no fear; still nearer, and he discovered none. I advanced my hand towards him, and he took no notice of it. I seized him, and supposed I had caught a new bird, but casting my eye upon the other cage, perceived my mistake. Its inhabitant, during my absence, had contrived to find an opening, where the wire had been a little bent, and made no other use of the escape it afforded him than to salute his friend, and to converse with him more intimately than he had done before. I returned him to his proper mansion, but in vain. In less than a minute he had thrust his little person through the aperture again, and again perched upon his neighbour's cage, kissing him as at the first, and singing, as if transported with the fortunate adventure. I could not but respect such friendship as, for the sake of its gratification, had twice declined an opportunity to be free, and, consenting to their union, resolved that for the future one cage should hold them both. I am glad of such incidents. For at a pinch, and when I need entertainment, the versification of them serves to divert me.—W. C.

In a letter to John Newton there is a thought which must have occurred to many, although they may not have given it expression. There are very few who will not thank God that the years of our life in the present dispensation have been curtailed, and that three score years and ten, or a handbreadth more, is now the limit of existence. In youth, indeed, all things are new and joyful; the world is robed in freshness and beauty, and early delights have a keenness which, we think, will never be dulled. But before the grey hairs appear on our head, the old enthusiasm goes, the early pleasures are staled by custom, the fresh wonders of youth pass, and the sad realities of manhood take their place. So, then, we are thankful that no "life almost millenary" spreads out its long

waste of centuries before us, but that in a few brief years we, having life in Christ, shall be given back that lost gift of youth with more than the old strength and possibilities of delight which can never be ours again here.

Cowper wrote:

. . . I have wondered in former days at the patience of the antediluvian world: that they could endure a life almost millenary with so little variety as seems to have fallen to their share. It is probable that they had much fewer employments than we. Their affairs lay in a narrower compass; their libraries were indifferently furnished; philosophical researches were carried on with much less industry and acuteness of penetration; and fiddles, perhaps, were not even invented. How then could seven or eight hundred years of life be supportable? I have asked this question formerly, and been at a loss to resolve it; but I think I can answer it now. I will suppose myself born a thousand years before Noah was born or thought of. I rise with the sun; I worship; I prepare my breakfast; I swallow a bucket of goats'-milk, and a dozen good-sizeable cakes. I fasten a new string to my bow, and my youngest boy, a lad of about thirty years of age, having played with my arrows till he has stript off all the feathers, I find myself obliged to repair them. The morning is thus spent in preparing for the chase, and it is become necessary that I should dine. I dig up my roots; I wash them; I boil them; I find them not done enough; my wife is angry; we dispute; we settle the point; but in the meantime the fire goes out, and must be kindled again. All this is very amusing. I hunt; I bring home the prey; with the skin of it I mend an old coat, or I make a new one. By this time the day is far spent: I feel myself fatigued, and retire to rest. Thus what with tilling the ground, and eating the fruit of it, hunting, and walking, and running, and mending old clothes, and sleeping and rising again, I can suppose an inhabitant of the primæval world so much occupied as to sigh over the shortness of life, and to find at the end of many centuries that they had all slipped through his fingers, and were passed away like a shadow. What wonder then that I, who live in a day of so much greater refinement, when there is so much more to be wanted and wished and to be enjoyed, should feel myself now and then pinched in point of opportunity, and at some loss for leisure to fill four sides of a sheet like this. Thus, however, it is: and if the ancient gentleman to whom I have referred, and their complaints of the disproportion of time to the occasions they had for it, will not serve me as an excuse, I must even plead guilty, and confess that I am often in haste when I have no good reason for being so.

In the following passage from a letter to Newton the poet gives an account of an electioneering canvas before the days of the ballot. It may be questioned whether the ballot, while it ensures secrecy, secures purity of election. But Cowper's sketch has an interest of its own. He says:

We were sitting yesterday after dinner—the two ladies and myself—very composedly, and without the least apprehension of any such intrusion, in our snug parlour, one lady knitting, the other netting, and the gentleman winding worsted, when, to our unspeakable surprise, a mob appeared before the window, a smart rap was heard at the door, the boys hallooed, and the maid announced Mr. Grenville. Puss[1] was unfortu-

[1] His tame hare.

nately let out of her box, so that the candidate, with all his good friends at his heels, was refused admittance at the grand entrance, and referred to the back door as the only possible way of approach.

Candidates are creatures not very susceptible of affronts, and would rather, I suppose, climb in at a window than be absolutely excluded. In a minute the yard, the kitchen, and the parlour were filled. Mr. Grenville, advancing towards me, shook me by the hand with a degree of cordiality that was extremely seducing. As soon as he and as many more as could find chairs were seated, he began to open the intent of his visit. I told him I had no vote, for which he readily gave me credit. I assured him I had no influence, which he was not equally inclined to believe, and the less, no doubt, because Mr. Ashburner, the drapier, addressing himself to me at that moment, informed me that I had a great deal. Supposing that I could not be possessed of such a treasure without knowing it, I ventured to confirm my first assertion by saying that if I had any, I was utterly at a loss to imagine where it could be, or wherein it consisted. Thus ended the conference. Mr. Grenville squeezed me by the hand again, kissed the ladies, and withdrew. He kissed likewise the maid in the kitchen, and seemed upon the whole a most loving, kissing, kind-hearted gentleman.

This reminds us of the story of the beautiful Duchess of Devonshire, who, in order to secure a vote for her party, did not scruple to purchase one from a butcher at the price of a kiss.

In another letter to the same friend, there is a report of the way in which the election was conducted, and of the violence of the whole proceeding, the candidates themselves taking an active part in the scuffle. As a contrast to the electioneering conflict, how delightful is the following description of the greenhouse, which he calls in another place his "workshop," and where he revelled in the sights and sounds of nature:

. . . . My greenhouse is never so pleasant as when we are just upon the point of being turned out of it. The gentleness of the autumnal suns and the calmness of this latter season make it a much more agreeable retreat than we ever find it in summer: when, the winds being generally brisk, we cannot cool it by admitting a sufficient quantity of air without being at the same time incommoded by it. But now I sit with all the windows and doors open, and am regaled with the scent of every flower in a garden as full of flowers as I have known how to make it. We keep no bees, but if I lived in a hive I should hardly hear more of their music. All the bees in the neighbourhood resort to a bed of mignonette opposite to the window, and pay me for the honey they get out of it by a hum, which, though rather monotonous, is as agreeable to my ear as the whistling of my linnets. All the sounds that Nature utters are delightful, at least in this country. I should not perhaps find the roaring of lions in Africa or of bears in Russia very pleasing; but I know no beast in England whose voice I do not account musical, save and except always the braying of an ass. The notes of all our birds and fowls please me, without one exception. I should not, indeed, think of keeping a goose in a cage, that I might hang him up in the parlour, for the sake of his melody; but a goose upon a common or in a farmyard is no bad performer. And as to insects, if the black beetles—and beetles, indeed, of all hues—will keep out of my way, I have no objection to any of the rest;

on the contrary, in whatever key they sing, from the gnat's fine treble to the bass of the humble bee, I admire them all.

In a letter to Lady Hesketh (Nov. 1785), full of a winsome as well as a happy humour, he writes: "I cannot believe but that I should know you, notwithstanding all that time may have done. There is not a feature of your face, could I meet it upon the road by itself, that I should not instantly recollect. I should say, 'That is my cousin's nose, or those are her lips, and her chin,' and no woman upon earth can claim them but herself."[1]

Cowper owed much to the kindness and sympathy of women, and he delighted in their society; for no doubt there was something in their gentleness, and tenderness, and grace, akin to his own nature, and which soothed while it charmed his heart and imagination. "I have always said, and shall never say otherwise" (he writes), "that if patience under adversity, and submission to the afflicting hand of God, be true fortitude, which no reasonable person can deny, then your sex have ten times more fortitude to boast than ours." "Why is it, since the first offender on earth was a woman, that the women are nevertheless in all the most important points superior to men? That they are so I will not allow to be disputed, having observed it ever since I was capable of making the observation."

I believe, on recollection, [he adds] that when I had the happiness to see you here, we agitated this question a little; but I do not remember that we arrived at any decision of it. The Scripture calls you the *weaker vessels;* and perhaps the best solution of the difficulty, therefore, may be found in those other words of Scripture, *My strength is perfected in weakness.* Unless you can furnish me with a better key than this, I shall be much inclined to believe that I have found the true one.

Changes in the weather—early Spring with

"Daffodils
That come before the swallow dares, and take
The winds of March with beauty; violets, dim,
But sweeter than the lids of Juno's eyes
Or Cytherea's breath; pale primroses,
That die unmarried, ere they can behold
Bright Phœbus in his strength,"

[1] The letter proceeds: "As for me, I am a very smart youth of my years. I am not indeed grown grey so much as I am grown bald. No matter. There was more hair in the world than ever had the honour to belong to me. Accordingly, having found just enough to curl a little at my ears, and to intermix with a little of my own that still hangs behind, I appear, if you see me in an afternoon, to have a very decent headdress, not easily distinguished from my natural growth; which, being worn with a small bag and a black ribbon about my neck, continues to me the charms of my youth, even on the verge of age." In a postscript he adds: "That the view I give you of myself may be complete, I add the two following items—that I am in debt to nobody, and that I grow fat."

all these were noted by Cowper, and afford occasion for graceful remark. Thus, for instance, he writes:

. . . You talk of primroses that you pulled on Candlemas Day; but what think you of me who heard a nightingale on New Year's Day? Perhaps I am the only man in England who can boast of such good fortune—good indeed, for if it was at all an omen, it could not be an unfavourable one. The winter, however, is now making himself amends, and seems the more peevish for having been encroached on at so undue a season.

Cowper had his picture painted at the request of some friends, and the likeness, which was lifelike, and which is known to all admirers of the poet through an admirable engraving, gave rise to some "excellent fooling" on his part in a letter to Hayley.

. . . God bless your dear little boy and poet! I thank him for exercising his dawning genius upon me, and shall be still happier to thank him in person.

Abbot is painting me so true,
That, trust me, you would stare,
And hardly know, at the first view,
If I were here or there.

I have sat twice; and the few who have seen his copy of me are much struck with the resemblance. He is a sober, quiet man, which, considering that I must have him at least a week longer for an inmate, is a great comfort to me.

And once more:

. . . Well, this picture is at last finished and well finished, I can assure you. Every creature that has seen it has been astonished at the resemblance. Sam's boy bowed to it, and Beau walked up to it, wagging his tail as he went, and evidently showing that he acknowledged its likeness to his master. It is a half-length, as it is technically but absurdly called—that is to say, it gives all but the foot and ankle. To-morrow it goes to town, and will hang some months at Abbot's, when it will be sent to its due destination in Norfolk.

Cowper's letters, however, are not all humorous and gay: very many are full of the deepest melancholy, as if he wrote with a pen steeped in despair. From these we might imagine that his life had no sunshine, and was all darkness and gloom. His correspondence with Newton is nearly all of a sad character, and from the poet's letters to his friend, it may be gathered that Newton did not sufficiently allow for Cowper's timidity of character, or for the delicate manner in which his nerves were strung. It vexes us that Newton, good and excellent man that he was, instead of applying the healing balm of sympathy to poor Cowper's melancholy, should increase his melancholy by words that sound harsh and unsympathetic. No one can be scolded into peace, though by wise and gentle treatment we may be won to cast our cares upon Him Who careth for us.

Even when writing to Lady Hesketh, in the middle of a letter,

Cowper breaks out into such expressions as these: "Infinite despair is a sad prompter. . . . Oh, wretch! to whom life and death are alike impossible! Most miserable at present in this, that being thus miserable, I have my senses continued to me only that I may look forward to the worst." Again, he calls himself "the most miserable of all beings." Such letters, it must be remembered, were written when the poet's mind was under eclipse—when it was "like sweet bells jangled, out of tune and harsh." Yet never for long did his confidence in the goodness of God fail, and even through his thick spiritual darkness, gleams of light break forth which prove that hope lay at the heart of his despair. Though "cast down, he was not destroyed." Often and often in letters that breathe of spiritual distress, he gives such consolation to others that we feel he must have been a partaker in the comfort he conveys.

But the space at our disposal warns us to bring this paper to a close. To give all the letters we should wish to give would be to transfer the whole of Cowper's correspondence to these pages. We can only refer those who wish for some hours of rational enjoyment to Mr. Benham's portable little volume, and we can promise them, that much as they may admire Cowper's poetry, they will find his prose no less agreeable.

It is positively refreshing in these days of sensational novels and stories, and of trivial gossip published under the title of "Recollections," and "Memorials," and "Diaries," the greater part of which is composed of worse than unprofitable scandal, to turn to a correspondence so delightful, so natural, and so pure. His correspondence overflows now with humour, now with that love of nature, and now with that deeply religious feeling which lay at the very root of his being. We may say of his letters, what he said to Hayley of some verses which his friend and biographer had written to Austen, and sent with a present of honey: "Your verses to Austen are as sweet as the honey that accompanies them—kind, friendly, witty, and elegant."

CHARLES D. BELL, D.D.

ART. V. — SOME ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS UPON "NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD."

CANON HOARE has done well in calling attention to Professor Drummond's fascinating book; for I believe (notwithstanding its singular attractiveness) that there are principles underlying it which ought only to be accepted with very considerable modification and reserve.

The book, as the author informs us, was not intended for "those who already find themselves fully nourished on the older forms of truth." To such he "does not commend his pages; they will find them superfluous: nor is there any reason why they should mingle *with light* which is *already clear, the distorting rays of a foreign expression.*" Consequently he offers his thoughts rather to "those who are feeling their way to a Christian life, but who are haunted by a sense of instability in the foundation of their faith." Now, though this was the writer's intention, it is plain that in the wide circulation the book has attained, no such discrimination could possibly be exercised. It has been extensively read by the Christian public, and, when compared with publications of a like kind, has attained an almost unique popularity. The causes for this are not difficult to understand. The purity of diction, the ease and grace of expression, and the almost entire freedom from technical phrases, coupled with much that is richly suggestive in thought and illustration, have naturally secured for it an exceptionally large circle of readers. In the subject-matter, also, of the book, it has met a condition of thought which is at present widely prevalent. During the last decade, natural science has been brought within the reach of the multitude. Admirable handbooks have been written, and a desire to become acquainted with the rudiments of science has been gradually fostered. But this is not all. The Churches are active; the pulse of religious life beats strongly; and publications upon spiritual subjects have an enormous sale. Formerly, religion and science stood apart—they were looked upon as necessarily antagonistic; now they have been brought together, and men are beginning to perceive that God's Word and God's work must be in harmony. But the books which have been written, hitherto expressing this harmony, have been for the most part very dry, abstruse, and technical; whereas Mr. Drummond's publication is eminently free from all such obscurity. The writing is luminous, and the scientific facts and allusions are fresh and happily chosen. A becoming reverence for religious truth pervades the book. Conversion, life as the gift of God, growth in grace, and the knowledge of God through Christ, are all more or less freely discussed. We can, therefore, scarcely wonder that a work which combines so much should be immensely popular. But just in proportion as it is so, does it concern the thoughtful student of God's Word to inquire whether the principles which lie at the basis of this exquisite superstructure are in every respect reliable.

Before, however, entering upon an examination of these fundamental principles, let me call attention to the way in

which the spiritual condition of this country is described. Our "religious opinions" are said to be "in a state of flux;" "the intellect of the age is slowly divorcing itself from Christianity." "The natural world," under the discoveries of science and the introduction of the reign of law, is a "*cosmos*," a world of order; but the spiritual world is a "chaos"! And "in a transition period like the present, holding authority with one hand, and with the other feeling all round in the darkness for some strong new support, theology is surely to be pitied!" This is certainly a very melancholy picture; but I am inclined to think that fair judging minds will pronounce it to be not a little exaggerated. No doubt there is much irreligion existing; and it is quite true that some scientific and literary men, by the very intensity of their application to their special fields of study, have well-nigh shut out all beside. To such, God and the spiritual world may be non-existent; but to say that intellect is being divorced from piety, and that theology is in a decrepit chaotic condition, is to shut the eyes to some of the plainest facts and tendencies of our time. However this may be, Mr. Drummond has a sovereign remedy, which he feels, if skilfully applied, will rehabilitate theology, and ultimately transform the "chaos" which exists in the spiritual sphere into a state of harmony and order.

Now it is this remedy which forms the great central feature of the work, and it is with it we proceed to deal. At page 6 of the preface we read the following statement:

> Is there not reason to believe that many of the laws of the spiritual world, hitherto regarded as occupying an entirely separate province, are simply the laws of the natural world? Can we identify the natural laws, or any one of them, in the spiritual sphere? That vague lines everywhere run through the spiritual world is already beginning to be recognised. Is it possible to link them with those great lines running through the visible universe, which we call the natural laws, or are they fundamentally distinct? In a word, is the supernatural natural or unnatural?

Again, at page 11, "The position we have been led to take up is not that the spiritual laws are analogous to the natural laws, but that they are the same laws; it is not a question of analogy but of identity." "The laws of the invisible are the same laws, projections of the natural, not supernatural;" "which at one end, as it were, may be dealing with matter, at the other end with spirit." Again. "If the natural laws" (p. 27) "were run through the spiritual world we might see the great lines of religious truth as clearly and simply as the broad lines of science." Natural law, were (p. ix.) "it traced in the spiritual world, would have an important scientific value, it would offer religion a *new credential*;" and when this is effected, "we shall offer to thinking men a truly scientific theology." The gift of science to theology (p. 32) "will illuminate what the inspiration

of revelation has left obscure, heresy in certain whole departments shall become impossible," and "scepticism even may come to be regarded as unscientific."

Here, then, we have the scientific method proposed. The natural is to illuminate the supernatural, and the results promised, if only they could be realized, are certainly of inestimable value. But in order to test the real worth of this method, it is necessary to ask (*first*) whether it is quite accurate to say that we may push up the natural laws into the spiritual sphere, and when they are so extended, that they still remain exactly the same laws? or are they not, from the very necessities of the case, very materially modified? And (*secondly*) do these laws when thus traced upwards really constitute a new proof of truth in the spiritual world of such strength and efficacy that all doubt and vagueness will cease, and theology at length rest upon an immutable scientific basis?

Now it is well known that the generality of a law decreases as the complexity of the subject in which it moves increases. The *results of a physical* law can only be modified in a very small degree, compared with the larger modification which takes place in that law when extended to the higher region (let us say) of biology; for in the former case we know all the governing and guiding forces, but in the latter, new powers and forces are introduced which may partly be known and partly unknown. Push that law a step still higher up, introduce it into the region of human life, and we at once call into action again a new and fresh set of influences and powers which must still further modify its working. And if we take one stage higher and extend it to the spiritual, it passes into a region where the forces and powers are again different, and such as cannot be determined in any way from nature, but only from the page of revelation; in fact, at each step in the progress upwards the indeterminate elements have become continuously greater until we reach the spiritual sphere where they are the greatest, and the consequent modification of the law resulting therefrom must manifestly here attain its maximum.

With these facts before us, we venture to ask whether it is quite accurate to say that the law which we recognised in the physical is exactly the same law when it has reached the spiritual? May not—nay, must not—much of the original law have been overruled and counteracted in its upward journey? and does it not therefore pass into the spiritual, in a form very different from that in which it originally existed? and is it not from the increase of the unknown and indeterminate powers in its passage upwards, surrounded by a vagueness which should make us hesitate (having regard to these altered surroundings) to pronounce it—at all events

from the standpoint of nature—to be the same law we noted as acting in the physical and material? We do not say (let it be observed), that the law has actually ceased to exist, for to do so would be to forego the principle of continuity, and to forget the connection which one department of science has with another. All we say is, that in its passage from beneath it has been indefinitely modified, and reaches the unseen in a widely different form from that in which it was originally recognised. Each department through which the law passes takes up, indeed, those elements and principles which have gone before, but adds to them certain other elements which are peculiar to itself; and so when the region of theology is attained, the old is not lost, but it is changed and transfigured in the new, and the law in its final condition is best interpreted not by that which preceded—for this, as we have seen, has been progressively modified—but by the facts and truths of the spiritual kingdom itself, which have been made known to us not by nature, but by certain revelation.

And here let me add that one of the most fruitful sources of error in theology at the present time, is the persistent application by scientific authorities of the modes of thought and language derived from physical science to the interpretation of spiritual truth, for these, from the very necessities of the case, must be inadequate; and the lower the department in nature from whence they are derived, the greater will this inadequacy be found. It is in the region of mind—in the mental, moral, and spiritual nature of man, and not in that of physical phenomena, that we obtain our worthiest conceptions of the Being and character of the Almighty. But even these require to be constantly and carefully corrected by the express statements of revelation to make them, even for practical purposes, adequate to the representation of the great realities of the spiritual world. It is admitted that all language, however carefully employed upon such subjects, will retain a certain amount of inaccuracy, which, perhaps, in our present finite condition is unavoidable; but the deliberate employment of a terminology derived from the lower departments of nature is to adopt a mode of expression, which we know, when so employed, must be inaccurate; and consequently the attempt to express spiritual truths in terms of physical science, which is one of the root-ideas of the book, is very far from satisfactory, and will (we feel persuaded), if extensively employed, lead to conclusions fundamentally erroneous.

The principle therefore of extending direct laws of the natural world to the spiritual, and supposing that thereby we shall illuminate that sphere, will not bear examination. Moreover, it is proceeding on a method which is at variance with all previous

experience. How do we discover the laws of nature? Is it not by careful observation and classification of phenomena within the special sphere to which they belong? Even so in the spiritual world a similar inquiry should be conducted within its fitting limits, that so we may formulate the laws which are applicable to it. But we cannot expect, by simply pushing up natural laws, which at every stage in their progress are being constantly modified, to discover the laws of the spiritual, and so to reduce that realm, as the Professor suggests, to order. If when the laws of the spiritual are formulated by a proper induction, we can trace a correspondence with the natural law beneath, well and good; but to push up the natural, and to force that correspondence, is clearly unscientific. The light which we can derive from nature, therefore, is not likely to illumine the spiritual, and introduce into it the promised law and order. This must be done (and has been done) by other means. If that region is to be illuminated, it will be accomplished in the same way in which this has been effected for the natural sphere, namely, by patient investigation and careful combination of the facts to be gathered within *its own* limits, and which consequently in this case will be from the pages of revelation. The new light therefore eludes us, just when we reach the region where it was promised that it would be specially effective, and we are left (if we desire to obtain light at all), to follow the track which the theologian has ever pursued, even the patient study of God's Word; but with this proviso, that since theology as the crowning science embraces within it the whole complete sphere of being, we should be ready to gather hints and helps from every quarter. But these hints and helps should be wisely used, and ever subjected to the final test of God's revealed Will.

We are now in a position to give an answer to our second inquiry as to whether these natural laws, when extended to the spiritual, afford a new and effective proof of the latter, of such a character that under its influence all doubt and perplexity will be done away, and theology at length rest upon a really scientific basis. Surely such a hope, if it has been ever cherished, must, if the considerations we have ventured to submit are valid, have already entirely vanished. Doubtless analogy and correspondence must ever exist between the natural and the spiritual, and in some cases even identity; but that identity is surrounded and interpenetrated with so much that is new, that any additional proof beyond the usual arguments from analogy must be of the slenderest character, and so far from exercising the influence Professor Drummond seems to expect, will, we are inclined to think, leave matters very much as they are at present. It should also be borne in mind that natural

law, which is simply the tabulated expression of human observation at a given period, is not the final embodiment of truth, but from its very nature a variable and progressive quantity, subject to continuous correction as observation and experiment are still further prosecuted. And it is not too much to say that many of the scientific conclusions of to-day will before many years are passed be set aside, or very materially altered. Physical laws which at first sight appear simple are often found upon deeper investigation to be exceedingly complex, and this complexity is one of the causes which renders alteration afterwards necessary. If Professor Drummond's principles were admitted, it would follow that with each change in the apprehension of natural law, we must be prepared to make a corresponding change in its spiritual equivalent; and so, instead of introducing stability, fixedness and order into the spiritual world, there would be constant variation and uncertainty such as the believer in God's Word could not concede for a moment. In truth, *natural* law is the human and therefore imperfect interpretation of the facts of nature, which were they to be fully known would embody the Divine Will; but *spiritual* law as given in the Word of God is the Divine and therefore complete and final expression of that Will. The one admits of change, but the other excludes it.

Still it may be said, is there not room for human error in our apprehension of God's revealed Will, just as there is scope for a similar misapprehension in nature? Yes, there is. But the possibility of error is infinitely less in the former case, because the facts of Scripture are all known, whereas the facts of nature are only beginning to be unravelled.

We may illustrate these remarks by referring to the chapter on "Biogenesis." "All life comes from pre-existent life" is the present law of natural science; and so it is argued that in the spiritual sphere life cannot be self-evolved, but is the gift of God. This is a very beautiful analogy; but it is well known that the hope of certain leaders of scientific thought is, that this law may be set aside, and that nature's "grand progression," from the formless to the formed, from the lifeless to the living, may be realized by powers or forces inherent in nature herself. Now suppose this had taken place, are we prepared to make the corresponding change in the spiritual law, and so accept the principle that spiritual life is self-evolved? Surely not; but for this reason, observe, that we had accepted the truth that life is the gift of God, not upon the basis of a supposed law of nature, but upon the record of His revealed Will in His Word. Again, in accordance with Mr. Herbert Spencer's definition of life, we are told that to be "in correspondence with environment is life," but to be out of cor-

respondence is death, and that a perfect correspondence with a perfect spiritual environment means eternal life. This is very interesting, and some features of the analogy are deeply suggestive; but I scarcely think it throws much light upon the spiritual world. Harmony with environment may be one of the conditions and accompaniments of life, but it certainly does not explain it. It leaves life what it was before, a mystery; and any light to be gleaned on the subject will not be found in the consideration of this or any other law of nature, but in the clear statements of the Word of God.

Degeneration, we must all admit, finds its reproduction in the spiritual world, and the parallel between the two is full of solemn and suggestive thought; but that degeneration is a law of nature does not explain it, much less does it convey all that we mean by it in the spiritual sphere: there may be some active cause yet discovered in nature, beyond the mere negative disuse of function, which will show us why an organism degenerates. Whether this cause be discovered or not, we know that in the moral and spiritual world there is the personal power of the evil one, which is exerted to this end. Here again observe, the knowledge of the fact does not come from nature, but from the Word of God. That growth in nature is "spontaneous" (p. 126) can only be accepted with the reservation that the word must not imply the possession of independent self-evolving power; but when the principle is applied without qualification to the spiritual sphere, it is altogether misleading. To say that here all efforts are useless, is to state something which experience refuses to endorse. Natural growth may be accomplished without trying, but spiritual growth is certainly not to be so attained. All growth, whether it be material or spiritual, is a mystery. That two should become three, and three become four, that the effect should be greater than the cause, cannot be explained upon the principle of mere natural law; but once we admit that God is the Author of life at its commencement, and that God is the continuous Giver as progress is made, then a flood of light is thrown upon the whole; for we have here a cause at once adequate to the production of the results. But where, we again ask, do we get this information? Not from the study of nature, but from the revelation of the Lord.

There is much in this interesting book which is well worthy of patient thought and consideration; but we have said, we trust, sufficient to show that the central principle upon which it rests cannot be accepted without much reserve and very serious qualifications. The conclusion, therefore, seems fairly to follow, that natural laws, when pushed up into the spiritual sphere, are not what they once were when they arrive at their

final destination; nor can we expect, from the application of any such method, that the unseen and the spiritual will be so illuminated that the whole will be reduced to order, theology placed upon a scientific basis, and scepticism almost made a thing of the past.

J. EUSTACE BRENAN.

ART. VI.—ANNE BOLEYN.

Anne Boleyn. A Chapter of English History, 1527-1536. By PAUL FRIEDMANN. Two volumes. Macmillan and Co. 1884.

WE have been agreeably surprised by a study of these volumes. We were prepared for those details of laborious industry which characterize Teutonic research; but we thought that the task Mr. Friedmann had set before him was a work of supererogation. What could our author, we asked, have to tell us which Mr. Brewer[1] and his accomplished co-editors had not already told, which had escaped the inquiries of Mr. Froude, or which even was not to be found in the superficial erudition of Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Two Queens"?

The pages before us give an answer in the affirmative. The field indeed, thanks to State Paper investigations, to transcripts from foreign archives and to examinations of the private manuscripts of our own county gentry, had been well gleaned. But Mr. Friedmann, though the last to go over the familiar ground, has collected material well worthy of being garnered. His work is based upon the correspondence of Eustace Chapuis, the ambassador of Charles V. to England; and it throws some new light upon the period. Let us add that Mr. Friedmann writes with the ease and elegance of the cultured scholar, and that he is as lucid in his arrangement of facts as though he had not hailed from the Fatherland. We are bound to add also, that, in our opinion, he attaches undue weight to the letters of Chapuis (to a large extent partizan gossip), and as to several matters follows the Imperialist ambassador too closely.[2] The great blot of Mr. Friedmann's

[1] See CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 183. The two volumes of Professor Brewer's Prefaces, edited by Mr. Gairdner, are a treasure-trove of information. (The "Reign of Henry VIII.," by Professor Brewer, published by Mr. Murray.) We gladly repeat our recommendation.

[2] To many of our readers, perhaps, it is known that an abstract of the correspondence of Chapuis in regard to Anne Boleyn was given by Mr. Froude in the revised edition of his "History of England" (12 vols. Longman. 1870). In an appendix to vol. ii., entitled "Fresh Evidence

work, however, is his treatment of Cranmer. Of the statements which he makes with regard to the Archbishop, not a few, as it seems to us, rest upon no foundation.

The story of the life of Anne Boleyn, like that of Mary Queen of Scots, never fails to interest us. Her beauty, the vicissitudes of her life, her terrible end, make her the central figure round which much of historical and political activity revolves, and we are repelled whilst we are fascinated. Seldom has dawn been more brilliant, sunset more clouded. Anne was the daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn by his marriage with Lady Elizabeth Howard, a daughter of the Duke of Norfolk. In after years, when about to be raised to the throne, Anne courted the derision of the old aristocracy by pretending, through the aid of the kings-at-arms, that the Boleyns were sprung from a very ancient stock, and that her ancestor was a Norman lord who had settled in England during the twelfth century. As a matter of fact, her great-grandfather, Geffrey Boleyn, was a wealthy London merchant, who from being an alderman and a knight, in due time became Lord Mayor. Sir Geffrey married a daughter of Lord Hoo, and his eldest son married Margaret Butler, one of the daughters of the Earl of Ormond. There was blue blood in Anne Boleyn's veins.

When Mary Tudor went to marry Louis XII. of France, Anne, though quite a child,[1] crossed the Channel, as an attendant upon the future queen. France was now to be her home for several years. Here she grew up, learning French and Italian, and acquiring all those arts and graces by which she was afterwards to shine. In 1521, Sir Thomas Boleyn recalled his daughter. She was now a graceful young woman of some eighteen years, handsome, with fine black eyes and hair, and with the well-shaped hands of which her daughter was so proud. Quick, witty, fond of admiration, and knowing how to please, she soon became a favourite, and, thanks to her connection with the Howards, she obtained a good position at court. The events of her life from 1523 to 1526 are not exactly known. More than one offer was made for her hand; and it was said that she was actually betrothed to Sir Henry

about Anne Boleyn," Mr. Froude tells how he looked for the despatches of Chapuis in Brussels and at Simancas, and looked in vain; but at length he discovered them in the Austrian archives. Mr. Froude remarks that Chapuis was a "bitter Catholic"; and although the correspondence found in Vienna is indeed a rich vein of information, yet in regard to such matters as the independence of the Church of England and the Royal Supremacy, the bias of Chapuis and the other writers should be borne in mind.

[1] Anne was born, probably, in 1502. It was in 1514 that the Princess Mary crossed the Channel.

Percy, eldest son of the Earl of Northumberland. In 1525 her father was created Lord Rochford; and as he held an office which obliged him to be nearly always at court, Anne spent a good part of her time with him in the vicinity of the royal palace. "It is pretty certain," says Mr. Friedmann, "that, in 1526, Henry had fallen under the fascination of the handsome girl." It was known that he was on bad terms with his wife, Catherine of Aragon, and that he ardently wished to have a legitimate son. It was rumoured that the King sought to be divorced, and was about to seek another wife.[1] Vain and ambitious, Anne saw before her the dazzling prize of a crown, which it only required tact and patience on her part to secure. From a brilliant coquette she now became a political personage. Her empire over the King was supreme, and all the more absolute, because she would be satisfied with nothing less than the most honourable conditions. Either Henry must marry her, or must make up his mind to lose her. He hotly vowed he would not lose her; yet to marry her he must first be free from Catherine.

Divorce such as now exists was out of the question in the days of Henry VIII. Marriage was a sacrament in the Roman Church and was held to be indissoluble. Hence, when a wearied husband was desirous of getting rid of his wife without killing her, he had to prove that his marriage had never been good and valid. If he was wealthy and powerful, the court granted his prayer, and there was an end of the matter. "The courts before which such cases were brought," says Mr. Friedmann, "were most corrupt." They were "always ready to please the strongest." Mr. Brewer cites but one example, that of the Duke of Suffolk, who was three times divorced, and twice committed bigamy; who began by marrying his aunt, and ended by marrying his daughter-in-law. Indeed, during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., the repudiation of a wife was a matter of almost daily occurrence.

No allusion to the King's idea of a divorce occurs in the State Papers before 1527. "It is only in the spring of 1527," in fact, "that the divorce is first seriously mentioned." Henry then consulted some of his most trusted counsellors about the legality of his marriage with Catherine. She was, he said, his brother's widow; he had infringed the law laid down in Leviticus, and the curse of heaven had been upon his union by his loss of child after child. The supple and servile Wolsey,

[1] When, in 1514, he had quarrelled with King Ferdinand, his father-in-law, it had been said that he would divorce Catherine, who had then no child living. The political troubles of 1526 were in some respects very similar to those of 1514, and they naturally gave rise to the same reports. Friedmann, vol. i., p. 47.

seeing in what direction the royal wishes lay, gave it as his opinion that the scruples entertained by Henry were well founded. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Warham, concurred. Then it was asked of the Bishops whether a man might marry his late brother's wife? The Bench did not prove so subservient as had been anticipated; the answer returned was that such a marriage, with Papal dispensation, would be perfectly valid. In face of this reply the two Archbishops were unable to decide in Henry's favour; and even had they done so, Catherine would still have the right of appeal from their judgment to that of the Pope. And now ensued pleadings and cross-pleadings, intrigue upon intrigue, and incessant recriminations. We have no intention of telling a thrice-told tale as to the details of the divorce. Suffice it to say that after nearly seven years' delay Henry vowed he would marry Anne in spite of the Pope, and proceeded to put his threat in execution. Late in the January of 1533[1] (according to Mr. Friedmann, following Chapuis), he secretly married Anne in presence of a few of his most confidential attendants; the ceremony was performed, it was said, by an Augustinian friar. Thus Henry took the law in his own hands, and, though his marriage with Catherine had not been officially annulled, linked himself to Anne Boleyn. The consequence of this marriage was the rupture with Rome.

The sentence of excommunication fell lightly upon the heart of Henry.[2] If the Pope proved himself vindictive, the King, now guided by Cromwell, knew that he could retaliate, and the result of the struggle would not end in a victory for the Vatican. In June, 1533, he appealed from the Pope to the next general free council. In the same month Anne was crowned. On Sunday, the 7th of September, Anne's child was born; it was a girl. Intense was the King's irritation at what he considered "a mischance and a humiliation" (p. 230). Had a prince been born, the opposition to the marriage would have been overcome, for many an Englishman would have abandoned the cause of Mary for that of a Prince of Wales; but the choice lay between two girls, and the nation preferred Mary.

The position of Henry was embarrassing. On the Continent he had angered Charles and yet had not propitiated Francis; the Pope refused to cancel his decree of excommunication; at home the people were by no means contented. Chapuis, who called Anne "the wet-nurse of heresy," carried on his intrigues against her with even greater zeal. From this date may be

[1] The date of his marriage, says Professor Brewer, is a mystery.

[2] According to Mr. Friedmann, Henry lacked courage. It is true, of course, that he was apt to rely on some favoured counsellor; but our author, we think, makes too much of it.

traced the coolness on the King's part which was subsequently so apparent. As yet, however, though latent, it was not visible to the outside world. As time went on, matters grew worse.

At the close of the year 1534, there was no secret as to the estrangement of the King.[1] The Queen's position became indeed most unhappy. No atmosphere is so sensitive as that of a court. Anne Boleyn had never been a favourite; her rise was considered as an insult to the old nobility, who never forgave her. She was haughty and arrogant; she had offended the greatest power on the Continent, for Charles was naturally most indignant at the treatment his aunt had received, and she had consequently been the cause of much loss of trade with Flanders, our merchants fearing retaliatory measures from the Emperor. The courtiers took their cue from the monarch, and proved how empty and insincere is human homage. Her circle of acquaintance became narrower every day; foreign ambassadors snubbed her; the most open court was paid to the Princess Mary as the real heiress of the old line, and the little Elizabeth was crushingly ignored.

Early in 1535, the French ambassadors reported the unpopularity of the Queen. The common people, they wrote, were extremely angry against Anne, abusing her in no measured terms for the danger and distress into which she had brought the country. The upper classes were nearly all equally bitter; some on account of the changes in religion, others for fear of war and of ruin to trade; others, and by far the greater number, from loyalty to Catherine and Mary.[2] Englishmen had no wish to see Elizabeth on the throne with Anne Boleyn and Lord Rochford as her guardians and as regents during a long minority. (Vol. ii., p. 127.)

The King fondly believed that the hatred of his subjects was mainly directed against Anne, and that if she were not in his way, he might still triumph over his enemies. Why should he not put her away? He had discarded Catherine,

---

[1] With the usual coarse bluntness which characterized him, Henry made no secret of the change in his affections. He neglected his wife, and paid openly the most marked attention to a young and very handsome lady at court. Who she was Mr. Friedmann has not been able to discover, as neither Chapuis nor the French ambassador mentions her name in the despatches which have been preserved. The only thing certain is that she was *not* Jane Seymour.

[2] The acquittal of Lord Dacres by the Peers (May, 1534) excited much attention. An acquittal in cases in which the Crown prosecuted for high treason was very rare. In September, 1534, according to the Imperial ambassador, a conspiracy against the King was formed, and the Emperor's assistance invoked by disaffected English nobles. It was proposed to marry James V. of Scotland to his cousin, the Princess Mary.

why should he not discard Anne? The idea once suggested was all the more attractive, from the fact that Anne, worn out by anxiety and disappointment, had now lost her good looks. The volatile and heartless monarch laid the case before "some of his most trusted counsellors" (vol. ii., p. 55), and asked their opinion. If Anne was discarded, they replied, Catherine must be taken back, and Mary must be acknowledged as his heir and successor: there was no alternative.

In February, 1535, says Mr. Friedmann, "the English opponents of Henry's policy" were in high spirits. At a great dinner-party, the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, Sir W. Weston, Prior of St. John, Lord Abergavenny, "and other influential adherents of the Papacy, were present. Palamede Gontier [the French envoy] told them of the *auto da fé* at Paris lately, when Francis himself with his sons had marched in the procession, and had watched the torturing and burning of a good number of Protestants. The English lords were delighted to hear of this, and praised Francis for what he had done. There could be no doubt, Gontier wrote to Chabot, as to what they themselves would like to do in England." There was no doubt, indeed, as to the sympathies of these English nobles. If it be true, as the Imperial ambassador wrote, that they even appealed to the Emperor to "conquer" England, and "offered to unfurl his standard" in their native land, one desire that moved them and so warped their patriotism, was to have the power of "burning" Protestants.

On December 3rd, 1535, Chapuis, calling upon Cromwell, was told of the dangerous illness of Catherine; a messenger had just reported it to the King. When the ambassador was leaving Cromwell's house, however, a letter from de Lasco, Catherine's physician, was handed to him, with reassuring intelligence. On the first day of January he paid a visit to Kimbolton; and when he left, Catherine seemed in better spirits. On the 7th the unhappy Queen died.[1]

When the news was brought to Henry, "he took little care to hide his pleasure." He praised God Who had delivered them from all fear of war; there was no need now for the Emperor to meddle with English concerns; the cause of dissension had been removed; all would be well in the future.[2]

---

[1] The morning he left Kimbolton, Chapuis had some serious talk with de Lasco. Had the doctor any suspicion of poison? De Lasco shook his head, and said he feared something of the kind; for after the Queen had drunk of a certain Welsh beer, she had never been well. "It must be," he added, "some slow and cleverly composed drug, for I do not perceive the symptoms of ordinary poison." He thought she might get over it.

[2] Vol. ii., p. 165. Chapuis to Charles V.

"The only pity is," cried Lords Wiltshire and Rochford, "that the Lady Mary is not keeping her mother company."[1]

And now rumours began to spread. Was Catherine poisoned, or did she die from natural causes? Suspicion, if we are to credit Chapuis, points to foul play. But Chapuis, we know, had for a long time been afraid that the Princess Mary would be poisoned. Even if it be admitted that he reported precisely what he heard, not a tittle of evidence to support the accusation can be found. And after the letters which appeared in the *Athenæum* a week or two ago, there remains little doubt, we think, that Catherine died of heart disease.[2]

Mr. Friedmann's arguments in support of Chapuis appear to us inconsistent. In the beginning of November, he says, the King manifested an intention to have a Bill of Attainder brought in at the next Session of Parliament (p. 170). The King spoke very violently about it; and "those who knew his obstinacy seem to have been of opinion that he would carry out his purpose." Chapuis was afraid that a Bill would be forced through Parliament (p. 149). Thus, according to our author, Henry's mind was made up: Catherine's death was to be brought about by an Act of Attainder.

Mr. Friedmann proceeds to point out, however, that the "obstinacy" of the King would have brought on a rebellion. "It is quite certain," he asserts, "that the introduction of a Bill of Attainder would have been the signal for instant revolt. In such circumstances even Chapuis would have favoured an insurrection; and the conspirators, driven to extremity, would have acted unanimously and enthusiastically." "As the King had hardly any real adherents," adds our author, "and as he could not rely on the few troops he possessed, the conspirators

---

[1] Next day the King appeared in the gayest of dresses—all in yellow, with a white feather in his cap. Little Elizabeth, who was at court, was on that day taken to mass with extraordinary pomp, trumpets blowing before her, and numerous servants following. In the afternoon a ball was given at court, at which the King was present. He was in the highest of spirits, and by-and-by sent for Elizabeth, whom he carried round the room in his arms, showing her to the courtiers. Balls and jousts succeeded one another, and the court rang with gaiety. (P. 165.)

[2] In the strictest confidence the embalmer (the chandler of the house) told the Bishop of Llandaff, "who was required by the customs of the Church to remain with the body," that on opening the corpse he found all the internal organs perfectly healthy save "the heart, which was quite black and hideous to look at." All this the chandler, writes our author, asked the Bishop to keep strictly secret, for his life would be in danger if it became known that he had spoken. Dr. de Lasco, a Spanish subject, says Mr. Friedmann, was somewhat biassed. Atequa, the Bishop of Llandaff, was also a Spaniard. Chapuis thought Anne Boleyn, as well as the King, was guilty.

could scarcely have failed to triumph even without assistance from the Low Countries."

Of a proposal which was likely to lead to such a result as this, Mr. Friedmann tells us, Henry's councillors could not approve. If there was to be civil war, the more obnoxious of them would fall as victims to the popular fury, and the rest might have to disgorge their ill-acquired wealth. Henry's threats, Mr. Friedmann is certain, "must have filled them with alarm." When the royal councillors heard his angry vow (in November), when they became aware that he really meant to bring in the Bill, when they weighed the consequences, "they must have come to the conclusion that it would be necessary to use every means in their power to avert the catastrophe. And there was but one way in which Henry could be prevented from doing what he proposed. Catherine, at least, must be dead before the assembling of Parliament" (p. 173). The conclusion of this argument of assertions, strange to say, is *not* that the councillors poisoned Catherine, believing that the King would be obstinate about a Bill of Attainder, but that Chapuis had grounds for charging the murder on the King himself.

The last chapter in the history of Queen Anne was (Jan. 1536) now to be written. The King had fallen under the fascination of a new "favourite;" he was anxious to raise Jane Seymour to the throne. He spoke of his marriage with Anne as invalid; why should he not, he asked, be divorced again? But Cromwell was opposed to any agitation for a divorce; he thought that it was neither in his own interest nor in that of Henry. To have applied for a divorce would have been to "proclaim to the world that the King, on entering the holy bonds of matrimony, was careless whether there were impediments or not; it would have been to raise a very strong suspicion that the scruples of conscience he had pleaded the first time were courtly enough to re-appear whenever he wanted to be rid of a wife" (p. 240). And as for the secretary himself, Anne, if divorced, would remain Marchioness of Pembroke, with devoted friends; they would be hostile. Some other means, therefore, reasoned Cromwell, must be adopted for the discarding of the Queen. Anne was vain, a coquette; insatiable, like most such women whose beauty was on the wane, of flattery; she should be watched, and her conduct would soon afford Henry the opportunity desired. Thus Cromwell, as he afterwards told Chapuis, began to plot for the ruin of Anne.[1]

[1] "Difficulties and dangers," writes Mr. Friedmann, "were to be invented, that Cromwell might save the King from them. Anne was to be found guilty of such heinous offences that she would have no opportunity of avenging her wrongs. Her friends were to be involved in her fall, and

The plot once invented, the details were swiftly carried out. It was not difficult in a dissolute court to collect evidence sufficient for its purpose against a woman of somewhat coarse tastes, who, fond of admiration, was under the impression that all of the sterner sex who crossed her path were fascinated by her charms.

On April 24th, 1536, a commission, kept strictly secret, was signed by the King. Peers, judges, and high officials were empowered to make inquiry as to every kind of treason, by whomsoever committed, and to hold a special session to try the offenders. That this was "virtually a death-warrant for Anne," says our author, "Henry must have known or at least suspected; but his conscience remained quiet: the deed would be done by others." A case was made out. Sufficient "evidence" for the purpose of Cromwell was secured. On May 2nd Anne was charged with the most abominable misconduct, and arrested, and taken to the Tower.[1] Into the unsavoury details of the trial that ensued we decline to enter, and shall content ourselves with briefly alluding to the result.

On the 15th of May, in the Tower hall, the Court assembled. To the terrible charges, Anne gave an indignant denial, and she spoke so well that before an impartial tribunal, says our author, she could scarcely have been convicted. But her efforts were of no avail. She was adjudged guilty. The Duke of Norfolk thereupon gave sentence that Anne, Queen of England, was to be burnt or beheaded at the King's pleasure. The prisoner heard the sentence without blenching, and having obtained leave to say a few words, she declared that she did not fear to die. The thing which grieved her most, she said, was that the gentlemen included in the indictments, who were absolutely innocent, should suffer on her account; and all she asked was to be allowed a short time to prepare for death. She was then led back to her apartment.

The date of her execution was fixed—May 18th. From two o'clock that morning she remained in prayer with her almoner. At the celebration of the Communion, both before and after receiving the host, she declared on the salvation of her soul that she had never been unfaithful to the King. Not till the

---

the event was to be associated with horrors that would strike the imagination of the King, and withdraw the attention of the public from the intrigue at the bottom of the scheme. Calamity was to be brought upon her, too, in a way that would satisfy the hatred with which she was regarded by the nation, and take the ground away under the feet of the conspirators" (p. 242).

[1] As to the King's behaviour just then, Mr. Friedmann writes: "He could not hide his joy that means had been found to rid him of Anne and to enable him to take a new wife. Never had the Court been so gay . . . . Henry's raptures provoked general disgust."

following day, however, was the execution to take place.[1] She complained to the constable of the delay; she had hoped, she said, to be past her pain. During the night a platform had been erected on the Green. It rose but a few feet from the ground, for it had been deemed inexpedient to build up a high scaffold, which could be visible from afar. In the courtyard were some leading members of the Privy Council and the Lord Mayor with the Corporation; standing behind them was the crowd. Anne wore a dressing-gown of grey damask, which she had chosen because it was low round the neck, and so would not hinder the executioner's work; for the same reason she had tied up her hair in a net over which she wore her usual head-dress. On ascending the platform she stood before the block, and permission was now given her to address the crowd; this she did very simply, and in a few words. She had not come, she said, to preach, but to die. She desired those present to pray for the King, who was a right gentle prince, and had treated her as well as possible. She accused nobody on account of her death, for she had been sentenced according to the law of the country. So she was ready to die, and now asked the forgiveness of all whom she had wronged. She asked the bystanders to pray for her. Then she knelt down, took off her head-dress, and one of her attendants bound a handkerchief round her eyes. After this her ladies also knelt down, silently praying, while she repeated the words, "O God, have pity on my soul!" The executioner now stepped quickly forward and took his aim; the heavy two-handled blade whistled through the air, and Anne's head rolled in the dust. The remains were taken up by the ladies, wrapped in a sheet, laid in a plain coffin, and carried to the Tower Chapel. There they were buried with scant ceremony; no inscription, except a few letters, was put upon the grave, and the exact spot of Anne Boleyn's last resting-place was soon forgotten. It was discovered only a few years ago.

Such was the end of a strange and eventful career. "For a moment," says our author, "it seemed as if Anne would leave no trace in history; but the schism of which she had been the first cause, and to which in one form or another the ruling powers were already deeply committed, could not be undone. Her influence survived, too, in the little girl at Hunsdon, who grew up to be very like her. From Anne the English people received one of the greatest of their rulers."

[1] The hangman of Calais, the only subject of Henry who knew how to behead with a sword, had been sent for, as Anne, faithful to her French education, considered it more honourable to die in that way than to be burnt. The executioner may have been late. The delay was probably due to a different cause. All foreigners were excluded from the Tower.

The Anne Boleyn of Mr. Friedmann does not differ materially from the Anne Boleyn of Mr. Froude. Mr. Friedmann terms her "incredibly vain, ambitious, unscrupulous, coarse, fierce, and relentless." Of the charges brought against her, however, he considers her innocent, though indirectly he accuses her.[1]

If it be admitted that the "gospel light" was not, as sung by Gray, reflected from her eyes, Protestantism can well dispense with such a supporter. The more the history of the Reformation period is investigated, the clearer stands out the fact that leaders in court and ecclesiastical councils, as a rule, cared little for political and religious freedom, and much for personal greed and ambition. Thoughtful and devout observers on the Continent and in England were disgusted at the enormities of the religious orders, the selfish arrogance of the Vatican, the degrading puerilities which a vicious superstition had engendered. The Church of Rome had long possessed the field, and the moral state of the court of that "Defender of the Faith," Henry VIII., or of the court of that most Christian King, Francis I., may well be considered when judgment is being formed of the character and career of Anne Boleyn.

Reviews.

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., Oxon., D.D., Ph.D. Two vols. Second edition. Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884.

A REVIEW of the second edition of a work, as a rule, is a sort of summary, giving opinion in short compass, without entering into details of criticism. But to every rule there are exceptions. The work now before us is one of no ordinary character. It is a "Life of Christ," and it has its own peculiar features, as "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah." It is a work which displays remarkable ability and acuteness, independent thought as well as laborious research, while its language is lucid, stately, and impressive. Its descriptions of social and religious life in "the times" of the Messiah are often as pictorial as they are precisely accurate. A veritable treasure-house of Jewish learning —its value as a *present-day* work can scarcely be overrated. For ourselves, it was a matter of regret that a work of such a character was not, owing to circumstances, reviewed in these pages soon after it appeared. The

[1] "Whilst I am strongly of opinion," he writes, "that the indictments were drawn up at random, and that there was no trustworthy evidence to sustain the specific charges, I am by no means convinced that Anne did not commit offences quite as grave as most of those of which she was accused. She may have been guilty of crimes which it did not suit the convenience of the Government to divulge."

reception of a second edition, however—the volumes before us—afforded an opportunity of which we gladly availed ourselves; and the present notice of Dr. Edersheim's work will serve, we trust, to show our high appreciation of its aims and excellences, and also to lead those of our readers who as yet are acquainted with it only through reviews to procure it, and study it, for themselves. Among the many inspiriting tokens which are so welcome in days of doubts, and difficulties, and divisions, the appearance of such a "Life of Christ" as this, sound and strong, is worthy of note. The first edition was published towards the close of the year 1883: and a second edition quickly appeared. The third edition will we hope soon follow.

According to the Preface, this book was first and foremost to be a study of the Life of Jesus the Messiah. But secondly, since Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew, spoke to, and moved among Jews, in Palestine, it was necessary to "view that Life and Teaching in all its surroundings of place, society, popular life, and intellectual or religious development." Such a full portraiture of Jewish life, society, and thinking, furnishes alike a vindication and an illustration of the Gospel narratives. And in truth, continues Dr. Edersheim, "we know not only the leading personages in Church " and State in Palestine at that time, their views, teaching, pursuits, and " aims; the state of parties; the character of popular opinion; the " proverbs, the customs, the daily life of the country—but we can " in imagination enter their dwellings, associate with them in familiar " intercourse, or follow them to the Temple, the Synagogue, the Aca- " demy, or to the market-place and the workshop. We know what " clothes they wore, what dishes they ate, what wines they drank, what " they produced, and what they imported; nay, the cost of every article " of their dress or food, the price of houses and living; in short, every " detail that can give vividness to a picture of life." All this is indeed important for the understanding of the Gospel history, and justifies the fulness of archæological detail in Dr. Edersheim's book.

From the deeply interesting passages in which is described the metropolis of Judaism, with two worlds, heathenism and Judaism, existing side by side, we take the following graphic sketch:

> When the silver trumpets of the priests woke the city to prayer, or the strain of Levite music swept over it, or the smoke of the sacrifices hung like another Shechinah over the Temple, against the green background of Olivet; or when in every street, court, and housetop rose the booths at the Feast of Tabernacles, and at night the sheen of the Temple-illumination threw long fantastic shadows over the city; or when at the Passover, tens of thousands crowded up the Mount with their Paschal Lambs, and hundreds of thousands sat down to the Paschal Supper—it would be almost difficult to believe that heathenism was so near, that the Roman was virtually, and would soon be really, master of the land, or that a Herod occupied the Jewish throne. Yet there he was, in the pride of his power, and the reckless cruelty of his ever-watchful tyranny. . . . The theatre and the amphitheatre spoke of his Grecianism; Antonia was the representative fortress. (P. 119.)

And so, adds Dr. Edersheim (p. 129), in Jerusalem there were two worlds, side by side. "On the one hand, was Grecianism with its theatre and amphitheatre; foreigners filling the Court, and crowding the city; foreign tendencies and ways, from the foreign king downwards. On the other hand was the old Jewish world, becoming set and ossified in the schools of Hillel and Shammai, and overshadowed by Temple and Synagogue. And each was pursuing its course by the side of the other." If Greek was the language of the Court and camp, the language of the people (spoken also by Christ and His Apostles) was a dialect of the ancient Hebrew.

The chapter in which Dr. Edersheim deals with the greatest of uninspired Jewish writers of old, Philo of Alexandria, will have an especial

interest for some of his readers. Recent assaults upon the fourth Gospel contain strange statements in regard to the Logos of Philo and the Logos of St. John; and certain critics who have not advanced so far as M. Renan have evidently failed to perceive the significance of the inspired writer's statement, *The Logos was made flesh*, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. This is, indeed, the foundation-truth of the Johannine Gospel; and herein, as we have always maintained, is the starting-point of true comparison between the Logos of the Alexandrian seeker-after-truth and the Logos of the writers to whom truth was revealed by the Holy Ghost. As Dr. Edersheim remarks, in the fourth Gospel "God is not afar off, unrecognisable by man, without properties, without name. He is the Father. Instead of a nebulous reflection of the Deity we have the Person of the Logos . . . St. John strikes the pen through Alexandrianism when he lays it down as a fundamental fact of New Testament history that 'the Logos was made flesh,' just as St. Paul does when he proclaims the great mystery of 'God manifest in the flesh.'"[1] Further. "It is not by a long course of study, nor by wearing discipline, least of all by an inborn good disposition, that the soul attains the new life, but by a birth from above, by the Holy Ghost, and by simple faith which is brought within reach of the fallen and the lost." The value of the chapter from which we thus quote is increased, as regards critical students, by an Appendix on Philo and Rabbinic Theology. And here we may remark, that at the end of vol. ii. are several Appendices which scholarly readers will thoroughly appreciate.

"Birth *from above*," it will have been noticed, is Dr. Edersheim's expression; and his exegesis of γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν (vol. i., p. 382) differs from Professor Westcott's. "Born *from above*," he says, and not "born *again*," or "*anew*," is the right rendering. His note runs thus: "The word ἄνωθεν has always the meaning *above* in the fourth Gospel (ch. iii. 3, 7, 31; xix. 11, 23); and otherwise also St. John always speaks of 'a birth' from God" (St. John i. 13; 1 John ii. 29; iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18). The Revised Version, following Dr. Westcott ("The Speaker's Commentary"), has "born *anew*," but in the margin appears "*from above*."

The passage in which occurs the *Magnificat* is very suggestive. Dr. Edersheim points to the word χάρις, "grace," "favour," "spiritual blessing," as the key-note of the song. The narrative, as he says, is entirely one of "grace," "favour." Mary was "highly favoured," κεχαριτωμένη; she *received* grace[2] ("was *endued with* grace," R.V. *marg.*). Bengel's saying, "Non ut mater gratiæ, sed ut filia gratiæ," is quoted; and Dr. Edersheim well observes that Jeremy Taylor's remarks ("Life of Christ") in this matter, would "require modification."

Dr. Edersheim has "unhesitatingly retained" the reading of the *textus receptus* in Luke ii. 14. From his narrative we quote a few sentences:

> Glory to God in the highest—
> And upon earth peace—
> Among men good pleasure!

Only once before had the words of Angels' hymn fallen upon mortal's ears, when, to Isaiah's rapt vision, Heaven's high Temple had opened, and the glory of Jehovah swept its courts, almost breaking down the trembling posts that bore its boundary gates. Now the same glory enrapt the shepherds on Bethlehem's plains.

---

[1] Dr. Edersheim's remarks on the Alexandrian views, as compared with the argumentation of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are admirable. There is, indeed, a similarity of form, he says, but "the widest possible divergence in substance and spirit."

[2] The verb only occurs elsewhere in the New Testament in Ephesians i. 6 (R. V.): "to the praise of the glory of His grace, *which He freely bestowed* on us in the Beloved."

Then the Angels' hymn had heralded the announcement of the Kingdom coming; now that of the King come.

From a striking passage on the visit of the Magi, we quote the following:

It appears that the temporary shelter of the "stable" had been exchanged by the Holy Family for the more permanent abode of a "house;" and there the Magi found the Infant-Saviour with His Mother. With exquisite tact and reverence the narrative attempts not the faintest description of the scene. It is as if the sacred writer had fully entered into the spirit of St. Paul: "Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more." And thus it should ever be. It is the fact of the manifestation of Christ—not its outward surroundings, however precious or touching they might be in connection with any ordinary earthly being—to which our gaze must be directed. The externals may, indeed, attract our sensuous nature; but they detract from the unmatched glory of the great supersensuous Reality.

Dr. Edersheim does well in adding a remark that "in this seems to lie the strongest condemnation of Romish and Romanising tendencies, that they ever seek to present—or, perhaps, rather obtrude—the external circumstances. It is not thus that the Gospel most fully presents to us the spiritual, nor yet thus that the deepest and holiest impressions are made."

The chapters in which John the Baptist is brought before us are impressive and informing, with many touches of expository power. The whole teaching of the Baptist, it is well said, was saturated with Isaiah-language and thoughts. Now, one picture was most brightly reflected on those pages of Isaiah which had formed the Baptist's religious training, and were the preparation for his work; it was "that of the Anointed, Messiah, Christ, the Representative Israelite, the Priest, King, and Prophet, in whom the institution and sacramental meaning of the Priesthood, and of Sacrifices, found their fulfilment." In his announcement of the Kingdom, then, that great Personality always stood out before John's mind; it was the Isaiah-picture of "the King in His beauty," the vision of "the land of far distances."[1]

Dr. Edersheim's observations upon Isaiah liii. (in connection with the Paschal Lamb) possess a peculiar interest. That prophecy, he says,

must always have been Messianically understood; it formed the groundwork of Messianic thought to the New Testament writers. Nor did the Synagogue read it otherwise, till the necessities of controversy diverted its application, not indeed from the *times*, but from the Person of the Messiah. But we can understand how, during those forty days, that greatest height of Isaiah's conception of the Messiah was the one outstanding fact before his [John's] view. And what he believed, that he spake, when again, and unexpectedly, he saw Jesus.

His eye had been fixed upon the Coming One; we mark (John i. 22-28) increased intensity and directness in testimony; he says—after forty days' meditation and prayer (v. 29)—the Coming One has come: "*Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.*"

One of the best chapters in the book is that in which Dr. Edersheim deals with the Temptation. Several passages in it are interesting and eloquent. No reader surely will fail to admire the beauty of the description on page 303: "Jesus stands on the lofty pinnacle of the Tower, or "of the Temple-porch, presumably that on which every day a priest was "stationed to watch as pale morning light passed over the hills of Judea "far off to Hebron, to announce it as the signal for offering the morning "sacrifice. If we might indulge our imagination, it would be just as the "priest had quitted that station. The first desert-temptation had been "in the grey of breaking light, when to the faint and weary looker the "stones of the wilderness seemed to take fantastic shapes, like the bread

[1] Dr. Edersheim, as one would expect, cannot agree with Mr. Cheyne ("Prophecies of Isaiah," vol. i., p. 183) that there is no Messianic reference here.

"for which the faint body hungered. In the next temptation Jesus stands "on the watch-post which the white-robed priest had just quitted. Fast "the rosy morning-light, deepening into crimson, and edged with gold, is "spreading over the land. In the Priests' Court below Him the morning-"sacrifice has been offered. The massive Temple-gates are slowly open-"ing, and the blast of the priests' silver trumpets is summoning Israel to "begin a new day by appearing before their Lord. Now then let Him "descend, Heaven-borne, into the midst of priests and people. What "shouts of acclamation would greet His appearance! What homage of "worship would be His! The goal can at once be reached, and that at "the head of believing Israel. Unseen by those below, Jesus surveys "the scene. By His side is the Tempter, watching the features that "mark the working of the spirit within. And now he has whispered it. "Jesus had overcome in the first temptation by simple, absolute trust. "This was the time, and this the place to act upon this trust, even as the "very Scriptures to which Jesus had appealed warranted. But so to "have done would have been not trust—far less the heroism of faith—"but *presumption*. The goal might indeed have been reached; but not "the Divine goal, nor in God's way—and, as so often, Scripture itself "explained and guarded the Divine promise by a preceding Divine "command."

The exposition of the Sermon on the Mount is not only very able and instructive, but it has a peculiar value in relation to the Talmud. In dealing with the Lord's Prayer, for example, Dr. Edersheim admits that there are somewhat similar expressions in Hebrew literature; but he adds, of course, that "all recorded Talmudic prayers are of much later date than the time of Jesus." And what a contrast, he argues, between the teaching of the Messiah and that of the Talmud! "Who that has read half-a-dozen pages successively of any part of the Talmud, can feel otherwise than by turns shocked, pained, amused, or astounded? There is here wit and logic, quickness and readiness, earnestness and zeal, but by the side of it terrible profanity, uncleanness, superstition, and folly. Taken as a whole, it is not only utterly unspiritual, but anti-spiritual." Of the Talmud—as of Buddhist writings, which, just now, it is fashionable in a certain circle to patronize—an honest critic should mark the tone, and examine, not picked-out portions merely, but the whole. The Talmud, says our author, is anti-spiritual:

> Not that the Talmud [he adds] is worse than might be expected of such writings in such times and circumstances, perhaps in many respects much better—always bearing in mind the particular standpoint of narrow nationalism, without which Talmudism itself could not have existed, and which therefore is not an accretion, but an essential part of it. But, taken not in abrupt sentences and quotations, but as a whole, it is so utterly and immeasurably unlike the New Testament, that it is not easy to determine which, as the case may be, is greater, the ignorance or the presumption of those who put them side by side. Even where spiritual life pulsates, it seems propelled through valves that are diseased, and to send the life-blood gurgling back upon the heart, or along ossified arteries that quiver not with life at its touch. And to the reader of such disjointed Rabbinic quotations there is this further source of misunderstanding, that the *form* and *sound of words* is so often the same as that of the sayings of Jesus, however different their spirit. For, necessarily, the wine—be it new or old—made in Judæa, comes to us in Palestinian vessels. The new teaching, to be historically true, must have employed the old forms and spoken the old language. But the ideas underlying terms equally employed by Jesus and the teachers of Israel are, in everything that concerns the relation of souls to God, so absolutely different as not to bear comparison. (P. 525.)

Here and there, in every portion of the work, occurs a comment in which is explained some Greek or Hebrew word of interest. The Biblical student will thoroughly appreciate these exegetical remarks, which, as we have

said, are happily frequent. Two or three instances may be given. Thus, upon Luke xii. 29, instead of "neither be ye *of doubtful mind*" we find "neither *be ye uplifted*" (in the sense of not aiming or seeking after great things). This rendering of *μετεωρίζειν*, says Dr. Edersheim, is in accordance with its uniform use in the LXX., and in the Apocrypha. In Josephus and Philo, no doubt, the sense is "doubtful mind;" but the "context here shows that the term refers to the disciples coveting great things." Again, the invitation of the Pharisee, Luke xi. 37, was to the "morning meal" (which took place early, immediately after the return from morning-prayers in the Synagogue)—not to "dinner." Although in *later* Greek the word *ἄριστον* was used for *prandium*, yet its original meaning as "breakfast" seems fixed by Luke xiv. 12, *ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον*. So, in Matt. xxii. 4, Dr. Edersheim renders "early meal," *not* "dinner," as in the A. V. and the R. V. The King had made ready his "early meal" (*ἄριστον*), the servants were bidden to say, and that, no doubt with a view to the later meal, "the oxen and fatlings were killed." The invitation was given and repeated. Again, in Matt. xxiv. 40, "one shall be *taken*" (*παραλαμβάνεται*), the idea, we are reminded, is "*received*," *taken up* (by the angels; v. 31). It is the same word as in John xiv. 3: "I will receive you unto Myself."

The portion of the second volume in which the events of the last week of the Life are set forth has been written, we think, with special care, and it certainly shows remarkable power. Many a scene is an impressive study, full of pathos.

Here is a graphic sketch:

> As, at about half-past one of our time, the two Apostles ascended the Temple-Mount, following a dense, motley crowd of joyous, chatting pilgrims, they must have felt terribly lonely among them. . . . In all that crowd how few to sympathize with them; how many enemies. . . . The worshippers were admitted within the court of the priests in three divisions. We can scarcely be mistaken in supposing that Peter and John would be in the first of the three companies. . . . for they must have been anxious to be gone, and to meet the Master and their brethren in that "Upper Room." . . . . . The sacrifice was laid on staves which rested on the shoulders of Peter and John . . . . It was probably as the sun was beginning to decline that Jesus and the other ten disciples descended once more over the Mount of Olives into the Holy City.

Dr. Edersheim thinks that the house in which our Lord held the Passover belonged to Mark's father (then still alive); a large house, as we gather from Acts xii. 13. The soldiers went to seek Jesus in the Upper Chamber of Mark's house; Mark, roused from sleep, cast about him a "linen cloth" (Mark xiv. 15).

The description of Christ before the Sanhedrists, strikes us as vivid, and every detail is suggestive. The High Priest adjured Him by the Living God, and no doubt or hesitation could here exist. Solemn, emphatic, calm, majestic, as before had been His silence, was now His speech. And His assertion of what He was, was conjoined with that of what "God would show Him to be, in His Resurrection, and sitting at "the right hand of the Father, and of what they also would see, when "He would come in those clouds of heaven that would break over their "city and polity in the final storm of judgment. They all heard it—and, "as the Law directed when blasphemy was spoken, the High Priest rent "both his outer and inner garment, with a rent that might never be re-"paired. But the object was attained. Christ would neither explain, "modify, nor retract His claims. They had all heard it; what use was "there of witnesses?—He had spoken Giddupha (blaspheming). Then, "turning to those assembled, he put to them the usual question which "preceded the formal sentence of death. As given in the Rabbinic "original, it is: 'What think ye, gentlemen?' And they answered, if

"for life, 'For life!' and if for death, 'For death.' But the formal "sentence of death, which, if it had been a regular meeting of the "Sanhedrin, must now have been spoken by the President, was not pro-"nounced."

Honest students of the Gospel narrative will ask (it is their duty to ask), what they ought to think of Him who thus "asserted" Himself before the Sanhedrists; and Dr. Edersheim appeals to such in a very striking passage. "On that night of terror," he writes, "when all the "enmity of man and the power of hell were unclaimed, even the false-"hood of malevolence could not lay any crime to His charge, nor yet any "accusation be brought against Him other than the misrepresentation of "His symbolic Words. What testimony to Him this solitary false and "ill-according witness! Again: 'They all condemned Him to be worthy "of death.' Judaism itself dare not now re-echo this sentence of their "Sanhedrists. And yet is it not after all true—that He was either the "Christ, the Son of God, or a blasphemer? This Man, alone so calm "and majestic among those impassioned false judges and false witnesses; "majestic in His silence, majestic in His speech; unmoved by threats to "speak, undaunted by threats when He spoke; Who saw it all—the end "from the beginning; the Judge among His judges, the Witness before "His witnesses: which was He—the Christ or a blaspheming impostor? "Let history decide; let the hearts and conscience of mankind give "answer. If he had been what Israel said, He deserved the death of "the Cross; if He is what the Christmas-bells of the Church, and the "chimes of the Resurrection-morning ring out, then do we rightly "worship Him as the Son of the Living God, the Christ, the Saviour of "men" (Vol. ii., p. 561).

To several other passages which had especially attracted us, we should gladly call attention; but our limits are already overpassed.

In concluding our notice of these volumes we may repeat our hearty recommendation. We do not agree with every doctrinal exposition given therein, nor do we regard the work as free from faults. Several sentences, we think, might well have been pruned; and now and then the swing of the narrative is checked by critical details which would form an excellent foot-note. But viewing the work as a whole, we are delighted with it; and we tender sincere thanks to the learned author for so readable, so rich, so deeply reverent a book. As an expository and critical commentary upon the narrative of the Evangelists, its rank is of the highest. And although a certain portion of the work will be studied only by clerical or "theological" readers, yet, after all, there is very little which cultured lay readers will not peruse with interest. To the younger clergy we would venture to suggest that if, just now, they feel any doubt as to an addition to their library—"what new books shall I buy?"—they should secure this book (worth of the ordinary . . . how many?) and *stick to it*.

John Wiclif: his Life, Times, and Teaching. By the Rev. ARTHUR ROBERT PENNINGTON, M.A., Canon Non-Residentiary of Lincoln; Rector of Utterby, Lincolnshire; Author of "The Life of Erasmus," "Epochs of the Papacy," etc. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Of the numerous literary productions which the Wyclif Quincentenary celebration called forth, the most valuable, and likely to be the most enduring, is the life of the great Reformer by Canon Pennington, which has already, more than once, been brought under the notice of readers of THE CHURCHMAN, but not formally reviewed.

It is by no means an easy task to write in about 300 pages, 12mo., a work at once popular and exhaustive on a subject having so many ramifi-

cations as the career of Wyclif. The theological development of Wyclif —on which the later and greater Reforming movement depended—was to a great extent the outcome of his political circumstances; and English politics at that time were more dependent on continental politics than during the three subsequent centuries. A proper treatment of the subject, therefore, involves a knowledge of the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. Canon Pennington comes to the subject equipped by laborious researches, the results of which have been embodied in his "Epochs of the Papacy;" and he had already traced the development of the doctrines of the Morning Star of the Reformation in that work and the "Life of Erasmus."

The coldly impartial lifting of the veil from individual life is a modern characteristic. Our forefathers took little pains to chronicle the events of private life; and the four foremost English authors—Wyclif, Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare—are as men almost unknown to us. The man's life must, to a certain extent, be recast from an examination of his times and his works. The biographer, therefore, necessarily depends upon them; and to a superficial observer it may appear that there is much introduced extraneous to a "life," whereas, in fact, it is this that now constitutes the life of the man to us.

The subject of Wyclif's career, though extensive, has been already well threshed out. The Wyclif Society has been able, in the three years of its existence, to throw but little additional light on the life of Wyclif; and it is unlikely that many facts will be added to those in the pages of Lechler, whose exhaustive treatise must form the basis of all books on the subject. Originality must lie rather in the treatment than in the array of new facts; and Canon Pennington fully establishes his claim to originality in his portrayal of the struggle of the two "nations"—the northern and the southern—at Oxford. Wyclif was connected with the northerns, who were in philosophy Realists, and in politics and religion opposed to the Church of Rome. "Wiclif, as a northern man, had made common cause with the northern party, which had become in his time, as Wood says, the weakest in the University, and had thus become animated with that spirit which led him to stand forward afterwards in defence of civil and religious liberty and independence." Canon Pennington shows clearly how, in his early period, Wyclif is identified with the movements of the age. The scholastic influence is shown in his work on a doctrine so purely abstract as "Dominion in Grace." This tenet, which has been cited by the enemies of the Reformer, and even by writers of such acumen as M. Wallon, as a direct encouragement to contemporary revolutionists, is most clearly explained by the Canon.

As one of the "northerns," Wyclif was led to oppose the Papal usurpations, and naturally carried on the war which had been waged by Grosseteste and others against the corruptions of the orders—corruptions so graphically brought before us by the characters and stories of his contemporary, Chaucer.

In his opposition to Papal usurpations and the corruptions of the order, Wyclif was merely acting with the movement of the times. His next step was to examine the foundations on which the ecclesiastical edifice was based; and here lies the originality of Wyclif, of which Canon Pennington makes a great point. In attacking the doctrines of the Roman communion, Wyclif inaugurated a new era in the Church. Wyclif lit the torch of the Reformation, which, though nearly, was never quite extinguished. The last chapter, Wyclif's influence on the Reformation, is the most important in Canon Pennington's book. It has been common, not only among secular, but among ecclesiastical writers, to regard the English Reformation as a German ecclesiastical movement,

forced upon a reluctant people, from a train of circumstances originating in the passions and temper of Henry VIII. Canon Pennington, in some pages of great vigour and ability, has brought forward a series of cogent proofs that Wyclif's influence was permanent, despite fierce persecution; that the German Reformation was the outcome of Wyclif's movement, for which the English people were fully prepared by his previous work.

It is particularly in this, the closing chapter, that the author shows his grasp of the subject, and makes a very important departure from the beaten track.

The chapter on "Poor Priests" is a clear exposition of Wyclif's views on "Missions," and is especially valuable at a time when attention is being given to the best modes of reaching the millions, to whom religion of any kind is almost unknown. The author is very happy in working out the points of resemblance between the movements of Wyclif and Wesley in this respect.

Canon Pennington does not attempt to give to Wyclif's doctrines a consistency which they did not possess, and frankly admits that the Reformer's views as to Episcopacy were fluctuating. Perhaps a little more prominence might have been given to these fluctuations in doctrine: the Reformers were necessarily, as men, groping their way in the dark, and hesitating at every step.

Most works in a small compass on Wyclif are very hazy. Canon Pennington has himself clear conceptions of his theme, and clothes his conceptions in appropriate language, transparent, and attractive. In style the work is an advance on his previous historical productions, in which the sober muse of history was arrayed in too gorgeous robes. The style of this work is at once terse and ornate. Many happy illustrations occur, as when describing the permanence of Wyclif's influence: "Thus, like the fabled river of old, the stream rolled on, as it were in a subterraneous course, until at length it burst forth into the full light of day, and poured its fertilizing tide over a parched and barren soil, so as to clothe it with rich vegetation."

The Canon possesses no mean power of graphic portrayal; and the great events connected with Wyclif appear in lively colours on his canvas, as—the angry scene at the Synod in St. Paul's, Oxford student life, the great riot on St. Scholastica's day, and the sad scene by the tomb where the Reformer's ashes were outraged.

The work is readable throughout. The subject is singularly interesting, not only to every member of the Church of England, but to every Protestant; and it has been treated by Canon Pennington in a masterly manner. Compact in form, correct in detail, spirited in description, the work is a most suitable gift-book; while the new views which it brings forward, as to the genesis of Wyclifism and its continuity, give it a permanent place in ecclesiastical literature.

H. R. CLINTON, M.A.

The Unity of Nature. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. Alexander Strahan.

This is a sequel to the well-known treatise, "The Reign of Law," by the same illustrious author. We believe that this book is destined to form a landmark in the Christian literature of our day. It is calculated to render the greatest and most needed services in various pending controversies, religious, literary and scientific. To all thoughtful students of Science and Scripture it may be commended with the utmost confidence, no less for the value of its arguments and reflections than for the reverent and impartial treatment of each topic, and specially for the author's firm and consistent vindication of the harmony which unites the truths of Nature and of Revelation. This is the distinguishing merit of

the book. It does not, like too many popular treatises, inquire, "How many of the old beliefs may be surrendered in deference to the dominant temper of modern inquiry?" But it submits to the test of the most thorough and exhaustive investigation some of the principles which have been taken for granted by modern scepticism, and proves either that they are unsound or that they are easily reconcilable with Revelation. The unity of Nature is an inexhaustible subject, and it evidently possesses a wonderful fascination for the author (even in the busy life of a statesman), which he has imparted in a very striking way to some of the descriptive passages in this book.

His readers will enter fully into the noble Duke's feelings as he writes in the Preface: "Every subject of interest, every object of wonder, every thought of mystery, every obscure analogy, every strange intimation of likeness in the midst of difference—the whole external and the whole internal world—is the province and the property of him who seeks to see and to understand the unity of Nature. It is a thought which may be pursued in every calling—in the busiest hours of an active life, and in the calmest moments of rest and of reflection."

Some of the most charming parts of the book are the descriptions of natural scenery and of the habits and instincts of various animals in various parts of the world, as we accompany the author through the grounds of Inverary Castle, into the Riviera, and on to the banks of the St. Lawrence. Many of those narratives in the Old Testament, such as the fall of man and the inherited taint and plague of sin, which have given offence to men of Science, and which some believers in the Christian faith pass over altogether and would gladly explain away as parable or poetry, are shown to be not only true, but necessary, and capable of being expressed in the most accurate language of modern Science.

The most important part of this book in the religious controversies of the future is that which treats of man's place in the unity of Nature. We shall be enabled more clearly to understand those features in the character of man which make him "the great exception." Primeval man was not a savage, nor inferior in intellectual capacity to any of his descendants. So far from this, the earliest inventions of mankind were the most wonderful which he has ever made; for instance, language, the use of fire and the discovery of the methods by which it can be kindled, the domestication of wild animals, and the processes by which the various cereals were first developed out of some wild grasses. "That the first man should have been born with all the developments of savagery is as impossible as that he should have been born with all the developments of civilization."

Here also we see the cause of the failure of the attempts which have been made to account for the origin of religion without God. If there be no God, the sceptic is asked, How all men came to invent one. But if God exist, as the unity of Nature indicates by so many separate and converging lines of argument, then the question is, How long He left His creatures without any intuition or revelation of Himself? The origin of man's perception of God ceases to have any other mystery than that which attaches to the origin of all the other elementary perceptions of his mind and spirit. It would seem, then, that from the very first, and as part of the outfit of his nature, some knowledge was imparted to him of the existence of the Creator and of the duty which he owed to Him. To the brutes the senses convey all that they know. Not so to man. To us they speak but little "compared with what our spirit of interpretation gathers from them."

It is to be earnestly wished that his Grace's present work may be widely known and carefully studied, not only for the sake of the truths of

Revelation, but for the sake of society itself; for no man who looks at the present condition of the world, especially among the crowded masses of our great cities, will hesitate to acknowledge the accuracy of the following words. We quote them from the last chapter of the book:

> Those who wish to sever all the bonds which bind human society together—the State, the Church, the family—and whose spirits are in fierce rebellion against all law, human or divine, are, and must be, bitter enemies of religion. The idea must be unendurable to them of a Ruler who cannot be defied, of a Throne which cannot be overturned, of a Kingdom which endureth throughout all generations. The belief in any Divine Personality as the source of the inexorable laws of Nature is a belief which enforces, as nothing else can enforce, the idea of obligation and the duty of obedience.

But the book as it is, we must add, is not suited for general circulation in those places where such truths are specially needed, and among thousands of our countrymen who would not be unwilling to receive its teaching if it were given in a form which they could understand, and in language more level with their comprehension.

We commend this book to the admirers of Professor Drummond's "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," which offers us, what is in reality, a new religion, without Creeds, and Articles, and Sacraments, and authority, in which also it is very doubtful whether he regards the continuance and transmission of any of the positive institutions of the Christian Church as a duty never to be superseded, and an essential part of the Christian religion.

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

Short Notices.

Religion in England from 1800 *to* 1850. A History, with a Postscript on Subsequent Events. By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D. Two vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1884.

THE six volumes of Dr. Stoughton's History of Religion in England have a good place, probably, on the shelves of many of our readers; and the two companion volumes, lately published, which complete the pious and learned author's work, carrying on his narrative during the nineteenth century, will be cordially welcomed. The characteristics of Dr. Stoughton's writings are so well known that we need scarcely discuss them. Seldom indeed will a candid critic question either the impartiality or the kindliness of his tone and method; and his ability, painstaking research, and deep reverence, will be admitted—or rather we should say, will continue to be admitted—upon every side. Now and then his view of affairs, we think, appears defective or inaccurate. Nevertheless, his History of Religion is rich, and very readable: in certain respects, indeed, it is unique. Many Churchmen, like ourselves, will value in it the information given about our Nonconformist brethren by a cultured and honoured Nonconformist.

The first of the two volumes before us begins with "Political Relations;" then proceeds to "The Episcopal Church." From chap. viii. onwards, we find Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Wesleyans, and Irvingites, and so forth. The second volume opens with "Church and State, 1830-1837;" among its other chapters are "Tractarianism," "Typical Churchmen," "Roman Catholicism," "The Evangelical Alliance."

In his sketch of "Early Evangelicals, 1800-1837," appears much that is

well and strikingly put. "There was a living power in their convictions," we read, "which moved their whole being, and gave incisiveness to words, boldness to work. . . . They were the very salt of the Church of England, during a period when influences existed threatening decay and corruption. If not for any number of dignitaries within its circle, if not for a multitude of adherents within its ranks, yet for spiritual force, for religious efficiency, the Evangelical Movement can scarcely be overrated." Perfectly true. The sketches of Cecil, Simeon, and others are brief, but appreciative and just. Yet when the author proceeds to point out how frequent and important are the inaccuracies which are now to be found in writings relating to the history of the Evangelical Movement in its earlier stages, he trips himself. In pp. 120-130 he does not, as we think, present a clear and consistent representation. For instance, he says that Daniel Wilson (1830) "was, in fact, bishop in the north of London." Again, he says that "perhaps the zenith of prosperity in the Evangelical section of the English Church may be dated from 1810 to 1830." Both these statements, we think, are erroneous. As to Islington, any well-informed Churchman will perceive at a glance the historical absurdity. But as to the growth of the Evangelical section of the Church there is equal inaccuracy. Dr. Stoughton has, in fact, too much kept in view the "Clapham sect," and he over-estimates their influence. A more careful study of the biographies of leading Evangelicals (1810-1820) would have led him to the conclusion that the influence of Evangelicalism in the Church was, speaking proportionately, extremely limited. In ecclesiastical circles throughout the country—nay, even in the Diocese of London—Evangelicals as a rule were regarded with suspicion and dislike, not seldom with contempt. As to the "zenith of prosperity," how many Evangelical incumbents in the year 1810 could be found in all England? Take the large towns, where was "Evangelical prosperity"? Nay, if even we come down to 1830, the state of things—social and ecclesiastical—as regards Evangelical "prosperity," what is to be said of it? The work begun by a few men of intense spirituality, practical, hard-working, self-denying, and steadily consistent, had been growing, no doubt, and under God bearing much fruit; but how few those men really were, how much they had to endure at the hands of Bishops and "Bishops' men" and worldly clergymen of many types, what little social influence there was to support them, and how much to thwart and discourage them,[1] these are points too often misunderstood or imperfectly appreciated in the present day.

Dr. Stoughton's remarks on the Tractarian Movement are precisely what one might expect. He says:

> Yet none the less can any sound Protestant lament and condemn the characteristic opinions of the Oxford divines. Those opinions drew off sons of the Church who had been looked up to as its ornaments. They poured in a tide of sacerdotalism which has ever since troubled the adherents of the Reformation, and sadly perverted the teachings of many clergymen. Ritualism, scarcely distinguishable from that of Rome, entered parish after parish; and this fact damaged the Establishment in the eyes of multitudes, and strengthened popular arguments against its principles. Those who adopt Evangelical views, who believe that the

[1] Dr. Stoughton briefly shows (p. 8) the condition of the Church in rural districts, and he quotes Sydney Smith's rhyming burlesque of Bishop Blomfield's Chester Charge in 1825:

> Hunt not, fish not, shoot not;
> Dance not, fiddle not, flute not;
> But before all things, it is my particular desire,
> That once at least in every week, you take
> Your dinner with the squire.

teaching of Holy Scripture is unsacerdotal; that church worship in the primitive age was eminently simple and unceremonial; that salvation by grace through faith, apart from mediæval ideas of merit, is the doctrine of St. Paul; and that the written Word of God is the ultimate and conclusive standard of theological appeal, must regard the main tendency of the movement as mischievous and deplorable.

Church Ordinances from the Layman's Standpoint. By MAJOR SETON CHURCHILL. London. Nisbet and Co.

It is a great advantage to the clergy and to others when a thoughtful layman frankly publishes his deliberate opinions regarding Church Ordinances, and the relation of general Church questions to social and personal life. And of all laymen, perhaps soldiers (they will allow us for the moment to call them laymen from our present point of view) are more likely than any other class to be useful in this way. Their training has made them clear-sighted and practical, and impatient of confused statements and of ensnaring mysticism. Major Churchill seems, both generally and specially, to be well fitted for criticism of this kind. We have taken up his book with a predisposition in its favour; and we have not been disappointed.

It is evident, under the circumstances of our existing controversies, that the character of the Christian Ministry and the manner of the Divine Presence in the Eucharist are the two chief pivots upon which such questions as are treated of in this volume will chiefly turn. As to the latter point, it would be quite a mistake to suppose that only a slight value is here attached to Christ's Eucharistic Presence, and to the blessing which results from it. True to the instinct of his profession, Major Churchill says, "Military writers tell us that Napoleon's personal presence in the battle-field was worth a whole brigade;" through that presence "the faint-hearted took courage again, and the weary frame was urged on by the mind" (p. 120). This presence, however, of Christ, which may very properly be thus illustrated, is spiritual. "Christ present to faith is the great sacramental truth" to which we must firmly hold (p. 119). The author elsewhere (p. 233) very fitly quotes the Dean of Peterborough, whose words really state the whole case: "The presence is a presence to faith; not in the hand, but in the heart. I can conceive of only two kinds of presence, a literal one, or a figurative one—a presence to sense, to sight, to touch, which is personal presence; or a presence to the mind or heart, which is a spiritual presence."

From the question of "presence" in the Eucharist we easily pass to the question of "sacrifice" in the Eucharist, and thence to the consideration of the true character of the Christian ministry. The phrase "commemorative sacrifice" is one which is frequently used as describing the meaning of the Eucharist, and which fosters the notion of a sacrificial priesthood in the Christian Church. It is, however, a phrase inviting confusion of thought. Major Churchill, again attracted perhaps by the military comparison (p. 246), quotes Dean Stanley as saying that the Eucharist "can no more be called a commemorative sacrifice than the Waterloo banquet can be called a commemorative battle." The Epistles to the Hebrews (iii. 18), and to the Romans (xii. 1), show what the sacrifices are which must be offered up under the Christian dispensation. But these sacrifices "are to be offered up by the whole Church" (p. 245). No contrast can be

greater than that between the Old Testament and the New, in regard to the character of the Church ministry. "If we take the New Testament only for our guide, we find no directions for a material sacrifice, for an altar, for a priesthood" (p. 251). The whole case is summed up in a quotation here given from Bishop Thirlwall, regarding the offering up of the bread and wine as in sacrifice; and it is of the highest importance that the utterances of that great scholar and divine should not be forgotten amongst us: "The Church has deliberately rejected the doctrine; for in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. every expression which implied a real and proper sacrifice had been carefully weeded out; in the second Prayer Book every allusion to an altar, or to a material sacrifice, was finally got rid of—the word *altar* thenceforward disappearing from the Liturgy" (p. 246).

The Holy Communion, in almost all its aspects, is discussed in this volume; and other subjects brought under discussion are Baptism and Confirmation. But the extracts already given will suffice to show the general character and spirit of the book. Without any pledge of agreement with every phrase that it contains, it may confidently be recommended for general perusal and study. It is suggestive of various and serious thought, and it is rich in illustration. And another of its merits must be carefully named. It is written in a charitable spirit. While firm in the expression of his own opinion, the author does not think that all those who differ from him are necessarily bad men. He says truly, (p. 201) that "the student of the history of great religious movements, be they good or bad, true or false, cannot shut his eyes to the fact that almost every error has had associated with it some sincere minds whose very earnestness and zeal were worthy of a better cause." D.D.

The Four Holy Gospels. The Authorized Version, with variations of type, and marginal notes. By Rev. E. T. CARDALE, late Rector of Uckfield. Pp. 128. Rivingtons. 1885.

The main feature in this edition of the Gospels is the additional use of capital letters. The Divine Names are throughout printed in capitals, and small capitals; initial capitals are employed for pronouns relating to the Divine Persons. Mr. Cardale is known as one who has given time and thought to this question—a by no means easy question—and we are pleased to recommend his little book. It is a sequence of the tractate "Capital Letters in Holy Scriptures, a plea for their further and corrected use." We observe that "the son of man," A. V., is printed "the SON of Man;" instead of "saith unto me, Lord, Lord" (Matt. vii. 21), we find "saith unto Me, LORD, LORD." In Matt. xi. 25, Mr. Cardale has printed—"I thank Thee, O FATHER, Lord of heaven and earth." Yet it is κύριε here, as in Matt. vii. 21; but Mr. Cardale alters the type according "to the *sense*."

The Sceptic's Creed. Can it be reasonably held? Is it worth the holding? By NEVISON LORAINE, Vicar of Grove Park West, London, author of "The Church and Liberties of England," etc. Pp. 160. Hodder and Stoughton. 1885.

The author of this thoughtful little book, the Preface tells us, invited his congregation to suggest topics for a series of Sunday evening discourses. Among the subjects proposed was "The Sceptic's Creed—an examination of popular aspects of Unbelief." This proposal commanded the Vicar's "instant sympathy." Hence discourses, and a lecture, and this volume.

A Diurnal for the Changes and Chances of this Mortal Life. Edited by CATHARINE STURGE. Pp. 216. Hatchards. 1885.

A very interesting little book is this Diurnal; and many devout and thoughtful persons who are fond of *bits* of really good prose and poetry will prize it much. "This is not a devotional book," says an introductory note, "but it is hoped that the daily perusal of the extracts will further 'high thinking,' and be a help to some in the varied, and often rugged path of life." Trench, Hemans, Wesley, Browning, Tulloch, and Jeremy Taylor, are some of the authors quoted. The prose extracts are, of course, very brief; *bits*, as we have said; and of many sacred songs only a few lines appear. Two of the three verses by Anne Brontë, "In Sickness," are given; the first verse is given in the Rev. W. O. Purton's book, "Trust in Trial."

Studies on the Character of our Lord as our Example. By A. NICHOLLS. With Introduction by the Right Rev. Lord Bishop of SODOR and MAN. Pp. 140. W. Hunt and Co. 1885.

A well-meant endeavour; may prove useful to many. Our Lord's use of Scripture, observance of the Sabbath, humility, sympathy, are some of the sections.

Diocesan Histories.—Norwich. By the Rev. AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D., Rector of Scarning, late Head Master of King Edward VI.'s School, Norwich. With Maps. S.P.C.K.

This is an exceedingly good representative of the "Diocesan History" series; and we are sorry that it has not sooner been noticed in these pages. Dr. Jessopp has given a good deal of time and thought to the preparation of this History; and, although we do not forget his modest reference (in the preface) to this little volume as a ridiculous mouse to come out of years of research, we are of opinion that impartial critics will say that the result of his research is by no means unworthy. Dr. Jessopp's book is indeed more than a dry compilation; and readers who are specially interested in the Diocese of Norwich will be grateful to him for it, while all students of the history of the National Church will be glad to have it.

Madagascar and France: With some Account of the Island, its People, its Resources, and Development. By GEORGE A. SHAW, F.Z.S. London Mission, Tamatave. With many illustrations from original sketches and photographs, and a Map. Pp. 320. The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

A special interest attaches to this book. Mr. Shaw's connection with Madagascar for nearly fourteen years as a Missionary of the London Missionary Society, enables him to speak with authority touching the progress—social, political, and religious—of the Malagasy; and the manner in which he was treated by Admiral Pierre, at a crisis in the French operations on the coast of Madagascar, has not yet been forgotten. For the past two years, says Mr. Shaw, feeling has been aroused by accounts which have been brought to England about French aggression in Madagascar. A great deal of indignation was expressed on the receipt of the first news of the high-handed action of the civilized nation towards the comparatively weak, but singularly interesting people: and that feeling, though dormant, strongly tinges the deep sense of sorrow and pity felt in this country for those who a few years ago were heathen barbarians, but who have struggled through thick clouds of superstition into the light of Christian civilization. The claims put forward by France in justification of her aggressive operations, says Mr. Shaw, are lame and paltry. During

the past two years trade has been stopped or hindered, neutral merchants have been ruined, property has been destroyed, lives have been lost, and Mission work has been upset. What has been the conduct of the Malagasy within this painful period? "It has excited the strongest admiration," says Mr. Shaw: "they have shown themselves determined patriots, clear-"headed politicians, good soldiers, and conscientious Christians. In their "dogged determination to resist to the last, and their indifference to the "hardships of the campaign, in their watchfulness in the trenches, and "bravery in meeting death, they have called forth the encomium of those "who have seen active service in other parts of the world; while their "practical Christianity and faithfulness under the trying dispensation of "Providence have completely silenced their detractors who prophesied "that at the first breath of calamity the Malagasy Christians would "revert to their ancient idolatry and superstition." The Government, we note with pleasure, has by no means lost influence or power. Mr. Shaw's description of the coronation of the new Queen will be read with interest by all English supporters of Missions.

Mr. Shaw's book is not, as might be supposed, mainly political. Of its fourteen chapters four are historical and descriptive; two relate to the flora and fauna of the island; two others are "The Accession of Ranavalona III.," and "Present Civil and Religious State of the Malagasy." "The Bombardment of Tamatave"—a graphic narrative—is specially interesting.

Man's Departure and the Invisible World. A Collection of Opinions and Facts. By G. H. H. OLIPHANT-FERGUSON. Second edition. Pp. 240. Nisbet. 1885.

"Dissolution of the Body," "Departure of the Spirit," "The Spiritual Body," "Recognition of Friends," and "Dying Experiences," are some of the chapters in this volume, which many will read with interest and profit. There are several excellent quotations, both prose and verse. The book is printed in very clear type.

The Devotional Use of the Book of Common Prayer. A Paper read at the Chester Diocesan Conference, on October 21st, 1884. By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF CHESTER. Chester: Phillipson and Golder.

We gladly recommend this paper. Here is a specimen extract:

I may have seemed in some words used above to depreciate sacred music as a help to devotion. This, however, was very far from my meaning; and I hope our Precentor will receive my public thanks for all that he has done in giving expression to the clouds and sunlight which float over the rich fields of David and the other Psalmists. While it seems to me that in our Parish Churches good reading of the Prayers is infinitely better than bad intoning, yet I think that the Psalter ought pre-eminently to be wedded to music, and that it derives from this source one of the best explanatory commentaries. In the *Spectator* we are told of Sir Roger de Coverley—who was "landlord to the whole congregation, kept them in very good order, and suffered no one to sleep in it besides himself"—who, when a boy had answered well "on a catechizing day," ordered a Bible to be given him next day for his encouragement, and "sometimes accompanied it with a flitch of bacon for his mother"—that "in order to make his parishioners kneel and join in the responses he gave every one of them a hassock and a Common Prayer Book; and at the same time employed an itinerant singing-master, who went about the country for that purpose, to instruct them rightly in the tunes of the Psalms."

The Relation of the Jewish Christians to the Jews in the First and Second Centuries. By the Rev. F. H. REICHARDT, B.A., late Scholar of Corpus, Cambridge. Seeley and Co.

This essay was written four years ago at Cambridge as a Hulsean Dissertation, and was mentioned with approval.

Like Christ. Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Conformity to the Son of God. A sequel to "Abide in Christ." By ANDREW MURRAY. Nisbet and Co.

The tone of this well-written book is all that could be desired. Everywhere may be felt a depth of devotion, true Scriptural earnestness, together with an affectionate simplicity. The high standard is commended in a very winning way, and even beginners or inquirers will find themselves helped onward and encouraged. One cannot criticize such a book as this. There are thirty-one readings; not one of them is too long.

Meditations for Advent. Short Readings on the First and Second Coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. By DANIEL MOORE, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen and Prebendary of St. Paul's, author of "Sunday Meditations," etc. Hatchards.

This excellent book did not reach us in time for a notice during the season of Advent; but we have read its Meditations with much interest and satisfaction. A book which bears upon its title-page "Daniel Moore" is certain to be suggestive, with the marks of sound judgment and spiritual power. We tender our thanks to the honoured author of these "short readings." They form a worthy companion of "Sunday Meditations," a very helpful book, which we had the pleasure of recommending, and now commend once more. The present volume, it may be added, is well printed, in clear type.

Messrs. Shaw and Co. have published more of their capital "Home Series," reprints of well-known Tales (*e.g.*, *Mistress Margery*, by Miss Holt), in a convenient form, only sixpence each.

The Clergy List for 1885 (John Hall, 291, Strand, W.C.) reached us too late for the March CHURCHMAN. The notes of this valuable Directory, accuracy and completeness, are universally acknowledged. The volume for 1885, admirably printed, has some new features, and the information is thoroughly up to date.

Galilee in the Time of Christ, by Rev. S. MERRILL, D.D., is No. VI. of that excellent series "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge," for which the Christian public is indebted to the Religious Tract Society. Dr. Merrill's interesting book "East of the Jordan," published two or three years ago, was reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN at the time. We have pleasure in recommending his present work, an essay expanded: it is clear, up to date, and, though in some respects slight, has a good deal of suggestive statement. Section XVII., "Was Galilee regarded with contempt by the people of Jerusalem?" will surprise many readers. The popular view, says Dr. Merrill, has hardly a shadow of proof. As to the origin of the name Nazareth, rejecting the very popular explanation (for which Hengstenberg laboured in his "Christology"), a reference to the Messiah as a *sprout* or *branch* of David, Dr. Merrill goes to the root *natzar*, and we are inclined to agree with him. Nazareth is a "city" (πόλις in N. T., a town, *not* a "village"), with a hill commanding a wonderful prospect; Nazareth *watches*, overlooks, a vast region, land and sea. The real character of Nazareth, in connection with both Temple-life and a great traffic-road, is an interesting subject for discussion.

The fifth volume of "Present Day Tracts on subjects of Christian Evidence, Doctrine and Morals" (R. T. S.), contains timely and ably-written papers; *e.g.*, "The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel," by Dr. Godet; "The Present State of the Christian Argument from Prophecy, by Dr. Cairns; "The Zend-Avesta and Zoroastrianism, or the Religion of the Parsîs," by Dr. Mitchell (for many years engaged in Missionary service in Bombay). In "Man not a Machine, but a Responsible Free Agent," Mr. Row appeals to common sense against materialistic, necessitarian philosophy. "A wide-spread philosophy at the present day," he says, "affirms that there is no distinction between the forces which energize in the material and in the moral universe; but that both are alike subject to an iron law of necessity." To some points in the learned Prebendary's argument we hope to return; certainly, the subject just now is of great importance. From Mr. Row's remarks on Altruism we may quote the following:

But the utilitarian principle of altruism, or that the realization of the greatest happiness of the greatest number will be attended with the realization of the greatest happiness of self, is no new discovery. It is neither more nor less than one of the old laws of the kingdom of God, but deprived of all the sanctions by which it can be enforced. Yet we are invited to believe that altruism is a great improvement on the now worn-out Christian law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, mind, soul, and strength;" and, consequent on this, "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;" and on the new commandment, to love one another as Christ has loved us. All that the utilitarian philosopher has really effected is, to divest these commandments of all moral power, by proclaiming that there is no God whom we need regard, no Christ to love, and no hereafter to fear.

But if this philosophy is the sole foundation on which morality is to be based, I ask, how is this principle of altruism to be generated? It cannot be generated by invoking the principle of evolution, for it is one of its fundamental principles that primitive man was altogether selfish, and that everything in civilized man which is not so is an after-growth. How, then, can the disinterested love of others be evolved out of a being whose one distinguishing characteristic is pure love of self? Many are the shifts to which utilitarianism has recourse, such as the family, and the tribal feeling; but it may be justly asked, whence came these? How did they originate in a being whose moral constitution, if he had any, was selfishness pure and simple.

The Honey Bee, by W. H. HARRIS, B.A., B.Sc., will prove to general readers a very interesting book, full of anecdotes and instructive information, while to those who are thinking about keeping bees it will prove a treasure. Mr. Harris tells all about the nature, homes, and products of the bee—all, that is, which one really would wish to know; and many will thank him for so enjoyable a book. There are many illustrations.

In *Blackwood's Magazine* appears "Our Egyptian Atrocities: From Capel Court to Khartoum." The article is very strong against Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville. "If Mr. Gladstone," says *Blackwood*, "had "bestowed half the attention on the Dual Note of January, 1882, that he "was then giving to obstruction, he would have saved his own country "and Egypt money enough to buy every farm in Ireland under five acres, "and make a clean present of it to the tenant. While he was gagging the "House of Commons, Egypt was hurrying to her ruin, bombarded by "his 'friendly' ironclads, invaded by his 'friendly' armies, reduced to "bankruptcy by his 'friendly' Controllers, and abandoned at last to the "tender mercies of 'friendly' bondholders. Alas! bad as it is, that is "not the bitterest drop in this cup of national sorrow and humiliation. "It is only when we stand in imagination, with uncovered heads and "grief-stricken hearts, beside the unknown grave of Gordon, that we "realize the full evil of our 'meddling and muddling' on the Nile. "General Gordon, the oriflamme of our Christian chivalry, dead!"

In the *Monthly Interpreter* for March (No. V. of the new magazine), appears an interesting paper on "The Assumption of Moses," by the Rev. W. J. DEANE, M.A. The *Monthly Interpreter*, published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark, and Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., is much the same as the *Expositor*. Under the heading "Foreign Periodical Literature" appear some interesting paragraphs. We quote a portion of one :

Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Sept., Oct., 1884. M. Massebieau, who has considered some of the leading German and French studies of the *Didaché* (edited by Bryennios), presents his general conclusions. Part I. (*Catechesis*) he thinks must date from before 100 A.D., and was probably of Roman origin. As it contains little Christian matter—with the exception of what relates to the Sermon on the Mount,—its substance may be Judæo-Hellenic teaching, designed for the numerous pagans who desired to embrace the law of Moses. Part II. A. *Baptism, Fasting, The Lord's Prayer, The Eucharist.* Here also the ritual ascends to early times—in particular, with reference to the Lord's Supper, to a time when the Agapé was entirely identified with it. Zahn, on the other hand, holds that the Agapé comes immediately after the Supper, in the directions.

We are pleased to recommend a pamphlet lately published—*The Fourth Commandment in the Light of the Four Gospels*, with an Introductory Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford, and to the Members of the Oxford Diocesan Conference, by the Rev. ALFRED KENNION, M.A., Vicar of Gerrard's Cross, Bucks. (London : Bemrose and Sons, 23, Old Bailey ; and Derby. 1885.) In THE CHURCHMAN of November, 1884, appeared an interesting letter from a Member of the Oxford Diocesan Conference, touching the debate on which Mr. Kennion comments. Many of our readers will be glad, no doubt, to make themselves acquainted with Mr. Kennion's ably-written essay. Its key-note is, "Read the Fourth Law in the Light of the Four Gospels."

We give the title of an ably written pamphlet: *Churchmen, hear! a further "Remonstrance" against the Recital of the Athanasian Creed.* A reply to the *Church Quarterly Review*, with Addenda, by a Member of the Church of England. (London : W. Ridgway, 169, Piccadilly, W. 1885.) Into the controversy on the Athanasian Creed we have no desire at present to enter ; nor have we the slightest wish to comment upon the article in the *Church Quarterly ;* but it will be admitted on all sides, we think, by impartial readers of this pamphlet, that many of its statements are worthy of serious consideration. A very telling passage is the author's reference to Cardinal Newman.

The Fireside News—of which we have some recent numbers before us —has many claims upon Churchmen who value wholesome teaching, and it ought to have a very large circulation. It is an admirable Church newspaper, with well-written articles, and a good deal of social information ; altogether bright, cheery, and thoroughly sound. Much remains to be done, no doubt, in the way of penny papers for the masses ; but the *Fireside News*—for which the Church is indebted to the Rev. Charles Bullock—is to a large extent meeting a great want of the times. It is published at "Home Words" Office, 7, Paternoster Square, E.C.

In the *National Review* appears an admirable article on Woman Suffrage ("a reply" to Mr. Raikes's article in the January number), by Mr. Philip Vernon Smith. For ourselves, we are inclined to agree with the learned barrister, whose criticisms on the right hon. gentleman's position are acute and practical. Another interesting article "Recruits and Recruiting," which has special attractions for many readers, is written, surely, by Dr. F. Robinson, a contributor to THE CHURCHMAN.

In *Cassell's Family Magazine* for March we notice this pleasant bit :

There is no sound that we feel to be more rural than the cawing of rooks ; yet the rook has been established time out of mind in London. Tall trees are all he wants for a home, though they may stand in the noisy Marylebone Road, or even in the heart of London at Gray's Inn Garden. But though the rook never objects to the presence of men at the foot of his trees, it is strange that he should be willing to remain in London, where the streets afford him no food, and the parks, one would think, very little. It must be remembered that, attached as the rook is to his home, he often wanders very far afield in his daily round; and as he can at any time easily overfly the few miles of houses which part even Gray's Inn from the open country, he can hardly be aware of the distinction which we feel between the life of the town and the country. A bird so wary as he, and so circumspect in his dealings with the human race, must well appreciate one great advantage which belongs to the London rookeries—that there is no rook-shooting possible there in the spring. In consequence of this advantage the numbers of the London rooks ought to increase very rapidly, and one would like to know how they settle who shall emigrate and who stay behind.

In the *Art Journal* for March (Virtue and Co.) there is a beautiful etching by Mr. Slocombe, "Friday," from the picture by Mr. Sadler, in the collection of the Corporation of Liverpool. "Nature through a Field-glass" is excellent.

An interesting little book is *Wesley Anecdotes*, by JOHN TELFORD, B.A., published by the R.T.S. We also recommend two little volumes, *The Lilies of the Field*, and *Walking with Jesus*, "Sunday Readings for the Little Ones ;" illustrated, neatly got up, and cheap.

From Mr. Elliot Stock we have received, too late for notice in the present CHURCHMAN, a very dainty little volume, *Before His Presence with a Song ;* fifteen Hymns, by the Rev. Canon BERNARD. An admirable gift-book for Easter.

The Rev. Canon Clarke has sent us the following Rondeau :

"*I will bless the Lord at all times.*"—Ps. xxiv. 1.

I'll bless the Lord, when fragrant morn
Seems breathing on a world new-born,
  And when the lips of ling'ring light
  Kiss wearied earth and say,—" Good night !
And starry gems thy head adorn !"

When harvests wave with golden corn,
Or fields are rank with frequent thorn ;
  Come plenty's bloom, or famine's blight,
    I'll bless the Lord.

Though dark'ning clouds my soul affright,
Though tempests gather in their might,
  Though angry thunders peal, and warn
  Of coming woe, contempt, and scorn ;
E'en when the storm is at its height,
    I'll bless the Lord.

THE MONTH.

IN the House of Commons on the 27th of February, the Government obtained a majority of 14, 288 voting for Sir Stafford Northcote's resolution, and 302 against it. In the House of Lords, however, the vote of censure was carried, and by a majority of 121, only 68 peers voting with the Government. The language of Lord Salisbury's motion was a little stronger than Sir Stafford Northcote's. Mr. Forster and Mr. Goschen criticized the conduct of the Government, and voted in accordance with their speeches. A few other Liberals voted with the Opposition. On the morning after the division the *Times*, remarking that it was doubtful whether the Ministry could survive the defeat, said:

> The disgraceful treatment accorded to General Gordon, and the cynical coolness with which Ministers have ignored or made light of what is felt to be a national reproach, have no doubt operated to disgust candid men of all parties. But apart altogether from that shameful episode, their whole conduct of national affairs, not only in the Soudan but in Egypt itself, and in our foreign and colonial relations generally, has been of a kind which deserves the most uncompromising censure. Technically they have escaped, though only by the skin of their teeth, but morally they are defeated, discredited, and condemned.

There have been serious misunderstandings between Lord Granville and the German Chancellor. Prince Bismarck (said the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the 3rd) "is far and away the most powerful man in the world. His word is law from Moscow to Paris. Yet in some way or other we have contrived to excite in this dictator of the Continent sentiments which he finds it difficult to express even in the large license of his White-books." But the mission of Count Herbert Bismarck was apparently a decided success; and Lord Granville's apologetic speech has removed the soreness created by White-books and Blue.

The advance of Russian forces on the boundary of Afghanistan, in the direction of Herat, has excited serious misgivings.

General Brackenbury, when almost in sight of Abu Hamed, retreated to Korti; General Buller was also ordered to retreat; the concentration of Lord Wolseley's force, under the circumstances, seemed absolutely necessary.

The news of the death of Sir C. Stewart was received with general regret.

A "supplementary estimate," on the 11th, contained a grant of £20,000 to the family of General Gordon.—A Mansion House Fund for a memorial to General Gordon has been established. — In St. Paul's, in the Abbey, and in many cathedrals, memorial services[1] have been held.—At Norwich,

[1] In the *St. James's Gazette*, on the 14th, we read: "Most of those who

on the invitation of the Bishop, "A Service of Humiliation for our Sins, with prayers for our nation in general, and especially for our soldiers and sailors in Egypt," was held in the nave of the Cathedral.

At Suakin, about the same time, landed the 15th Sikhs, and a battalion of the Guards. The English and Indian forces of the Empress-Queen are thus once more meeting together. The line of railway from Suakin to Berber, or to somewhere esle, is expected to be finished by autumn. A volunteer contingent from New South Wales left Sydney for Suakin on the 3rd.

The new President of the United States, in his address, made no striking announcement. It seems, however, that the Democratic Party (which has not been in power for twenty-four years), has abandoned Free Trade principles.

Dr. Walsh, President of Maynooth, has been elected to the Roman Catholic Archbishopric of Dublin. Whether he will make as firm a stand against the lawlessness of extreme Nationalists as did his predecessor Cardinal McCabe, remains to be seen.

The Rev. Canon Garratt has commented, in pungent terms, on the fact that an atheist, Mr. Bradlaugh, has been elected President of the Ipswich Radical Association.

A memorial to the Bishop of Liverpool against the continuance of the proceedings which have been instituted by Dr. Hakes against the Rev. J. B. Cox, Incumbent of St. Margaret's, Liverpool, signed by 138 clergymen, was presented. In the reply of his Lordship, we read:

> You will doubtless remember that I have had nothing whatever to do with the institution of this suit. The only point which has come before me for decision has been whether or not I should prohibit it. You ask me to "stay the proceedings, if possible." Your request comes too late. The case has already been referred to the Provincial Court of York, and has passed entirely out of my hands. . . . I earnestly desire, as much as any of yourselves, to prevent strife and contention among Churchmen. I dislike all Ecclesiastical lawsuits, however necessary they may sometimes be. But I must remind you that in such cases as the one you have brought before me the peace of a diocese is not so much disturbed by the promoters of the suit, as it is by those who give occasion for legal proceedings by persistent disobedience to the law, and by refusing to obey the repeated admonitions of the Bishop.

---

were present in the churches yesterday, or who have read the accounts of the impressive ceremonials this morning, will feel that these great gatherings of his countrymen in prayer were the commemoration and the monument Gordon himself would have approved, had his wonderful humility and self-abnegation permitted him to judge himself worthy of such remembrance. For money he had the contempt which is common to many less pure minds than his. He had even schooled himself, though the struggle was perhaps hard, to that rarer virtue which is indifferent to fame."

At a meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences attention has been directed to the subject of Church Defence.

The Church Missionary Society has received intelligence of the death of King Mtesa.

At a meeting of Wellingtonians, presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury, a Wellington College Mission Committee was formed. £150 a year is guaranteed for a Mission clergyman in a poor district in the East End.

At the opening of the new wing of the Church Missionary House, in Salisbury Square, some deeply interesting speeches were made. Mr. A. Beattie, in the name of the subscribers, presented to the committee a portrait of the venerated President, Lord Chichester.

At the Jubilee meeting of the Church Pastoral-Aid Society, held in the Egyptian Hall, Mansion House, speeches were made by Mr. Deacon, the Bishop of Sodor and Man, Mr. F. Bevan, Mr. Clarke Aspinall, Canon McCormick, and Bishop Hellmuth. In the course of his speech Canon Hoare said:

We hear of missions, mission-halls, schoolrooms, cottage lectures, schoolroom lectures, etc., by laity and by clergy. Now I stand here myself as a man who was actually presented by my churchwarden at the visitation of the Archdeacon, and brought up before all my brother clergymen for censure. Now what for? What was this that so humbled me? It was for what was considered by my churchwarden the offence of giving religious lectures in my own school; and the Archdeacon said it was a very grave matter and must be referred to the Bishop. That was the state of things not quite fifty years ago. I shall mention another case. There is a large parish in the town of London, not in the city, and the rectory of that was offered to a dear friend of mine. I went with him to call upon the outgoing rector, and the outgoing rector spoke of the charms of his parish, and at length said that "It has this great advantage, that I have brought it into this beautiful order, that although there are 20,000 people in the parish it is brought into such a state of order that there is not the least occasion to keep a curate." Can you imagine a state of things more fatal for these 20,000 people?

The Rev. H. M. Butler, D.D., Head Master of Harrow School, has been appointed, we are pleased to record, to the Deanery of Gloucester.

The Rev. F. Paget, who was ordained Deacon in 1873, succeeds Dr. King in the Regius Professorship of Pastoral Theology.

In the *Contemporary*, Mr. R. A. Watson makes a most slashing attack on what he terms, "Professor Drummond's New Scientific Gospel." He thinks the gist of Professor Drummond's book "is fitted to create scepticism rather than confirm faith," and "takes leave to call Professor Drummond's theory neither science nor theology, but a bastard Calvinism, of which Scotland ought to be ashamed, and the sturdiest Arminian may well say the old is better. Certainly the Calvinism of John Calvin is a vast deal better—for where is Christ in this religion?"