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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1885.

ART. I.—THE REVISED VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. I.

THE EDITING, ORTHOGRAPHY, AND USE OF CAPITAL LETTERS.

AT length this great work is accomplished, and we are allowed to hold in our hands the Revised Old Testament. Fourteen years have elapsed since the first meeting of the Revisers, and during this time ten of the company have passed away. The task was spread over eighty-five sessions of ten days each, six hours of close application being given on an average each day, to say nothing of the amount of preliminary work done by each Reviser in his own home. Here is a fruitful subject for meditation; for if so much labour has been called forth in the revision of our English Bible, which was confessedly an accurate version to begin with, what must be the toil and responsibility in which the missionary is involved, who has to undertake almost single-handed, with no—or next to no—literary assistance, and amidst exhaustive labours and bitter disappointments of every sort, a translation of the Scriptures book by book into a language which possesses no literature whatever! As we turn over the list of the British and Foreign Bible Society's Versions, one gets a new idea of the magnificence of their undertaking in the light of this new work just accomplished. Bible translation, however, though difficult, is intensely interesting. It calls for a number of gifts, and it ought not to be undertaken without clean hands and a pure heart and a spirit of dependence on the enlightening grace of God. But when taken in hand in this loyal spirit, the work will bring its own reward. One cannot ponder over these ancient sacred records, and weigh and scrutinize the words which they contain, and examine the bearing of tense

and preposition and definite article, and compare passage with passage to find out the usage of special terms, without gaining strength and depth in one's own convictions, and in one's grasp of sacred truth. This has been the experience of translators in all times and countries; and we cannot doubt that the bishops, professors, and learned men who have been engaged on the work before us will add their testimony to that of others on this point.

Touching the mode of carrying out the work, there appears to have been a marked difference between the plan adopted by the Revisers and that which was thought best when James I. arranged for the Authorized Version. In those days the Old Testament was divided into three parts, certain learned men in London undertaking the Pentateuch and Historical Books to the end of the Kings; Cambridge being answerable for the Books of the Chronicles onward to Ecclesiastes; and Oxford for the Prophetical Books. To Cambridge was also allotted the Apocrypha; to Oxford the Gospels, Acts, and Apocalypse; and to Westminster the Epistles. Moreover, in those days all the learned clergy were urged by their bishops to send notes to the various companies, a course which does not seem to have been thought necessary now. Our Revisers met all together, and discussed the whole Old Testament verse by verse, admitting no change into the text which had not a majority of two-thirds of those present, and subjecting the whole revision when accomplished to a farther revision, which probably tended in a more conservative direction, when the work could be read as a whole, and its effect on the ear could be judged of. It must have been a delicate matter to deal with the suggestions of the American Revisers, who had the great disadvantage of not being present to argue out the results of their own company's labours, and who represent a more "modern" style of expression, even in sacred things, than we are used to. The list of rejected American suggestions appended at the end of the Old Testament is very imposing and somewhat perplexing. It would have been much more convenient to the general reader if some of them had been admitted into the margin, and the letter A prefixed to mark their source.

But now it is high time to pass from these prefatory remarks to the book itself. And first comes the *title-page*. This compares very favourably with the old one, but is still very defective. The old title-page was simply ludicrous, because it spoke of "His Majesty's special command," without telling people who "His Majesty" was, whilst those who consulted the fulsome dedication (which is fast disappearing from modern Bibles) would only learn that he was "the most high and

mighty Prince James, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland." The revised title-page does not tell us by whose command the new work has been taken in hand, but affirms in the most conspicuous type that the work is "printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge"—a statement which might lead some to imagine that these learned bodies had put their *imprimatur* on the text, whereas they have only bought the copyright of the work as a commercial transaction.

The *Preface* gives us the real history of the Revision; and though it is not such a monument of learning as the Translator's preface to the Authorized Version, now no longer printed in the Bible, but to be obtained separately by the studious, yet it is clear and sensible, and gives just the information needed about the principles on which the Revision was undertaken.

As to the *editing* of the book, one or two remarks may be made, based upon an examination of the 8vo. (minion) edition. The general appearance of the book is good, and the type is fair but rather closely packed; the stereotype plates from which the text is printed are already becoming damaged and need looking after; the paper and presswork are capable of improvement, but the press has been very well read, and we doubt if many misprints will be detected. The most serious editorial defect is the arrangement of the page-headings, which give chapter and verse on the inner margin instead of the outer. How any practised Biblical editor can have ordered this is a marvel. If the numbers of the chapters were inserted with the title of the book, and the paging was put at the bottom in the centre, then there would have been room for what are called "running page-headings," which would have been most convenient to the reader, and would not have been of the nature of comment. Readers of the Bible Society's Paragraph Bible will see carried out what is here suggested. Another slight editorial defect appears to be in the numeration: the numbers marking the chapters are too small, and those marking the notes are too large. These seem little things to speak of, but they tend to mislead the student, who wants clearness above everything.

The book is rightly printed in paragraphs, and the poetical parts are in some cases printed in indented lines; but a great deal more of the Old Testament might have been exhibited in its poetical form to great advantage. Editors will differ in their arrangements, but the Revisers must have had before them not only the Paragraph Bibles of the three great English Societies, but also some foreign Bibles, such as that prepared by M. Louis Ségond, and might have easily told off one or two

of their members to submit to their company a copy based on those works. Apparently the New Testament Revisers thought that the Prophetical Books would be printed in parallels. This has led to the anomalous fact that passages cited in the New Testament as poetry appear in the Old Testament as prose.

It is strange that the Revisers have not availed themselves of the use of *inverted commas* for extracts from speeches and documents in some passages where they would be very helpful, as in the fourth, fifth, and sixth of Ezra. The editors have not divided the Psalms into strophes, as they might well have done, though now and then they have attempted it; but they have grouped some chapters and passages together, and have separated others by "a white line," as may be seen in parts of Job and in the Canticles.

The next things that we naturally look at are the *spelling* and the *English*. Putting aside for the present the spelling of proper names, we observe a slight inconsistency in the Revisers' orthography. It would be natural to suppose that they would adopt the spelling of the day. This they do sometimes, but not always. They have thought fit to write "inclose," not "enclose;" they have put an *e* into the middle of the word "judgment"—as the New Testament Revisers have done—but with what object? The spelling of the word was settled, and called for no revision. They have done away with "sope," "clift," and "pilled," but have retained "fat" for "vat," "fitches" for "vetches," "jubile" for "jubilee," "agone" for "ago," "confectionaries" for "confectioners," "wringed" for "wrung," "tired" for "attired," "astonied" for "astonished," "chapiter" for "capital," "knop" for "knob." No one will quarrel with "crookbackt," or "pluckt," or with "borne," in the active sense, as in Gen. xxx. 20, as compared with Isa. ix. 6.

The word "its" is introduced instead of "his" or "her," where required, in accordance with modern usage, and we no longer read in 1 Kings xiii. 27, "Saddle me the ass; and they saddled him." Is the word "wist" retained? "Forgat" is still left, though we suppose it ought to be pronounced "forgot," as "plat" should probably be pronounced "plot."

A good many *new words* are introduced into the Revision, but not more than might be expected, and there are not so many changes in this respect as in the Revised New Testament, in proportion to the size and nature of the Books. Though the "dragon" has been retained, the "unicorn" has gone out, being replaced by the "wild-ox" (though the "bison" would have been better). "Songs of Degrees" are turned into "Songs of Ascents;" the "college" where Huldah lived is become the "second quarter" (2 Kings xxii. 14); the King's

"chapel" is a "sanctuary;" we are introduced to palanquins, crescents, pendents, satraps, darics, raids, tent-pins, he-lambs, bull-calves, tumours, pipings, and swoons. We have the lotus, the greyhound, the caperberry, hatchets, henna, lye, sandals, caravans, tubes; we read of godless men, worthless men, cavillers, marshals, sorrel horses, moats, castanets, satchels, sashes, shawls, canopies, amulets, terebinths, tunics, interdicts, vaults, bolts, spouts, obelisks, basilisks, papyrus, acacia, gasping, glowing, whirling, gamboling, rustling, festering and teeming. "Artillery" has disappeared, Spirits no longer "peep" (*i.e.* "pipe"), but they adopt the more pleasant method of "chirping;" "carriages" are turned into "baggage," and "Lucifer" becomes "Daystar." "Distemper" is still called "untempered mortar;" doves still have "mouths," and "footmen" figure as before.

Out of respect, no doubt, for the instigators of the Revision, the word "convocation" has been retained; but it is not so clear why the words "candlestick," "beeves," "emerods," and "assay" have been left. Though "foxes" have generally been turned to "jackals," they have been left occasionally for old acquaintance' sake, *e.g.* in Ps. cxvi. 11.

The Revisers have been apparently puzzled as to the use of the hyphen. Thus they print "birthstool" like "footstool." This is well enough, though the word is a queer one; but if they print "almond-blossom," why leave out the hyphen in "snuff-dishes"? Why invent such marvellous compounds as "Presence-bread" and "Anointing-portion"? If they print "sand-lizard" and "land-crocodile," why print "sea mews"? There are some very serious omissions in the matter of hyphens, which will be adverted to in a later paper. Meanwhile we may add a few more to the list of new words. "Bowlful" is good, but "omerful" looks rather curious. "Mirror" is good, instead of "looking-glass," as tending to remind the reader that the object in question was made of metal. "Clasp," "shoulderpiece," "headtire," are good words; of "screen," more anon. It is well to have got rid of "matrix," "tache," "bonnet;" and ladies will be glad to read of "sealskins" instead of "badgerskins," in connection with the Tabernacle. "Ouches" are still left.

The Revisers rather take credit to themselves for having retained the word "bolled" in Exod. ix. 31. But have they explained it rightly? Perhaps it was safe to translate a hard Hebrew word by a hard English one, but if a "Boll" is simply a "ball," or "circular seed-pod," the word can hardly mean "in bloom."

It will be a relief to everyone to find that certain indelicate expressions are removed from the text; and the wonder is that

one or two very strong, not to say coarse idioms, have been allowed to remain, as in 2 Kings xviii.

One of the most noteworthy changes in the terminology of the Old Testament is the introduction of certain Hebrew words into the text. First among these is the word *Sheol*, which generally answers in its usage to the Greek *Hades*. It is doubtful if the expedient is a good one, and whether such an expression as "the nether world" would not have found more favour with the public. Again, *Abaddon* has been introduced into the text in three places. There is less reason for this innovation than for the last, because the meaning of *Abaddon* is quite clear, and if it had always been rendered "Destruction" or "Ruin," with a capital initial, and with a marginal note on its first appearance, all would have been done that was needed. Besides, if it is good in Job xxvi. 6, why not in Job xxviii. 22 and xxxi. 12? If good in Prov. xv. 14, why not in Ps. lxxxviii. 11; to say nothing of Esther viii. 6, and ix. 5? In the regulations for the Day of Atonement the word "scapegoat" has gone out, and the Hebrew term *Azazel* has been introduced. This change is very questionable, though it may be justified as a confession of our ignorance as to the exact force of the word. Other expressions have been retained which are quite as doubtful as "scapegoat," *e.g.* "familiar spirits." The idolatrous objects called "groves" are turned to *Asherim*. This, again, may be easily justified on literary grounds, but it seems useless from a practical point of view to interpret the obscure by the obscurer. Then there are the *Teraphim*, *e.g.* Gen. xxxi. 19, for and against which the same arguments may be adduced. The words *Nephilim* and *Rephaim* cannot be objected to (see Gen. vi. 4; Deut. ii. 11).

There has also been a tendency to introduce Hebrew names of persons and places instead of their interpretations or translations in several cases. Thus we read of *Atharim* in Num. xxi. 1, 14 instead of "spies," and of *Abarim* in other passages instead of "fords," and of *Beth Merhak* in 2 Sam. xv. 17 instead of a place that was far off. The word "Dammesek" in Gen. xv. 2 looks strange. There seems to be some play on the word "Damascus" in the Hebrew, but the Revisers have been foiled in their attempt to bring it out. The introduction of the word *Rosh*, in Ezek. xxxviii. 2, 3, and xxxix. 1 will interest students of prophecy. The old Greek version has the word; and so have the Sclavonic and Russian Bibles, which represent the people most deeply interested in the chapters in question. We are very glad to see *Suph* substituted for "Red Sea" in Deut. i. 1, and *Cush* for "Ethiopia" in Gen. ii. 13, for the text, as it stood in the Authorized Version, was most bewildering to the geographical investigator. Similarly it is pleasant to observe that

"populous No" is turned into "No-amon" (Nahum iii. 8); but what will be thought of Isa. xxx. 7, where instead of "Their strength is to sit still," we read "Rahab that sitteth still." The margin suggests another interpretation, viz., "They are but arrogancy—be still." The passage has to do with Egypt, and Rahab is supposed to signify Egypt in Ps. lxxxvii. 4, and lxxxix. 10, and Is. li. 9. So that there is probably a play on the word in the passage before us; but we doubt if the Revisers have hit the true point.

"Sela" is rightly introduced into the text in Isa. xvi. 1, xlii. 11 (query "Sela'"), being the Hebrew name answering to the Greek "Petra," the picturesque but now desolate centre of Edomite life. "Palestine" is rightly turned into "Philistia" in Isa. xiv. 29; and the Revisers have boldly inserted the *Nile* in Jer. xlvi. 7. They seem to entertain no shadow of doubt that they are right, and they may be so; but the text is, to say the least, capable of another interpretation, the uprisings of Egypt being compared to the flooding of a *nachal*, that is, a *wady* or watercourse.

In Jer. xli. 17 a new locality has crept into the text, viz. *Geruth*, the rendering "lodging-place" being retained in the margin. Everyone will be glad to find "Meribah" and "Massah" in Ps. xcv. 8. There is a curious note on Jer. li. 1. Here, instead of the old rendering, "The midst of them that rise up against me," we find the Hebrew words "Leb-Kamai" inserted in the text, and a note, saying that according to ancient tradition this is a cypher for *Casdim*, that is Chaldæa.

We confess to a feeling of considerable regret on finding that the name or title of *Messiah* has been omitted from the ninth of Daniel. There must have been potent reasons to cause a two-thirds majority to consent to the change, whereby a word in common use amongst Jews and Samaritans in the days of our Lord is obliterated from the pages of the Old Testament.

The "captains" in 2 Kings xi. 4 are turned into "Carites," who seem no more at home in the passage than the "Matrites" do in 1 Sam. x. 21.

Passing to the spelling of *proper names*, it must be acknowledged that the Revisers have been very merciful to those with which we are most familiar, but they have "taken it out" by touching up *ad libitum* those which are only occasionally referred to in Scripture. So it has come to pass that we have "Grecians" retained where the word is evidently wrong, in Joel iii. 6, and the respectable name "Aphses" (1 Chron. xxiv. 15) turned into the barbarous "Happizzez"! The word "cherubim" being the plural of "cherub," is no more printed "cherubims;" and so the words "Emims" and "Horims"

have taken their departure. The Revisers seem to have shrunk from taking a further step, which, at any rate, would have been welcomed in the margin, viz., the putting "cherubs" and "seraphs" for "cherubim" and "seraphim." For national and tribal names the termination *-ite* seems better than *-im*; at any rate it would be preferable to read "Caphtorites" for "Caphtorim."

The change from "Nazarite" to "Nazirite" seems somewhat pedantic, and the change from "Bekah" to "Beka" (*e.g.* Exod. xxxviii. 26,) is hardly needful, though it may be defended as in analogy with the popular spelling of Beer-sheba. We really need an inverted comma, or some such mark, to stand for the Hebrew letter *Ain*. We are glad to see "Hai" changed to "Ai" in Gen. xiii. 3, for the Hebrew spelling is identical in Genesis and in Joshua (viii. 9), and the letter *H* is here the Hebrew definite article, which stands before several names of places for some obscure reason. "Ships of Chittim" look very strange as "Ships of Kittim" (Numb. xxiv. 24), but the *C* is certainly hard. There is a passion now amongst classical students for the letter *K*, and we may be thankful, under the circumstances, that we do not read of Kyrus. Perhaps it is as well that *Cab* should be turned into *Kab*, but is *Cub* better than *Chub?* The "Kenite" is turned into "Kain" in Numb. xxiv. 22; whilst "Giblites" are turned into "Gebalites" (1 Kings v. 18), but other names of the same kind are unaltered. "Non" is rightly turned into "Nun" in 1 Chron. vii. 27, and "Shemuel" into "Samuel" in 1 Chron. vi. 33; but why is "Jeshua" left standing in Ezra, instead of the more familiar "Joshua"? We are not bound to follow the caprices of dialects in these matters. In 2 Kings xvi. 6 we read "Elath" where the Hebrew is "Eloth," but in 2 Chron. viii. 17 we find "Eloth" retained; why is this? and why do the Revisers print "Zeboiim" in Gen. x. 19, but "Zeboim" in Hos. xi. 8? An "Ephrathite" is turned into an "Ephraimite" in 1 Sam. i. 1, without a note of explanation, so that the unfortunate reader is led to imagine that Samuel belonged to the tribe of Ephraim. There is indeed ground for the translation (see Judges xii. 5); but all Ephrathites were not Ephraimites, as may be seen from Ruth i. 2. There has been such an interminable discussion on the localities mentioned in 1 Samuel, in the pages of the "Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund," that the greatest accuracy is called for in the translation of the names. In Micah v. 4, "Ephratah" is turned into "Ephrathah." The marvel is that "Euphrates" is not restored to its Hebrew name *Phrath!* We see little good in altering "Kirjath," wherever it occurs, into "Kiriath," (*e.g.*, in the name "Kirjath Jearim," where the Revisers take away the

first *j* and leave the last), or to have introduced the words Goiim, Shallun, Hananel, Hanamel, Nethanel, Chislev, Ziv, Pashhur, Morashtite, Oholah, Oholiab, Tehaphnehes (Ezek. xxx. 8), (*but* Tahpanhes in Jer. xliii. 10).

In dealing with Ezek. xxix. 10, "from the tower of Syene," the only alteration made, is for the worse. Syene (which we have retained in the word Syenite) is turned into Seveneh.

Another thing that will strike the attentive student as a novelty is the use made of the word *Aram*. This is the Hebrew name for Syria, and is to be found in Genesis x. 22, as the name of one of the descendants of Shem. A Syrian is an Aramean, and the Syrian language is the Aramean or Aramaic language; but now — oh, horror of horrors!—a Syrian lady is introduced as an Aramitess! The Syrian language is still called Syrian in 2 Kings xviii. 26 (note, Aramean); "Syriack" is turned to "Syrian" in Dan. ii. 4, (note, Aramaic); the Chaldee language or dialect is now spoken of as Aramaic; see notes on Dan. ii. 6, Jer. x. 11, Ezra iv. 7. At the same time the Revisers occasionally refer to Chaldee in their notes. In 1 Chron. xix. 6, we read of *Mesopotamia* and Aram Maachah. Would it not have been better to have dropped the Greek equivalent (if it *is* an equivalent) for "Aram Naharaim" in this place? But is it certain that the country which we call "Mesopotamia" is the country always referred to in the Bible as "Aram Naharaim" (or Syria of the two rivers)? There are reasons for doubting this, as any student of the Bible will see, if he will examine the usage of the expression.

Before bringing this First Paper, which is rather of a preliminary character, to a close, it should be noticed that the Revisers have dealt with *capital letters* in rather an inconsistent way. In Gen. xxxi. 21 we are told that Jacob rose up and passed over the River, and a note is appended, "that is the Euphrates;" but in Deut. xi. 24 we read "from the river, the river Euphrates." Surely the first of these words (river) should have been begun with a capital. In Numb. xxxiv. 12 we read of the "Salt Sea," but in verse 6 we read of the "great sea." Why is this? In Gen. xii. 9 we read of the South, and in a note "Heb. *Negeb*, the southern tract of Judah"; and in Gen. xiii. 10 of the Plain of Jordan, and in a note "or Circle," whilst in Neh. iii. 22 the Plain is explained as "Circuit." Which is right? Thus technical or local words of a peculiar character are marked with capitals. But if it is good to speak of the Tent (Exod. xxxi. 7), why should we read of the "tent of meeting" (Lev. i. 1)? Why not print other technical words with equal care, *e.g.* Pit and Grave, when they stand for *Sheol*, as in Numb. xvi. 30, Gen. xxxvii.

35? This is the only method by which the Revisers' strange inconsistency with reference to *Sheol* could be justified.

In Exod. xxiii. 20 we read, "Behold, I will send an angel before thee;" see also xxxii. 34, and xxxiii. 2. This was no ordinary angel, as is plain from the context in the first-named passage; compare Josh. v. 14. Would not a capital letter have been well placed in these passages, and in the reference to them in Isa. lxiii. 9?

Public attention has already been drawn to the absence of the capital *S* in the word "spirit" in some passages, *e.g.* Gen. i. 2, and viii. 3; but there are other noteworthy passages where the defect is to be noticed, *e.g.* Isa. xlii. 1, "I have put my spirit upon him;" Isa. lxi. 1, "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me;" Isa. lxiii. 10, "They grieved his holy spirit." The Revisers of the New Testament are far better in this respect, for in the passages where these three verses are referred to, the capital letters are retained. See Matt. xii. 18, Luke iv. 18, and Ephes. iv. 30. There are certain passages where it may be difficult to decide what to do about capitals, but we cannot acquit the Old Testament Revisers of serious blame for cutting the knot in this rough-and-ready fashion.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—THE CHURCH AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

SINCE the passing of the Education Act of 1870, it is to be feared that an idea has been gaining ground that the Church is no longer under any obligation to give her attention to the formation and maintenance of Elementary Schools. This idea has, of course, been fostered from the first by the advocates of a purely secular education, and also by those who, having taken up the Board School System like a new toy, have made up their minds that there is no school to be compared with a "Board" school, while others have gradually adopted it as a natural effect of the twofold tax which has been laid upon their purse by the demand for a School Board Rate in addition to their accustomed voluntary subscriptions to their Parochial Schools. These influences have operated, more or less powerfully in different neighbourhoods, to chill the growing enthusiasm which was formerly felt in favour of Voluntary Schools, and to endanger the continuance of the Voluntary System; so that up to the present time no fewer than 750 Church Schools have already been abandoned, while

clergy are still found who openly avow their readiness to throw their schools upon the tender mercies of a Board, and Lay Churchmen, in increasing numbers, who refuse any further support to Church Schools. It shall be our endeavour in this paper to show that the idea to which we have alluded is a most mistaken one, and that the policy of surrender and inaction to which it gives rise is likely to be as disastrous to the interests of true religion in the future as it is unjustifiable from the experience of the past.

The earlier history of elementary education is sometimes forgotten in the revolution caused by its later development under the Act of 1870; and people are apt to talk as if the work had been originated by the State simply for the purpose of promoting secular knowledge. Thus the teaching of religion comes to be regarded as a questionable importation into the scheme, or at best as an addition to it of only secondary value. But as a matter of fact, it was the Church, and not the State, that was first struck with the importance of educating the children of the working-classes, and it was a religious impulse and a religious aim that prompted the Church to embark upon the work, in the face of great difficulties and not a little opposition; so that elementary education may be said to owe everything—even its very existence—to religion, and that religion the Faith of Christ, mainly as it is enshrined in the life of the Church of England.

It was during the latter part of last century that the Church of England awoke to a consciousness of her responsibility in this matter. The wisest of men had said long since, "Train up a child in the way he should go," and there was the National Church, the spiritual mother of the people, altogether neglecting this important duty so far as regarded the poorer classes. The Master had said, speaking as the Saviour of the world and as the living Head of the Church, "Feed My lambs;" and the lambs were either perishing where they were for want of knowledge, or straying to other pastures. Once alive to this great shortcoming, the Church of England took vigorous measures to supply what had hitherto been wanting. With the assistance of the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, she commenced a system of national education based upon the great principle that "the fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom," and therefore having as its main object instruction in the Scriptures and in the Book of Common Prayer. The work grew with such rapidity that in 1811 it became necessary to form the National Society, for the purpose of giving it a more individual and careful attention than the S.P.C.K. could then do. And now the country began to be covered with a network of "National

Schools," where boys and girls were taught their duty towards God and towards their neighbour, and were fitted for the fulfilment of that duty by further instruction in all useful elementary knowledge. In the year 1832 this excellent work came under the tardy notice of the State; and although the State was not yet prepared to make the work its own, an annual grant was nevertheless voted by Parliament in order that it might be fostered and encouraged. Thus the Church, and to no small extent other religious bodies as well, went on creating an appetite for elementary education throughout the country, until at last, in 1870, the State felt itself constrained to take the matter up more seriously, in order to secure without further delay to every child in the realm the opportunity of being educated.

Now, whatever may have been the design of the State in furthering the cause of elementary education, it is perfectly clear from the foregoing historical sketch that the Church has taken up the work from the first as a *religious* work, for the purpose of training up children in the fear of God. Nothing, therefore, can ever justify the Church in abating her efforts, unless it can be shown that the children of the working-classes no longer stand in need of religious instruction, or that the work of so instructing them is being sufficiently carried out by means of other trustworthy agencies. Such a condition of things has not yet been arrived at, and we have no reason to suppose that it ever will be. The spread of infidelity, the increasing snares and temptations offered by an advancing civilization seem, on the contrary, to make it more and more necessary that the Church should give every possible attention to the religious training of the young through her elementary schools. No other agency has released her from this responsibility. School Boards certainly have not; if anything, they have served to increase her anxiety, for with a great semblance of benevolence their action is so uncertain, that they are as likely as not to withhold from the children under their care the one branch of knowledge of vital importance, or to present it in such a mutilated form that it is practically of no value. Sunday-schools have not; for although we would not say one word in disparagement of the loving, patient, self-denying labours of the vast army of voluntary teachers who are week by week employed in our Sunday-schools, yet experience has shown us that, while Sunday-school teaching is a most valuable supplement to the religious teaching given in the day-school, it can never take its place. The constitution of a Sunday-school of necessity precludes it in most places from having either the time or the teaching-power sufficient to impart that thorough grounding in religious knowledge

which is so essential to the maintenance of the Faith. It is, therefore, as much the Church's duty now as ever it was to give her attention to the formation and maintenance of elementary schools, that she may continue, through their instrumentality to provide systematic religious instruction for the children of the working-classes.

But in addition to this great call of duty there are other important considerations of a practical character which should encourage Churchmen to persevere in their support of Church Schools. Take first the immense sums of money which have been voluntarily contributed for the work up to the present time. No less than £11,759,833 has been contributed for school building, and £15,723,180 for school maintenance; while £271,185 has been contributed for the building of Training Colleges, and £375,949 for their maintenance. What capital, therefore, the Church has invested in this holy enterprise! what sacrifices her members have made in its behalf! Shall we, then, for the want of a little enthusiasm, suffer all the labours and self-denials of the past in this cause to become of no avail to future generations? God forbid! Rather let us go on building upon the good foundation which has been so well laid for us, by doing all that we can to maintain and develop the capabilities of our Church Schools.

Then observe the remarkable success which has so far crowned the work. There is no occasion to refer again to the period previous to 1870. We will simply note the position which Church Schools have held since that date. In the eyes of Churchmen the great Education Act did not sufficiently recognise the importance of the religious principle upon which elementary education had formerly been based. They could not, therefore, give it as hearty a welcome as they would otherwise have done. But they saw that there was no use in hopelessly bewailing the defects of the Act, and, for the most part, they adopted the wiser course of accepting accomplished facts, and adapting their educational machinery to somewhat altered circumstances. On all sides where it was pronounced necessary, and where it was found possible, new Church Schools were built, or the old ones enlarged until the original accommodation was increased nearly twofold; so that even now, although so many schools have been abandoned, and although for fifteen years School Boards have enjoyed the power of the rates for extending their operations, the Church of England still provides accommodation for as many children as are provided for in the Board Schools and in the schools of all other denominations put together.[1] The Training Colleges

[1] The statistics are these: Church of England Schools, 2,413,676; Board Schools, 1,396,604; and Religious Denominations, 860,161.

for teachers were also improved and enlarged, so far as the case required, so that the Church of England still trains twice as many teachers as are trained by all other agencies put together. Thus has the Church been enabled in the face of serious rivalry and increased difficulties, not only to maintain, but even to extend, her operations in the work of elementary education. She has only failed in places where the circumstances have been quite exceptional, or where interest and enthusiasm have been chilled through the growth of the half-hearted idea which we are endeavouring to combat.

With the strong sense of duty which has been bequeathed to us by past generations, and with the powerful encouragement which is given us to fulfil our duty by the present position of our own schools, we should exhibit no hesitation in our efforts to promote the cause of elementary education as a distinctly religious work. In some respects the responsibility of the Church in this matter is even greater than formerly. For it has now become necessary to employ the Church's educational machinery not only for directly influencing those who actually make use of it, but also as far as possible for indirectly influencing other educational agencies with a view to encouraging them to be religious. Every Church School which is zealously maintained in a state of efficiency, both trains its own scholars up in the fear of God, and also exercises a kind of constraint upon the neighbouring Board Schools to do the same by their scholars. Whereas, on the contrary, every Church School that is neglected or abandoned, both sacrifices the spiritual well-being of its own scholars and depreciates the importance of religious teaching in the eyes of neighbouring School Boards, so that theirs suffer also.

Thus elementary education in Church Schools possesses a missionary value which should never be lost sight of. It is indeed as much a mission work as any other Church undertaking, and as such it should be entered upon and developed with spirit and with vigour. Looking at the work of elementary education from this point of view, we shall be better prepared to face the difficulties and discouragements which sometimes surround it, and shall not lose heart at every change in the Code or advance in the School Board rate, which affect prejudicially our own school finances.

Every real mission work has its special hindrances, and the work of Church education is no exception in this respect. The jealousy and opposition of Secularists and of School Board enthusiasts; the troublesome restrictions placed by the State upon the delivery of religious instruction; the obstacles placed in the way of obtaining sufficient pecuniary support by the Code and by the School Board rate—these are some of

the hindrances which Churchmen must expect to meet in the work of elementary education. But while they may take all reasonable steps to remove these hindrances, they should never allow themselves to be dismayed or baffled by them, but should simply endeavour to surmount them in the strength of Him for whom they are working.

It will be found, more especially in town parishes, that wherever this missionary importance of Church Schools is systematically kept before the parishioners, there is seldom much difficulty in raising the required voluntary aid for educational purposes. In some towns, where this has been the case, Church people have both provided the entire school accommodation, and continued ungrudgingly to support the schools with their annual subscriptions. In country parishes where there are no wealthy residents, and where agricultural depression prevails, financial difficulties no doubt press more heavily. But even here they have not been found insuperable, and they might be still more easily met if a more general support was given to the several Diocesan Education Societies. The Archbishop of Canterbury is now appealing to every congregation in his diocese to give some annual support, however small, to the Canterbury Diocesan Society. If this appeal were properly responded to, the Society would be in a position to make grants for the support of Church Schools in any parishes where such external aid was really required. The same plan might easily be followed in other dioceses. We sincerely hope that this may speedily be done. We are confident that elementary education is a work which grows in interest and importance in our parochial organization with cultivation. The Church in any parish without a Church school is in our opinion a maimed and imperfect institution; and we would not only urge that all existing Church Schools should be jealously maintained, but that in new parishes every effort should be made as time goes on to provide new schools wherever it may be possible to do so. We are not prepared to say that no case can ever arise in which it may be necessary to abandon a Church school, but we do feel that such cases are so exceptional that their occurrence should be extremely rare. The Roman Catholics, who in this question at least are our example as well as our allies, have not, we believe, up to the present time surrendered a single one of their elementary schools.

The unworthy abandonment of Church Schools means the sacrifice of a great principle, the betrayal of a great trust. It means the renunciation of a grave responsibility, and the loss of much influence for good. It means the handing over the rising generation to a colourless creed, and perhaps to no

creed at all. It means a step towards national apostasy. Whereas, on the other hand, the careful retention of elementary education as part of the mission work of the Church means the preservation of a religious influence over the mind of the country which does not end with the religious instruction given in the schools, but permeates everywhere, checking the spread of infidelity, opposing the progress of vice, forestalling to some extent the need for those special missions among the people, which have so often seemed in their disappointing results as if they had come too late; in short, promoting generally the spiritual welfare of our nation by spreading the dominion of the Kingdom of God.

J. M. BRAITHWAITE.

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

VII. JULY. ST. JAMES THE APOSTLE.

A. FIVE SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS.

"*Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church; and he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword; and because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also.*"—ACTS xii. 1-3.

WE experience no difficulty in identifying that James whom we commemorate during the present month, and in separating him off from others in the New Testament who bore that name. It is well known that we touch now one of those intricate questions which have perplexed theologians.[1] But no such question arises in the present instance. That St. James who is now before our attention is quite accurately defined: he is the earliest martyr among the Apostles, and he is the brother of John, who lived the longest. The Epistle and Gospel for the day set these two aspects of the commemoration before us in this order, and in this order we may consider them. The topics (though not without a deep inner connection) being different in their character, it is not needful in this instance to have regard to chronology.

There is an advantage in taking the whole of the context in its continuity, because in this way we gain a general im-

[1] See remarks on the Festival of St. Philip and St. James in THE CHURCHMAN for May. The St. James before us in this month is the San Iago of Compostella, for whom such strange legends have been invented. There is a touch of edification in one part of the story, where it is said that in Spain he made only seven converts.

pression of the spirit of the passage chosen for St. James's day, and this is a case where the general impression has great value for us, as well as our observation of the particulars separately.

Five persons are here named—first, St. *Paul* and St. *Barnabas*, who, though afterwards active missionaries of the Lord Jesus Christ, never, so far as we know, saw the Lord in His earthly presence; next, St. *Peter* and St. *James*, who were His constant companions from those early days by the Sea of Tiberias to the time of His Ascension;[1] finally, *Herod the king —that is*, Herod Agrippa I., the grandson of that earliest King Herod who slew the infants at Bethlehem, and the nephew of that other Herod who built the city of Tiberias, and who took part in the mocking of Jesus before His crucifixion.[2]

These five persons, too, are presented to us in one view; and the place in connection with which they are so presented is Jerusalem.[3] It is a remarkable passage in the earliest history of the Church. Diverse elements in that history seem to meet here in one point, and to speak in eloquent language of what had happened and of what was coming. Barnabas and Paul represent the approaching diffusion of the Gospel throughout the Gentile nations; Peter and James remind us of the parables and miracles of Christ within the limits of Judæa; Herod impersonates the inevitable collision of Christianity with the selfish and cruel forces of the hostile world.

Barnabas and Paul, indeed, are not yet what they afterwards became. We observe, in fact, that the name of Barnabas is mentioned first, and that Paul still bears his old name of Saul.[4] No great missionary expeditions have as yet been undertaken; no Apostolic epistles of world-wide and perpetual renown have as yet been written. Yet that in which he and Barnabas were now engaged was most strictly a work of preparation for the spread of the Gospel. There was great poverty among the early Christians of Judæa. Why this was so we need not at present inquire; but that this was the case we have proofs in more places than one of the sacred history.[5] This was known at Antioch, where Barnabas and Paul were labouring; and in the prospect of impending scarcity the Christians there "determined, every man according to his ability, to send relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judæa; which also they did, and sent it by the hands of Barnabas and Saul."[6] This errand on which they went may have had very great consequences.

---

[1] See Matt. iv. 18, 21 and John xxi. 2.
[2] He was also the father of Herod Agrippa II. (Acts xxv. 13; xxvi. 2).
[3] Acts xii. 1, 19
[4] *Ibid.*, xi. 30.
[5] See Rom. xv. 26.
[6] Acts xi. 30.

It was, indeed, simply an errand of kindness; and kindness is not religion—there may be kindness without religion. But, on the other hand, religion is kindness; there cannot be religion without kindness. How warmly hearts were bound together by this benevolence, how much of mutual confidence was inspired, what solid preparation made for the deeper acceptance and wider diffusion of the Gospel, we cannot tell. But two things we may say very confidently: first, that this juxtaposition of events and persons in the Acts of the Apostles is not accidental; and that now, as well as then, by treating people kindly, we prepare them to accept those religious principles which we feel to be of such infinite importance, and to believe that those principles are true.

Peter and Paul are always parallel figures, standing side by side, and prominent above all others, when we look back at the beginning of Apostolic Christianity. Here the picture is enlarged by the presence of Barnabas and James; and for the moment our chief attention is turned to James, who in himself, perhaps, is the least conspicuous of the four. Various things in the consideration of his death are very affecting to us. His work on earth, in his Master's cause, was absolutely finished before St. Paul's great work began. How true this is to the course of God's mysterious providence in all ages since! There is no symmetry in Providence, but there is a fitness in its mystery and a deep law of wisdom which at present we cannot fathom. Then we are always much affected by the thought of early deaths. St. Stephen died young—St. James died young; and both died by martyrdom. There is nothing gloomy in such deaths; the thought of them seems to bring us nearer to the better world. Still, they move our feelings as nothing else moves them, and they remind us how bad a world this is, which puts to death its purest and its best. Once more, it is affecting to remember that in the death of James an inroad was made in the sacred and united circle of the Apostles. It is like some of the saddest parts of our domestic experience. The first breaking of the circle was the death of Judas; the second was the death of James. Some of our friends pass away with the mark of sin upon them. It is a terrible thought; and we can only consign them to God, Who is just and knows all secrets. Some leave us with hope on their faces, and we rejoice while we weep. This separation, too, of Peter and James was the close of a special and most intimate friendship. Together they had been on the Mount of Transfiguration—together in the death-chamber of Jairus's daughter—together in the Garden of Gethsemane; and now all possibility of seeing one another on earth again was over.

And what are we to say of Herod? We may attend just to

one phrase in the narrative. It sometimes happens that a phrase in the Bible histories, which at first sight seems quite incidental, is afterwards found to be full of meaning. So it is here. *Because he saw it pleased the Jews,* he proceeded to "take Peter also." What an unworthy motive for so great a crime! And yet how common a motive this is among mankind! How well we all understand the temptation which it involves! How often we find, as we go through the picture-gallery of the Bible, that we discover traces of our own characters in the portraits of the sinners, if not of the saints!

B. THE FOLLY OF AMBITION.

"*Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?*"—MATT. xx. 22.

It was a foolish ambition, though very natural. And there was for this ambition the excuse of ignorance. We can fix very definitely the time in our Lord's life on earth when those words were addressed to James and John. It was in coming to Jerusalem for the last time. The very place is known to us. It was in the neighbourhood of Jericho.[1] The Lord had been telling His disciples of His coming humiliation, of His suffering, and His death,[2] and they were utterly unable to understand His meaning.[3] They were alarmed and perplexed.[4] The Lord recognised this, and graciously made allowance for it. "Ye know not what ye ask," was His gentle word of rebuke. But at the same time also He spoke to them of His reigning, of His supremacy. This, too, it is quite obvious, they were very far from understanding. Yet this appealed persuasively to their natural human feelings, while the other revelation was a shock to them. Thus the ambition was natural, and on this account it had some superficial excuse. Moreover, words had been used which led them to suppose that the "kingdom" would "immediately" appear.[5] It might well seem to them (and to their mother) that no time ought to be lost. But again they were very conscious that they were privileged ones among the twelve. They (with Simon) had been selected companions of their Lord on confidential occasions. They were "Boanerges" on the same authority which had made him "Peter."[6] Moreover, they might seem to have a privilege which did not belong to him, inasmuch as they were cousins of the Lord Himself. Thus, on many accounts, we must admit that this ambition was natural.

---

[1] See Mark x. 32, 46. [2] Matt. xx. 17-19. [3] Luke xviii. 34.
[4] Mark x. 32. [5] Luke xix. 11. [6] See Mark iii. 17.

Yet it was very foolish; and in order to see its folly we cannot do better than to pursue this solemn and sacred history, and to consider what really did happen to these two brothers, James and John. "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" They did "indeed" drink of this cup, and were baptized with this baptism. They learnt the meaning of the thrones accessory to the throne of Christ. They were associated with His crucifixion, yet in ways very different. James was the first of the twelve to die the martyr's death. John lived the longest, and did not literally die a martyr's death. Yet perhaps he was still nearer than his brother to his Master's martyrdom, for he had prolonged experience of the sufferings connected with the Cross, of the contradiction of sinners, of the cruelty of persecution, of the care of human souls.

To Zebedee and Salome, if they survived, and especially to the latter, it must have been a severe blow, when the hope of a distinguished career for James was suddenly cut short by the sword of Herod. The Crucifixion had, no doubt, in some degree opened their eyes. The deeper meaning of many words spoken by Jesus must have become apparent to the women who were gathered round the Cross.[1] That which was meant by the "throne"[2] of Christ was now better understood. Probably the death of Stephen had opened out some part of the glories of martyrdom. Yet the abrupt and final close of a life of hope cannot have been what they conjectured or imagined. The Lord had spoken of James as destined to share His "cup" and His "baptism." The higher the value these parents set upon this honour, the higher their estimate of their son's qualifications for a great career, the deeper must have been their grief when the blow fell. The subject is purposely set before the reader in this way, because it is in the light of the disappointment of parents that the early cutting off of a hopeful life is most evidently sorrowful. How constantly we have illustrations of this form of trial around us! This frequently has become the groundwork of proverbs. The best, we say, "die first;" those who are admirable and full of blessing to others in early life are "too good to live." Perhaps one great meaning of this martyrdom of St. James, as

[1] See Mark xv. 40.

[2] Each of these thrones was in fact a cross. This thought is very forcibly expressed by de Pressensé ("Jesus Christ, Son Temps, Sa Vie, son œuvre," pp. 528, 529): "Les douze trônes qui sont promis aux apôtres commenceront par être des croix. . . . En d'autres termes, avant de régner il faut souffrir. Il n'en est pas du royaume de Dieu comme du royaume du monde où les rois et les grands dominent."

recorded in Holy Writ, is to give point to such experience in life, to call our attention to a solemn mystery of Divine Providence, to admonish us of the mistake which lies at the root of ambition. Certainly, as we carefully study this history, we clearly see the folly there was in the petition laid before our Lord, however true it may be that there were excuses that lead us to judge that petition leniently.

And this folly becomes equally apparent if we take into our serious thought the case of St. John. His martyrdom was quite as real as that of his brother—nay, more real. Let us ask ourselves, Who suffers the most in this world of varied trial? Not he who is abruptly cut down on the threshold of a distinguished career, though in such a disappointment there is a pathetic interest which misleads us. Who is really the nearest to Christ? Not he whose opportunity has been the shortest, but he who by suffering, by sympathy, by sad knowledge of the hearts of men, has had the deepest and fullest experience. These truths receive signal illustration through the example of this Apostle, viewed in the light of the subject before us. Often must he have said during those long years, This is my Master's "cup;" this is my Master's "baptism:" here is part of the explanation of the great riddle spoken that day on the way to Jerusalem. The martyrdom of John was indeed a reality, not simply in Patmos, "in tribulation, and in the patience of Jesus Christ, for the Word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ,"[1] but during those long years at Ephesus, where he was "tarrying" till his Lord should "come,"[2] spending laborious days and anxious nights in the presence of sinners, amid vulgar contentions and degrading ambition. And yet he himself had once been guilty in this very way. How much he had learnt since those early days in Galilee! Once he had wished to call down "fire from heaven" upon his Lord's adversaries.[3] Now he was seeking to obtain the sway over human hearts by the exercise of humility. Can we not see how this great example suits our own day—suits every day and every age? Studying thus his biography, we learn how to take a true estimate of the best methods of suffering with Christ, of serving Him, and of becoming a blessing to mankind.

---

[1] Rev. i. 9. [2] See John xxi. 22.

[3] "These were the two disciples who made themselves so prominent in resenting the rudeness of the Samaritan villagers. The greatest zealots among the Twelve were thus also the most ambitious: a circumstance which will not surprise the student of human nature. On the former occasion they asked fire from heaven to consume their adversaries; on the present occasion they ask a favour from Heaven to the disadvantage for their friends. The two requests are not so very dissimilar."—Dr. Bruce on the "Training of the Twelve," p. 274.

In such studies we must never forget that we have before us part of the Lord's divinely-planned training of the Twelve for their future work. Thus, while there is a pattern for ourselves in these Gospel incidents, there is in them much more than this. The whole treatment of James and John, viewed in this way, is full of the utmost interest. Those early lessons by the Sea of Tiberias; these later lessons by the same lake; that admonition in Samaria; those favoured communications of Divine knowledge in the chamber of Jairus, at the Transfiguration, upon the Mount of Olives,[1] in Gethsemane; and that well-defined scene on the way near the Jordan, which has been particularly under our thoughts—all were parts of one great instruction, which was to have its results in the process of founding the Church. Great principles, thus taught, were to be laid firm for ever. All future ages were to reap the harvest, of which the seeds were then sown.

Yet—such is the many-sided power of Holy Scripture—we have in the last scene an admonition and rebuke within the sphere of the most commonplace action. There is a vulgar offence against right feeling and right principle, with which we are familiar everywhere around us. This is the filling up of public appointments on the mere selfish aim at self-advancement, without regard to the public good, or to the claims of those who are really fitted for such posts. Thus society is injured, the general standard of duty is lowered, and jealousy and discontent are promoted. It must be confessed also that admission to high ecclesiastical appointments has too often been conducted on this faulty method. Now the existence of such low views of responsibility is very apparent in James and John upon this memorable occasion. When Matthias was appointed to succeed Judas, it was expressly stipulated by Peter, under Divine inspiration, that the new Apostle must have the requisite qualifications.[2] And here too it is solemnly asserted that for high service there must be the accompaniment of fitness. Thus does the lofty teaching of the Bible flow over the surface of our common life, and fill even the very crannies of society.

And yet one side more of this subject must be touched—though perhaps the hand that touches it should be gentle. It seems cruel to single out Salome for special blame. Yet scheming for domestic advancement is very full of mischief. Family ambition is seriously to be blamed. Christian mothers ought to learn here part of their highest duty towards their sons.

J. S. HOWSON.

[1] See Mark xiii. 3.

[2] See THE CHURCHMAN for February.

ART. IV.—THE ARCHDEACON OF LEWES ON CATHEDRALS.

The Pulpit, the Cathedral, and the School. An Address delivered at his Seventh Visitation, May, 1855. By JOHN HANNAH, D.C.L., Archdeacon of Lewes and Vicar of Brighton. Brighton: H. and C. Treacher.

ARCHDEACON OF LEWES is a title which has been especially known and esteemed in the present century; and a Charge by Archdeacon Hannah is sure to be read. A divine of marked ability and rich culture, whose learning is both varied and sound, Archdeacon Hannah has a reputation as an administrator as well as an author. In knowledge of educational and ecclesiastical questions he ranks high, and he is, moreover, a keen observer of the times who is thoroughly practical. His opinions, therefore, whether in a Diocesan Conference and the Central Council, or in the House of Convocation of which he is an ornament, carry weight; they are known to be the result of very careful consideration, free from prejudice.

The Archdeacon's Charge for the present year, which is now before us, seems to have more than ordinary interest. The subject set forth in it is the ideal of the *Ecclesia docens* through the Pulpit, the Cathedral, and the School. By most Churchmen, perhaps, it will be thought that the suggestions as a whole are judicious, and truly conservative; and the tone breathed throughout is such that, whether here and there we agree or differ, we cannot fail to listen with respect.

On only one division of the subject is it our present purpose to touch. What has the Archdeacon to suggest, in these democratic days, as to our Cathedrals?

The true ideal of these noble foundations, he says, "lends itself most worthily to the promotion of theological study, and to the work of raising the standard of sacred worship among the clergy. I am well aware that the relation of the Cathedral to the Diocese involves many considerations of deep significance and importance. 'The Cathedral,' says the Bishop of Peterborough, 'is the central and principal church of the Diocese, and ought to be the centre, as far as possible, of Diocesan organization and work.'[1] But this fruitful principle," continues the Archdeacon, "must not lead us to forget the claims which affect Cathedrals in relation to the Church at large. First and foremost, no doubt, a Cathedral was meant to supply the Bishop with his Council. But a Bishop's Council should contain men

[1] "Report of the Royal Commissioners on Peterborough Cathedral," appendix, p. 16.

of light and leading, as well as merely able administrators of Diocesan departments."

Three things appear "to me," says the Archdeacon, "to stand out clearly in the ideal of Cathedral institutions; first—for I should distinctly put this first—that the Cathedral should be the centre for Diocesan good works; next, that it should supply a home for study and devotion; thirdly, that it should provide a school of learning for the younger clergy, as well as opportunities for the training of candidates for Orders."

Now, the first of these heads, important as it is, has recently received, perhaps, an undue share of attention:

It is the aspect of the case [says the Archdeacon] which is put most prominently forward by the Cathedral Commissioners, in whose Final Report we read that, "in general they have regarded the Cathedral and the members of the Cathedral body with reference, not merely to the city in which they exist, nor, on the other hand, merely to the Church at large, but also, and *perhaps chiefly*, to the interests of the Diocese of which the Cathedral is the Mother-Church, and the Dean the leading Presbyter."[1] And again, at the close of their Report, "But, above all, the feelings with regard to the ties which bind together the Cathedral and the Diocese have undergone an unspeakable amount of change in the last few years, and, as we believe, have much improved. Many things have concurred to bring about this change."

The conception of the Bishop of a Diocese working from his Cathedral as a spiritual centre, of the capitular body being interested in the whole Diocese, and of the whole Diocese having claims upon the capitular body, has grown and is growing.

I readily admit [says the Archdeacon] that this consideration ought to occupy a leading place in any complete account of the present or prospective uses of Cathedrals. Taking them even in their broadest aspect, we must allow that a strong and healthy centre is the best support for an extended circumference; and that to make Cathedrals, in the words of the Commissioners, "more distinctly centres of spiritual light and life in the Diocese," "will strengthen their position, and make them more valued by the Church at large."[2] It is perfectly true that it was because the Cathedrals had generally, if not universally, lost touch with their respective Dioceses, that they were mowed down to a comparatively helpless uniformity by the legislation of 1840. It is because they have now drawn themselves into closer and more cordial relations with each Diocese, by many a useful act of sympathy and service, that Churchmen are beginning to recognise them as amongst the most important factors in the growing prosperity of the Church in England.

It is a good preliminary test for new proposals, therefore,

[1] "Final Report of the Cathedral Commissioners, 1885," p. 3.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

to ask these questions: Will their acceptance and adoption cause the Cathedrals to become more completely than they are already the centres of religious life and work throughout the Diocese? Will the new forms of statute which are recommended to our notice secure a more complete and living interchange of spiritual help and service, between the pastors and people of secluded parishes and the great Mother-Church?

To secure "affirmative answers to these questions," says the Archdeacon, "would be an excellent beginning; but I must maintain that it should be combined with a distinctive recognition of the value of Cathedrals as the homes and centres of theological learning."

An important feature in all recent proposals for Cathedral Reform, says the Archdeacon, is the restoration of the Greater Chapter to its proper position as the *concilium et senatus Episcopi*—an official Diocesan Council for the Bishop. With regard to the Lesser or Residentiary Chapter, he goes on to say that proposals for investing a portion of its members with Diocesan Administrative duties should be favourably considered. Thus, the Precentor and the Chancellor might do good service in the Diocese.[1] "And, above all, there is a widespread feeling that it would dignify and spiritualize their other duties if the members of the Residentiary Chapter could be counted on to assist their brethren as Missionary Preachers, whenever their other engagements permitted it and their assistance was desired. There would be no difficulty in finding time for this important function if the Residentiaries were resident; and the adoption of the plan would be a sufficient reply to the objections raised against the views of those who urge the necessity of longer residence, on the ground that they would bind fast to the Cathedral a body of clergy who for a large part of the year would have nothing to do." In this we thoroughly agree with the Archdeacon, and the point, our readers are aware, has been pressed in THE CHURCHMAN as an urgently needed reform.[2] The Archbishop of Canter-

[1] The Precentor might not only see that the Cathedral maintained in its services a model and example of the highest perfection of musical worship, which is his primary duty, but might, with very great advantage to the Diocese, take a kindly interest in the choral services of humbler fanes. The Chancellor, if not, as at Lincoln and elsewhere, the actual head of a great theological school, might usefully survey our whole educational apparatus.

[2] The plea has been three times urged in the Chichester Diocesan Conference by the Rector of Kingston-by-Sea. Thus, in the year 1880, Mr. Purton said: "A *Mission* can only be held after an interval of some years; but I plead for—to use a cumbrous term—ordinary 'extraordinary' services."

bury, some two years ago, suggested the appointment of Mission Preachers, Canons, or at least one Canon Preacher with a small staff under him, in every Diocese; and his Grace's letter was thankfully welcomed by Church Reformers who for years have pleaded for evangelistic Diocesan services in connection with the strengthening of the Cathedral system.[1]

We also agree with the Archdeacon when he speaks of the Cathedrals as homes for theological study.[2] He says:

> An honoured member of our own body, the late Professor James Mozley, as we read in the interesting volume of his letters, protested against a threatened policy which "would disconnect the Cathedrals from the great stream of theological and philosophical thought in the Church, and make them mere representatives of Diocesan Boards and Committees." The proposed plan, he thinks, would secure "a good deal of professional activity, but the whole will be a fall for the English Church."[3] Of course, we cannot expect that every country Cathedral should emulate the learning of Christ Church, where five of the six Canons are *ex-officio* Professors in a great University. But the tradition of this high function has never been lost. . . . At least one stall, if possible, should be reserved in each Cathedral as an opportunity of scholarly retirement for some man distinguished in sacred learning.[4]

The Archdeacon then turns to the work of theological education. Under this head he observes: "I cannot refer you to a higher authority than the late Bishop of Lincoln, the revered and lamented Bishop Christopher Wordsworth. We are told that 'to the Cathedral he looked for assistance alike in the conduct of ordinations examinations, and in the training of candidates for Holy Orders. "Our Cathedral Churches," he maintained, "were intended to perform functions like those which were discharged of old by the schools of the Prophets in the days of Samuel and Elijah."' This educational work of Cathedrals in relation to the Clergy has been made more prominent in recent years by the foundation of Theological Colleges in connection with many of these bodies, in which useful movement our own Cathedral bears an honourable part."

---

[1] At the Leicester Church Congress Mr. Magniac, M.P., referring to Residentiary Canons, said: "*Residence* should be translated into *Diocesan work.*"

[2] THE CHURCHMAN, vol. xi., p. 304.

[3] "Letters," etc., pp. 303, 333.

[4] In some of the proposed statutes the Cathedral Commissioners provide that a Residentiary Canon may claim exemption from Diocesan duties, "on the ground of his devoting himself to the study of theology, or to pursuits akin to or subsidiary to theology," etc. (St. Paul's, § 5). It would have been desirable to make this condition more explicit and general.

"In some Cathedrals," the Archdeacon continues, "there are Divinity Lectureships of ancient foundation, as at Chichester and Hereford. It is possible that these might be made more useful to the younger clergy." And he adds:

The Cathedral Commissioners have suggested that it should be provided, as far as possible, in the proposed new statutes, that one or more of the Residentiaries should "give instruction in some branch of sound learning and religious education either in the Cathedral city or in some other suitable place or places in the Diocese" (Canterbury, § 10; Norwich, § 12; Ely, § 10; Wells, § 10; Carlisle, § 8; etc., etc.). But the proposal is not very definite, and exemptions are in every case allowed.

"In what I have now ventured to submit to you," concludes the Archdeacon, "I have not been setting forth any new doctrines, as you will see from the following well-expressed definition of the ideal Chapter, which was written by Bishop Scambler in a letter to Queen Elizabeth, as long ago as 1582: 'That kind of foundation,' he says, 'implieth always a Society of learned men, staied and grounded in all parts of religion, apt to preach the Gospel and convince errors and heresies; . . . and further to assist the Bishop, the head of the Diocese, in all Godly and wholesome consultations; inasmuch that the Cathedral [Church ought to be, as it was, the oracle of the whole Diocese, and a light unto all places lying near to it.' Bishop Scambler combines in this passage all the most important propositions I have wished to urge."

We have quoted Dr. Hannah's suggestions as to Mission Preaching in the Diocese by dignitaries of the Cathedral. We may here remark that several suggestions of interest and practical value, bearing more or less directly on diocesan work by members of the Cathedral body, may be found in a recently-issued Convocational *Report* entitled "Spiritual Needs of the Masses of the People."[1] Of the joint Committee of both Houses of Convocation, by whom this *Report* has been prepared, the Archdeacon of Lewes is a member. Among the many matters touched upon in this document, we are pleased to notice a frequent suggestion, by the clergy consulted, that evangelistic work should be carried on by Canons and other Diocesan Preachers.

Art. V.—ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS.

FROM time to time the law of dilapidations in its application to ecclesiastical properties attracts the attention of that considerable body of the clergy who are in the actual

[1] Convocation of Canterbury, 1885, No. 182.

possession of benefices in the Church of England, or are hoping at some future time to succeed to such benefices, and of that more limited proportion of the laity to whom Church matters present a subject of special interest, and who are anxious to promote the welfare of the Church by providing as far as may be for the temporal well-being of its ministers.

This has been more particularly the case since the passing of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act in the year 1871, since which time the law of dilapidations and the Act of 1871 have been pretty continuously under the consideration of Diocesan Conferences, Rural Decanal Chapters, Church Congresses, and similar gatherings, while the Church papers have opened their columns to those who have wished to make public their grievances or suggestions.

In 1876 a Special Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider the subject. They listened to the complaints brought before them by several clergymen; they examined the Archbishop of York, the Secretary of Queen Anne's Bounty, and a few of the Diocesan Surveyors, and were manifestly much struck by a scheme of insurance laid before them in eloquent terms by the Bishop of Peterborough. Their report recommended this scheme to favourable consideration; but failing its adoption they put on record an opinion respecting the Act of 1871, that an "amendment of the law should take place with the least possible delay." On consideration, the scheme of the Bishop of Peterborough did not commend itself to the great body of Churchmen, and the Select Committee's Report was ultimately put on one side by the Secretary of State, who remarked in the House of Commons that while the Report said that amendments were needed, it failed to state definitely what those amendments should be.

The Convocations of York and Canterbury have considered and debated this subject, and appointed divers committees thereon. A Committee of the Lower House of Canterbury has recently brought up a Report and submitted Resolutions which have received the sanction of the House. It is not too much to say that this Committee has shown a far better grasp of the whole bearings of the subject than any that has preceded it, while its Resolutions recognise, to a degree not hitherto common, the good done by the Act of 1871.

As a broad, general proposition it is true that the benefices of the Church of England acquired the glebes and buildings belonging thereto by private gift. No compulsion has ever been exercised, at any rate has ever been exercised by the State, to compel landowners, parishioners, or others to provide residences and glebes for the clergy. Neither has there ever

been any law compelling such persons to maintain the residences of the clergy. Hence from time immemorial the law has called on the clergy themselves to maintain, repair and restore the buildings they occupy and enjoy, in such a way that the Church, or more properly the church of their own parish, should in their time receive no damage; but that its possessions should be handed on from incumbent to incumbent unimpaired in value. When a founder or donor has made over property to a benefice, he has ever had the guarantee of the law that his gift will remain for the perpetual benefit of the incumbents, each of whom, in his time, appropriates, or ought to appropriate, to his personal use such only of the proceeds of the gift as remain after its permanent maintenance is provided for. Incumbents therefore do not occupy their residences entirely free, but on the condition of maintaining them in perpetuity; and it is the ignoring or denying this proposition that has given rise to the great body of the complaints which have been directed against the Act of 1871, and not, as logically they should have been, against the ancient law of dilapidations. In fact, the omission to draw this distinction has given an impractical character alike to the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, to the great mass of the complaints, and to the suggestions made for the amendment of the law.

The ancient law of ecclesiastical dilapidations is founded on the constitutions of mediæval ecclesiastics, on custom, and on the judgments of the Law Courts, particularly on the well-known decision of Wise *v.* Metcalfe, a case tried in 1829. The whole judgment of Justice Bailey is most carefully reasoned out, and it concludes as follows: "The incumbent was bound to maintain the parsonage and also the chancel, and keep them in good and substantial repair, restoring and rebuilding when necessary, according to the original form, without addition or modern improvement; and that he was not bound to supply or maintain anything in the nature of ornament to which painting (unless necessary to preserve exposed timbers from decay) and whitewashing and papering belong."

There is another decision given by Lord Campbell in the case of Martin *v.* Roe, quite in accord with the foregoing, which lays down that incumbents are not to be called on to maintain unnecessary or luxurious buildings, such as greenhouses and conservatories, which are associated with observatories, menageries, and aviaries, the luxurious buildings indulged in by incumbents in the thirteenth century, which it was declared by a constitution of Archbishop Othobon, incumbents were not to be called on to maintain.

While, therefore, the law is strict in requiring that the

substantial structures of the buildings shall be maintained, so that they may be handed on practically unimpaired to succeeding incumbents, it treats ecclesiastics with the greatest leniency with regard to all matters of a perishable or unnecessary character.

There is manifestly no analogy between the position of an ecclesiastical tenant of a benefice and a tenant holding under a lease from a landlord. The incumbent pays no rent; he has entered into no agreement, arbitrarily arranged, as to the repairs he is to do; the question of the subdivision of repairs between landlord and tenant does not arise, for the sufficient reason that being his own landlord, the incumbent has no one else with whom to share the repairs. On the other hand, an incumbent is relieved, so far as the law is concerned, from decorative repairs, papering and painting, a heavy portion of the burden usually borne by a lay tenant. An incumbent must, indeed, hand over his premises to his successor in sound structural and substantial repair, or pay the penalty in dilapidations; but he may omit to paper or paint internally for years, and with impunity leave this opening for the display of the taste of his more fastidious or æsthetic successor. In fact, the Courts of Law have in this case arrived at a conclusion which must be felt to be intrinsically reasonable and just, and which in practice is by no means inconvenient.

On those who would alter this law rests the onus of showing that it is unduly burdensome to the clergy, or that it is unjust, and that there are funds available, other than the revenues of the benefice, from which the repairs of the buildings can be provided for.

Those who have been loudest in their calls for amendments have not perceived—or, at any rate, have ignored the fact—that it is the ancient law with which they are at issue, rather than the Act of 1871. A suggestion has been put forward—and it is recognised by the Select Committee of the House of Commons—that there was a "want of a definition of dilapidations." A more complete study of the subject would have shown that the suggestion is quite unfounded. The law is clear—possibly in some cases it is really felt to be only too clear—as to the liabilities of incumbents.

The administration of the law, however, before 1871 was to the last degree uncertain, and it was to obviate this that "The Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871," was passed. It is a purely administrative Act, and its passing did not alter the liabilities of the beneficed clergy as to their residences and glebe buildings; and hence, in the nature of things, it is impossible that amendments or alterations, while they are confined to the Act itself, should alter those liabilities.

Nevertheless, it is true that the Act has revolutionized the whole practice of Ecclesiastical Dilapidations. In a word, it has substituted certainty for uncertainty.

The administration of the law is put under the control of the Bishops. It is carried out by officially appointed surveyors.

Before 1871, in cases of vacancy, each incumbent appointed his own surveyor—very possibly a local man with fair knowledge of lay dilapidations, but to whom, from their fewness, ecclesiastical cases could come but rarely; and the principles of the two being directly opposed to one another, his views would naturally be very uncertain. To meet him might be appointed a man of like experience; or a sharp new incumbent would call in a London surveyor who made ecclesiastical dilapidations his speciality, to the infinite confusion of the local man.

Either by compromise or by reference to an umpire, a settlement was ultimately agreed to, and a sum of money passed to the new incumbent. He was, however, in the great majority of cases, given no details as to the dilapidations actually paid for; and, in truth, the whole matter being compromised, no details could be given. The new incumbents laying out the money as it seemed to them best, substantial repairs were very likely to be overlooked in favour of more decorative matters.

For this the Act substituted the official surveyor, who necessarily takes pains to acquaint himself with the whole law of the subject, and who acts equitably, somewhat in the character of umpire, between the two parties. It made provision that the works paid for should be set forth in detail, and full particulars served on the parties interested.

Thus it will be seen that the surveyor's work is done in an official way, and that it is open to the inspection and review of the parties interested in the result; and it is not to be wondered at that the reports of men of experience working under such circumstances should be found very generally to be of such a character as not to be modified under the very sufficient provisions for appeal which are embodied in the Act.

When the matter is settled between the new incumbent and his predecessor or his representatives, it becomes the duty of the former to have the necessary repairs executed under the supervision of the surveyor, and hereby an improvement in the condition of church property of a most important kind is now seen to have been effected. By the process of securing that at each vacancy at least the buildings are surveyed, and that they are then put into repair, and that the money recovered for dilapidation is expended on them, a far higher state of repair is established than in former times; while before long, when all benefices will have passed under the Act, the heavy cases of dilapidations, frequently pointed to as causing

great hardships to widows and surviving relatives of incumbents, will be things of the past.

It is open to incumbents themselves to carry out the principle, suggested by the Act, of periodical surveys, to be followed by the execution of such repairs as the surveyor shall find necessary. In order to encourage incumbents in applying the voluntary clauses of the Act a certificate is granted them on the execution of the repairs which exempts them from liability for dilapidations for a period of five years, in case during that time they vacate their benefices.

Every incumbent, therefore, may now obtain information as to his liabilities, which in so limited a time as five years ought not to become very onerous, and by his own action save much trouble, anxiety, and expense to his heirs or representatives.

This constitutes a system of insurance against dilapidation risks of a very perfect kind, and it can be worked much more economically as to office and surveying expenses than any system emanating from a central office: while there is an equitability in each man's repairing the buildings he enjoys, which it would be difficult to equal by any adjustment of premiums.

It would be incorrect and indeed manifestly futile to speak as though, even under the Act of 1871, dilapidations presented no difficulties, and that incumbents might not, under certain circumstances, find themselves unfortunately placed.

Many incumbents who entered on their benefices before 1871 received but a small portion of the amounts which ought to have been secured for them on account of the dilapidations of the buildings which they took over, and as to the expenditure of the sums actually received, they were probably not well advised, and so wants of reparation may have been allowed to accumulate. Even yet a man may succeed an incumbent whose estate is insolvent, and find himself with a responsibility to execute repairs, and no funds available.

In such cases the Act allows the repairs to be put on the future revenues of the benefice by means of a loan from Queen Anne's Bounty, a resource not exactly in itself equitable or desirable, but it is difficult to suggest any more efficient way of solving the question unless some external funds can be drawn on, and none such have yet been pointed out.

There are other sections in the Act relieving incumbents from special difficulties. They are, however, subject to the reasonable condition that the reliefs they afford should be applied by the incumbent during his tenure of office. There is probably no foundation for the suggestions sometimes made, that the Act has been systematically, or even occasionally,

harshly administered. If it is believed to be harshly drawn, it is because a large number of its provisions have been overlooked by the critics.

It is sometimes said to be hard that an incumbent who has laid out money in improvements or additions to the buildings of his benefice, should not be allowed to set off such improvements against the claims for dilapidations. The recognition of such a principle would involve great difficulties in adjusting claims, and lead to long disputes; and as the necessary repairs must be provided for in some way, the living would have to be burdened by a loan. As a fact, however, legislation, which is far more complete in regard to ecclesiastical than to ordinary property, has, by means of the "Gilbert's Acts," already provided for improvements, if only they are such as a bishop and patron can approve, being charged on the benefice by means of loans from Queen Anne's Bounty. Those who, in making additions, have not thought proper to avail themselves of such aid must be content to be numbered among those donors to the Church by whose generosity the ecclesiastical property throughout the country has been accumulated; and it is the merest act of justice to recognise how very largely the beneficed clergy themselves have contributed of late years, from their own resources, to the improvement of their benefices.

Dilapidations can never be an altogether pleasing subject. It is associated with and in fact arises from that decay which is inherent in all mundane things. Storms will beat on our houses, wind and water will find out their weak places, the worm will attack the wood, posts and fences will decay, and buildings wear out, do what we will. The evil of these things can be checked, and an accumulation of dilapidations avoided by timely care, and the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act has done something to compel, and much more to encourage, the application of that care by the clergy to the buildings of the benefices they enjoy. It has done much to adjust simply, cheaply, and efficiently questions of the duty as to the maintenance of buildings of persons holding property with an absolute ownership, hardly inferior to that of freeholders, but for a period strictly limited and in the highest degree uncertain. It is well after fourteen years of severe, if not well-directed, criticism, that the Act should be declared by so competent and at the same time so deeply interested a body as the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, in the Resolutions passed on the 1st May last, to have effected much good, and practically to be incapable of any amendments calculated to be beneficial to the clergy.

LACY W. RIDGE.

ART. VI.—THE VENERABLE BEDE.

IT is altogether a matter of congratulation that a knowledge of the Venerable Bede and his works is becoming much more generally diffused in the country which has had the honour of producing and possessing him. In the history of England before the Conquest there is, with the one exception of King Alfred, no greater ornament of the English Church or of the English nation than Bæda, commonly known as the Venerable Bede. And, at the risk of seeming heterodox in the eyes of the more strict school of modern historians, let us venture to retain the more familiar form of the venerated name. Nothing will induce Englishmen to prefer Aelfred to Alfred, or Eadward to Edward. And a similar prejudice in favour of what is popular rather than pedantic prevents us from substituting Bæda for Bede. Professor Freeman says: "When a name is thoroughly naturalized and has acquired an English form, I would retain that form;" and for this reason he prefers Mahomet to Muhammad. Surely one may with reason go a step further and say: "When in the natural development of a language ancient names have become modified in form, a writer should retain the form current in his own day." In such things (as in translations for popular use), it is better to be understood and found interesting by those who are not scholars than praised by those who are.

The revival of the study of Bede in England began in a most appropriate place—the city of Durham, where whatever portions of his body have not been scattered over Europe as relics still rest. Dr. John Smith, Minor Canon, and afterwards Prebendary of Durham (the only known instance of such promotion), devoted the last years of his life (1700-1715) to editing the Works of Bede. His work was completed by his son, George Smith, afterwards a Nonjuring Bishop, and was published in 1722.[1]

It was a member of the University of Durham, Rev. Joseph Stevenson, at one time University Librarian, who produced the next important edition of Bede, but only of the Historical Works. This was undertaken for the English Historical Society, and published in London in 1841. It reproduces some of Smith's notes. Dr. Hussey's edition was published at Oxford in 1869, and contains more of Smith's notes, but not the "Life of St. Cuthbert." Next year the very careful edition of Books III. and IV., by Mayor and Lumby, was published at

[1] See an interesting paper by Rev. J. L. Low on "The Ven. Bede and his Durham Editors," in the *Durham University Journal*, Nov. 12, 1883.

the Cambridge Press. It is to be hoped that they will edit the remainder with the same thoroughness. But the book would be more attractive to ordinary readers (and it is precisely ordinary readers that it is desirable to attract), if the archaic style of printing were abandoned. To persons accustomed to the usual method of printing Latin it is simply vexatious to have *u* perpetually for *v* and sometimes *v* for *u*.

Besides these valuable editions, various translations have contributed to make Bede's Historical Works accessible even to those who cannot read the original. The present writer knows of no translation between the famous one by King Alfred and that by the controversialist, Thomas Stapleton, published at Antwerp in 1565, and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. Since then there have been translations by Stevens, 1723; Hurst, 1814; Giles, 1840; and Gidley, 1871. To which may be added the popular account of the saint and his times by G. F. Browne in the "Fathers for English Readers," S.P.C.K., 1879; the articles on the subject in the "Dictionary of Christian Biography," and in the new edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica;* and the notices of Bede in the "Old English History" of Professor Freeman, in the "Early English Church History" of Dr. Bright, and in the historical works of the late J. R. Green. Through these various channels one of the greatest names of the eighth century, and indeed of several centuries before and after that, is becoming something more than a name to educated Englishmen.

In almost every branch of human knowledge, whether we are studying the history of literature, or of science, or of Biblical exegesis, or of the course of events in Church and State, if our investigations do not stop short of the time at which Bede flourished, we must, if our work is to be done properly, take account of Bede. Not merely in the history of his own country, of which he is the father, and in the interpretation of Scripture, in which he is a master, but in almost all other departments of learning that had been opened in his day, Bede is first, or among the first. His works have been justly called an encyclopedia of the knowledge extant at that period. His industry must have been enormous, and rivals that of the "adamantine" Origen, or the restless Jerome. The stereotyped epithet of "Venerable" must not make us forget the fact that he did not live to be old. He died at the age of sixty-two, and most of his extant works were written between thirty and fifty-nine. And all his life long he was not only reading and writing, but teaching. Besides which, a very considerable portion of each day was taken up with the services of the monastery. He must have been one of those men to whom change of work is as a rule more refreshing than cessa-

tion from it. "To learn, to teach, or to write was always a delight to me."

It is, of course, his "Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation" that is of supreme interest both to the student and also to the ordinary reader. As the work of a scrupulous, cautious, able scholar, and of a writer who was for the most part contemporaneous, or nearly so, with what he records, its value can scarcely be overrated. If Bede had done nothing else than set the example of dating events according to the Dionysian era of A.D., instead of the clumsy methods, "in the consulship of A," "in the 10th year of the reign of B," and the like, his service to history would have been very considerable. But he not only shows how historical events may most conveniently be dated, but with what care they must be collected and sifted, and in what spirit recorded.

The title of his chief work has probably had something to do with the comparative neglect of Bede. Men who would be ashamed if they had to own that they had never read a play of Shakespeare, or an essay of Bacon, would perhaps hardly take it as a compliment if you assumed that they had read some parts of Bede. It is "*Ecclesiastical* History;" and Ecclesiastical History is not much in their line. But we altogether mistake Bede's meaning and the purpose of his work when we translate *Historia Ecclesiastica* by "Ecclesiastical History" in the modern sense of the term. By the epithet "ecclesiastical" we mean that our observation is to be limited to those things which directly or specially concern the Church. Bede means nothing of the kind; nor is any such limitation observed by him. He adds the epithet in order to assure us that whatever he records is of importance. In his day the Church was the centre of history. Very frequently the leading men who had most to do with the making of history, the ablest statesmen and the ablest legislators, were ecclesiastics. Purely secular history, *i.e.*, history which entirely ignored the doings and writings of Churchmen, would have been comparatively insignificant; and Bede does not wish us to suppose that he works in any such narrow spirit. We prefix "ecclesiastical" to "history" in order to indicate that the point of view is limited. Bede does so to intimate that the point of view is lofty. In his own day this would be understood. But in modern times he would probably have had three times as many readers if, omitting the epithet, he had called his chief work simply "The History of the English Nation."

It is from the last chapter of this priceless history that we learn nearly all that is known of Bede's own life. Apparently he himself recognised this as the culminating point in his

labours; for he appends to it a brief autobiography and a list of his writings (Book V., chap. xxiv., § 453, 454).

Thus much of the ecclesiastical history of Britain, and more especially of the English nation, as far as I could learn either from the writings of the ancients, or the tradition of our ancestors, or of my own knowledge, has with the help of God been digested by me, Bæda, the servant of Christ and priest of the monastery of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, which is at Wearmouth and Jarrow.

Being born in the territory of that same monastery, I was given by the care of my relations when seven years of age to be educated by the most reverend Abbot Benedict, and afterwards by Ceolfrid. And from that period, spending all the remaining time of my life in that monastery, I wholly applied myself to the study of the Scriptures; and amid the observance of regular discipline, and the daily care of singing in the church, to learn, to teach, or to write was always a delight to me. In the nineteenth year of my age I received deacon's orders; in the thirtieth those of the priesthood: both of them by the ministry of the most reverend Bishop John [of Hexham], and by order of the Abbot Ceolfrid. From this time—when I received the order of priesthood—until the fifty-ninth year of my age, I have made it my business, for the use of me and mine, briefly to compile out of the works of the venerable Fathers and to interpret and explain according to their meaning (adding somewhat of my own) these following pieces. [Here follows the long list of works up to that date, A.D. 731, when he was fifty-eight.]

In these artless lines we have nearly all that is known of Bede's simple, beautiful, and most useful life. His parents were no doubt already dead when the "relations," who evidently were not his parents, placed him permanently under the care of the Benedictines of Wearmouth, whose ranks he afterwards entered. He never regretted the choice which had been made for him. He thankfully acknowledges that in this peaceful but active life Christ had "graciously granted him sweetly to drink of the words of His wisdom;" and on his death-bed he declared that "he had had a long life, and that the kind Judge had ordered his life happily." Perhaps nowhere in England—certainly nowhere north of the Thames—could Bede have found such opportunities for study as in this celebrated monastery. Thanks to the energy and enlightenment of the Abbots Benedict and Ceolfrid, the libraries at Wearmouth and Jarrow were excellent, and even Bede's insatiable love of reading could there find ample material. Benedict Biscop had been five times to Rome—a prodigious journey in those times—and on his third, fourth, and fifth visits purchased large quantities of books there and at Vienne. It was after his third journey that he founded Wearmouth, and after his fourth that he founded Jarrow, bringing with him John, the Abbot and Archchanter of St. Martin's at

Rome, to teach his monks music and ritual. One of the treasures brought by Benedict from Rome was "Cosmographorum Codex," a work of such beauty that Aldfrid, King of Northumbria (685-705), patron of Benedict, and himself a scholar, gave "land of eight families," or eight hides, for the possession of it. From the death of this enlightened prince, who had been a schoolfellow of Aldhelm, Abbot of Malmesbury, Bede dates the decay of morals among the northern clergy. It was largely owing to his peaceful policy that such a life as that of Bede became possible. During the troubled reign of his restless predecessor, Egfrid, who gave the land for the monastery at Wearmouth,[1] the warfare which was waged all round Northumbria towards Mercia, Strathclyde, and Scotland, must have caused constant anxiety to the peaceful monks, and have hindered the congregating of scholars. Another literary treasure brought by Benedict Biscop from Rome was a copy of the old version of the Latin Bible, the "Vetus Latina," which, though fast going out of use, had not yet been quite extinguished by Jerome's superior version. What Benedict had so well begun, his friend and successor, Ceolfrid, completed. Benedict, Bede tells us, had brought back from Rome on his third visit "no inconsiderable number of books on every branch of sacred literature;" on his fourth, "a numberless collection of all kinds of books;" and from his fifth "he returned (as was his custom) enriched with countless gifts for ecclesiastical purposes, and with an equally large supply of sacred volumes." Ceolfrid doubled the libraries both at Wearmouth and Jarrow. In particular he added "three *Pandects* of the new translation (Jerome's version) to the one of the old version which Benedict had brought from Rome. One of these, on his return to Rome in his old age, he took with him as a gift; of the other two, he left one to each monastery."[2]

From all this it is evident that the industry and ability of Bede had ample materials ready at hand for their exercise. Only at Canterbury, even if there, could he have been much

---

[1] Egfrid's name occurs on the dedication-stone of the monastery church of St. Paul at Jarrow: "Dedicatio Basilicæ Sti. Pauli VIII. KL. Mai Anno XV. Egfridi Reg. Ceolfridi Abb. ejusdemque Eccles. Deo auctore Conditoris anno IIII." The fifteenth year of Egfrid would be A.D. 684, when Bede was about twelve.

[2] "Lives of the Abbots," § 4, 6, 9, 15; "Six Ages of the World," A.D. 720. "Pandecta" was the name which was adopted by some writers; *e.g.* Alcuin, to express the collected books of the Old and New Testaments. The older name was *Bibliotheca*. It is to be regretted that "Bibliotheca" has gone entirely out of use. We lose much by regarding the Bible as an inspired *Book* instead of an inspired *Library*.

better off. Almost from the first Canterbury had had a school; and this had served as a model for Bishop Felix when he founded a similar institution in East Anglia at the now submerged Dunwich[1] (c. A.D. 631). But the Canterbury school had been greatly increased in importance by Archbishop Theodore and his energetic friend Hadrian, who "gathered together a host of disciples, to water whose minds rivers of wholesome knowledge daily flowed."[2] And as proof of their efficiency, Bede states that some of their scholars knew Latin and Greek as well as they knew their own language. It was from one of these Canterbury scholars that Bede received the chief encouragement to undertake his "History of the English Nation," as well as much assistance in collecting material for it.[3] This was Albinus, Hadrian's pupil and successor as abbot, who knew Greek well, and Latin as thoroughly as English.[4] Bede himself knew both Latin and Greek well, being able to write the former fluently and translate the latter; and, moreover, had some knowledge of Hebrew. In estimating which attainments, we must remember that a knowledge of Hebrew was at this time very rare in the West, while a knowledge of Greek was fast becoming so.

But excellent libraries at Jarrow and Wearmouth, with encouragement and help from Canterbury, were not the only advantages which Bede enjoyed. Besides the English learning which he received direct from Canterbury, he also had good instructors from other important centres—Scottish, Roman, and Gallican. From Trumbert, the disciple of Chad, and Sigfrid, the fellow-student of Cuthbert, he learnt Church discipline and Scriptural interpretation, as it was understood in the Scottish Church of Iona and Ireland. Acca, Bishop of Hexham and pupil of Wilfrid, would teach him much of the learning of the Roman school. The Benedictine form of monasticism in which he was trained from a child was of Gallican origin.

It has been suggested above that the title of "*Ecclesiastical* History," given by Bede himself to his chief work, has probably in modern times deterred some persons from reading him. The fact that he was a monk may have had a similar effect. "Monkish chronicles" are to most people not very attractive reading, and "monkish legends" still less so. And

---

[1] "Hist. Eccles.," III. xviii.

[2] "Hist. Eccles.," IV. ii. There are two MSS. of the Gospels, one in the Bodleian and one in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which are supposed by some to have belonged to the Canterbury Library, and to be part of a present from Gregory to Augustine.

[3] Bede's Preface to his "Hist. Eccl."

[4] "Hist. Eccl.," V. xx.

from the fact that Bede's history and biographies are known to contain various accounts of miracles, some have very possibly jumped to the conclusion that "legends" rather than "chronicles" would fitly describe Bede's historical writings. If so, we may trust that so utterly mistaken a view of our great national historian's value is fast becoming extinct. Among monkish historians, as among secular historians, we have every degree of badness and excellence; and each writer must be judged on his own merits. When judged thus, Bede's rank for intelligence, accuracy, and fairness will be of the highest. A readiness to believe in the frequency of miracles was the fault of his age, not of himself; and it ought no more to discredit him in our eyes than the similar defect discredits his great counterpart in Greek literature, Herodotus. Moreover, the miraculous element in Bede has been exaggerated. Some of the reported miracles are a mere misinterpretation of natural phenomena. Others, in which sick persons become steadily better after prayers have been offered for their recovery, are occurrences which a Christian will hesitate to disbelieve.

Again, it would be a huge mistake to confound the monastic system in which Bede was trained with those which prevailed in England during the centuries preceding the Reformation. The corrupt influences which ruined the latter were mostly wanting in the former. In Bede's day English monasticism (when not a sham) was still in the freedom and comparative purity of its youth. It was not of English growth; but, like Christianity and along with it, it had been imported into the nation from abroad. In the old Teutonic religion there was nothing analogous to it. Pagan Rome had its vestals; the pagan East had its celibate priests. The deities of the Jute, the Saxon, and the Angle seem to have exacted no such vows from either minister or worshipper. Hence monasticism, when it entered England, took a new departure upon virgin soil. The rule of Benedict found no heathen rival; nothing to conquer, or transform, or absorb. It became more elastic and more free than in its older homes. In England it was more in contact with the world: and we may well believe that both the world and it were the better for the intercourse. As yet no very strict line was drawn between the layman and the lay brother, between the secular priest and the ordained monk. And it was in the open, healthy atmosphere of a flexible system such as this that Bede was trained, and in his turn trained others. There was enough discipline to brace the soul and give regularity to labour: not such seclusion and rigour as to narrow the sympathies or warp the mind. Bede seldom left his beloved monastery. But his interests were as wide as the

universe. To know all that could be known; to teach all who cared for teaching; to pray for all who needed prayers—these were the three great occupations of his uneventful life. Bede was a monk and a priest. But he was keenly alive to the corruptions to which monasticism is liable, and to the worldliness which had begun again to infect the English clergy. The evils over which Gildas had wailed in the British Church were beginning to show themselves in the English. If anyone needs to be convinced of the openness of Bede's mind and the general soundness of his judgment, let him read the famous letter to Bishop Egbert, afterwards Archbishop of York, and the concluding portion of the "Six Ages of the World." To make his ready belief in miracles an exception to this is to blame him for not being far in advance of his age. In his time a miracle was the most obvious explanation of unusual phenomena. It was the first hypothesis that presented itself to men's minds, and it was commonly retained as adequate. With us a miracle is the very last hypothesis that we should try as an explanation of exceptional facts. And even in narrating miracles Bede's scrupulous honesty comes out. He tells them as they were told to him. "This story was told me by some of those who had heard it related by the person himself to whom it happened."[1] Another "was told me by the brother himself, on whom it was wrought."[2] St. John of Beverley, who ordained Bede, was "a holy man, of whom those who knew him well are wont to tell many miracles; and more particularly the reverend Berthun, a man of undoubted veracity."[3] And so on. The "Life of St. Cuthbert," which is specially full of such things, was submitted in its first form to some monks who had long been intimate with Cuthbert. And when their emendations had been embodied in it, it was sent "in proof," as we should say, to be criticized by the authorities at Lindisfarne, where Cuthbert had lived; and they found in it nothing to correct. Then, and not till then, was it finally transcribed. The difference between such careful reproduction of evidence and the careless repetition (or invention) of idle tales is immense. We may have our own opinion of the evidence, but Bede's method of collecting and stating it seems scarcely worthy of blame. His reason for continuing to work hard, even on his death-bed, is proof, if any be needed, that in all his writings his aim is the truth. "I don't want my lads to read what isn't true," he said, "and herein labour to no purpose when I am gone."

Nor will any unprejudiced person do otherwise than commend Bede for having followed Cuthbert and other

[1] "Hist. Eccles.," IV. xxii. [2] *Ibid.*, IV. xxxii. [3] *Ibid.*, V. ii.

excellent Englishmen in pronouncing in favour of the Roman rather than the Scottish method of fixing the time of Easter. It is evident from the frequency with which this subject recurs in Bede's writings that it was the burning question of his day. And it is argued with much probability that in no matter of greater importance can there have been any discord between English or British Christians and the rest of the Western Church; otherwise Bede would have noticed it. In the Paschal controversy the usage of Rome was the usage of Christendom both in the East and in the West. The Scottish practice was the survival of an anomaly, schismatical in its tendency. It was not the old quarto-deciman usage of keeping the crucifixion on the 14th Nisan, independently of the day of the week; a custom which was not likely to spread from Asia Minor to Britain. It was rather the result of a defective method of calculating the Sunday. This is quite clear from Bede's statements.[1] It sometimes happened that, while those who followed the Scottish usage were keeping Easter, the rest of Christendom were keeping Palm Sunday.[2] Even some of the Scots recognised the faultiness of their own system; and it would have been calamitous indeed if Bede had given the weight of his authority to the perpetuation of a confusion pardonable in its origin, but inexcusable then. The isolation of the British and Scottish Churches had inevitably produced some anomalies: but it was time for these to cease when intercourse with the rest of Christendom showed that they were anomalies.

The tonsure, though in our eyes a question of much smaller importance, was rightly decided by Bede on similar principles. Separation from the rest of Christendom, and from Rome, the chief representative of Christendom in the West, was a thing to be avoided, not merely in doctrine, but in customs. Local prejudices should give way to the interests of unity.

In judging of these questions we must beware of confounding the Rome of Bede's day with the Rome of a later age. In his time she was still the enlightener of the nations, from whom not only the truths of the Gospel, but letters and organization, arts and manufactures, were diffused throughout the West. As Englishmen, we ought to rejoice at the fact that Roman, rather than British or Scottish, Christianity in the end prevailed throughout England, and be grateful to Bede for helping to make the work of Augustine swallow up the work of Columba and Aidan. The Christianity of the Celts meant the Christianity of barbarism, or at best the Christianity of an insular and stunted civilization. The Christianity of Rome meant the

[1] See especially "Hist. Eccles.," III. iv. [2] *Ibid.*, III. xxv.

Christianity of culture, and of the highest form of culture then known. Bede acted in accordance with the best interests of his Church and country in preferring in that age to draw closer to the Churches of the Continent, over which Rome was gaining more and more influence and authority, rather than to the dwindling Celtic Churches, whose power of expansion and development seemed to be almost spent. In the conversion of the English nation the British Church perhaps could not have done much, and had done nothing; while the work of the Scottish had been absorbed, under the strong hand of Archbishop Theodore, in the larger work of Rome.

If we are determined to find that monasticism had some sinister effect on Bede, we had perhaps better study his "Martyrology." "In this Calendar of Martyrs, in which, however, even Beda could not yet fill every day, the tortures are related at great length for a calendar: and we have often real cause for amazement how so learned, and indeed so enlightened a man as Beda, not merely credulously accepted the most absurd and loathsome exaggerations, but also repeated them with a certain relish. Read, for example, the sufferings of St. Pachomius (14 May)."[1] The delight excited by Christian triumphs over suffering may easily become morbid when the details of the suffering are dwelt upon. But even this is far removed from the unwholesome descriptions of victories over sensual temptations, which some monkish biographers allow themselves to draw. No taint of this kind appears in Bede.

But we have not yet exhausted Bede's advantages. It has been mentioned that during his day, since the death of King Egfrid in the ill-advised and unprovoked attack upon the Picts in A.D. 685, Northumbria had had peace in all its borders.[2] And what was true of Northumbria was true of England as a whole. The struggle between the British and the English was over. Seven-and-twenty years before Bede was born the last great blow was struck, when King Oswald defeated Cedwalla at Heavenfield in 635.[3] Fighting did not forthwith cease between the victorious invaders in the East and their baffled opponents in the West. But thenceforward no British prince attempted serious warfare against the English. The armed struggle between Christianity and Paganism within the English nation itself lasted twenty years longer. King Oswald was defeated by his heathen English rival Penda at Maserfield in 642. But this struggle also came to an end in 655, when Penda of Mercia was defeated at Winwidfield by the Bretwalda

[1] Ebert, quoted by Mayor and Lumby, p. 13. See also the martyrdoms commemorated Feb. 16, March 16, May 3, July 23, Sept. 20.

[2] "Hist. Eccles.," IV. xxvi.; "Life of St. Cuthbert," xxiv., xxvii.

[3] "Hist. Eccles.," III. iii.

Oswy of Northumberland. Thus, when Bede was born in 672, both the contest of races and the contest of religions, so far as regards an appeal to the sword, was over.

And this peace and order among the secular princes of Britain was quickly followed by peace and order in that power which was destined to give unity and solidarity to the whole —the English Church. Christianity had been spread among the different sections of the English nation from various centres. Roughly speaking, we may say that the original mission sent by Gregory under Augustine converted Kent and Essex. Augustine's companion, Paulinus, went north and converted part of Northumbria, whose powerful King Edwin he baptized on Easter Eve, 627. At the same time the Burgundian Felix preached to the East Angles. In 635 an independent mission, sent from Rome by Pope Honorius I., converted the West Saxons. Its leader was the Benedictine Birinus. The great central kingdom of the Mercians was converted by Christian teachers of Scottish origin. And then the last strongholds of heathendom, Sussex, isolated by its belt of forests, and Wight, isolated by its belt of sea, were won over by the preaching of the Northumbrian apostle, Wilfrid of York. The result was a number of loosely connected Christian communities, without any systematic union or government. It was the work of the strong-headed and strong-handed Theodore of Tarsus to bring order out of this confusion, and consolidate the various elements into one national Church.[1]

He was the first among the Archbishops of Canterbury to whom every Christian community among the English was willing to yield obedience. He was welcomed from the first by kings and people alike, and the event showed that they had placed confidence in a man who deserved it. He was already an elderly man when he came to England in 669, and had no time to lose in tentative measures. He had a strong will, and made it felt. And when his long Primacy of one-and-twenty years was closed by death, it was found that his work had been thoroughly, if somewhat imperiously, done. For the first time in history there was an English Church. Long before there was an organized Kingdom of England there was an organized National Church, the Primates of which occupied a position, even in secular matters, such as no Bretwalda ever enjoyed. They were at the head of a system, all the officers of which were bound to obey their chiefs. Bishops from different kingdoms met together in synod under their presidency, and what was there decreed was obeyed by

[1] "Isque primus erat in archiepiscopis, cui omnis Anglorum ecclesia manus dare consentiret."—"Hist. Eccles.," IV. ii.

Christians in all kingdoms alike. Elsewhere Englishmen might be rivals or enemies: they were West Saxons, Mercians, or Northumbrians. In the Church they were fellow-subjects under one and the same rule. In all the confusion caused by the rivalry of the kingdoms and the inroads of the Danes the Church was the one working unity; and when the time for national union under one sovereign came, it was the Church which supplied a model and a basis for it. It was in Bede's youth that the foundations of this ecclesiastical union were laid, and he lived to enjoy the fruits of it. The careful investigations which he instituted in various parts of the island, in order to collect material for his history, were not only rendered much more easy in consequence of the peace and order which reigned both in Church and State, but were in some respects actually carried out by means of the machinery provided by the ecclesiastical organization.

Such, then, were some of the chief advantages with which Bede was blessed. He had a command of books almost unrivalled, at any rate in Britain. He had excellent instructors of various schools. He was from a child trained to monastic life of a very high type, training to which, in his case, we can trace little or no counterbalancing evil. And the whole of his working life was cast in a period of singular tranquillity, in which intercourse and inquiry were facilitated, and the distractions of warfare found no place.

It remains to give a brief account of the use which Bede made of his advantages. And this falls naturally into two parts: (1) His work as a teacher by word of mouth; (2) His work as a writer.

1. Of his work as a teacher of other students at Jarrow all that we know has to be gathered from a few significant sentences in his own works, in the priceless account of the last days of his life written by one of his pupils, and in the anonymous biography, which is probably of a considerably later date, and mainly consists of gleanings from Bede's own writings.

"Amidst the observance of regular discipline, and the daily care of singing in the church, to learn, *to teach*, or to write was always a delight to me." And thus on his death-bed almost his last thought is of his scholars. In his last sickness he insisted on continuing to teach and dictate. "I don't want my lads to learn what is not true," he said, "and spend their labour for nothing when I am gone;" and as his asthma became more painful, he would sometimes urge his hearers on with the warning, "Learn quickly, for I know not how long I may abide, nor how soon He who created me may take me away." And, as is well known, he died almost immediately

after completing by dictation a translation of the Gospel of St. John. It is unhappily lost; but it is among the very earliest pieces of English prose of which we have any certain knowledge.

This was one of the main causes of Bede's success as a teacher—his enthusiastic love for his work, and his power of kindling the like enthusiasm in others. His method was exactly that embodied in the teacher's three *R*'s—"Read, Reflect, Reproduce." All that was best worth knowing in every department of learning in those days he had taken pains to master. He had sifted it and tested it to the best of his ability, and then had given what he believed to be true to his pupils. He had no wish to burden them with a learning which might after all turn out to be baseless. A spirit of reverent, conscientious criticism guided his teaching. Of his teachers," says his anonymous biographer, "he emulated the better gifts of each; insomuch that, whatever spiritual wisdom each of them had acquired, he by hard study drank the whole from all of them, so that he was satiated with the plentifulness of God's house. . . . And thus this eminently wise bee of the Church, thirsting for that sweetness which is pleasing to God, gathered flowers all over the field of God's house, from which he made honey, as it were, by the alchemy of wisdom." And in another place this same writer compares him to a "clean animal" ruminating by learning, reading, or meditation, and reproducing by writing and teaching. His success was such, that the joint monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul had in his day hundreds[1] of inmates, and in some cases his own teachers were among his pupils.

2. Of his work as a writer we can judge for ourselves. Something has already been said of the unique value of his "History;" and his smaller historical works will always be of great interest and usefulness, especially the "Lives of the Abbots." Throughout them all his scrupulous care in collecting and sifting his materials is conspicuous. Consider the difficulties of correspondence in those days, and then judge what it must have been to have got together the material for his history while he was studying, and teaching, and commenting on a variety of theological and scientific subjects at Jarrow. He had correspondents who were working for him in Lindsey, in East Anglia, in Mercia, in Wessex, in Kent, and in Rome.

But his historical writings are not the only ones which have permanent value, nor do they form the bulk of his works. As we might expect in one who, as he says, "wholly applied himself to the study of Scripture," the majority of his treatises

[1] *Sexcenti* is perhaps only a round number.

are on Biblical subjects; and though he speaks of them very modestly as brief compilations out of the works of the venerable Fathers, with additions of his own, yet the additions are substantial, and are still found worthy of being quoted in commentaries on those portions of Scripture which he has annotated.[1] In the Old Testament he has commented on (1) Genesis, (2) the Tabernacle, (3) Samuel, (4) the Temple, (5) Kings, (6) Proverbs, (7) Canticles, (8) Ezra and Nehemiah, (9) Song of Habakkuk, (10) Tobit; in the New Testament on (11) St. Mark, (12) St. Luke, (13) the Acts, (14) the Catholic Epistles, (15) Revelation. Besides which there are a variety of treatises bearing on both Old and New Testaments, which are of more or less doubtful authenticity, printed in some editions of his works. The "Retractiones" on the Acts is not mentioned in Bede's own catalogue of his writings, but it is admitted by all editors in the collective copies of his writings.

To his historical and Biblical writings must be added a variety of treatises on arithmetic, astronomy, chronology, grammar, medicine, music, poetry, and rhetoric, together with a book of hymns, a book of epigrams, and the martyrology already described. The expression already quoted respecting his writings is fully justified. They form an *encyclopedia* of the knowledge of Western Christendom at that date.

We have about a dozen letters of Bede. Far the most interesting is that to Egbert, Archbishop of York, on the condition of the Church in Northumbria. It was finished November 5, 734, just about six months before Bede's death, and when he was already too ill to travel to York to see Egbert. It would seem that Egbert had received the pall some weeks before, and was, therefore, an Archbishop. Yet Bede is evidently unaware of the fact, for he addresses him simply as Bishop: so slowly did news travel in those days. The picture which Bede draws of the state of the Northumbrian Church is not a very cheerful one. The corruption which almost inevitably attends a time of peace and prosperity had already begun:

> Of certain Bishops it is commonly stated that they serve Christ in such sort, that so far from having about them men of religion and continence, they prefer those who are given over to laughter, jesting, gossiping, revellings, and drunkenness, with all the other incitements of a loose life. . . We have heard, and it is a common report, that there are many villages and hamlets of our nation situated in inaccessible mountains and thick glens, where for many years past a Bishop has never been seen . . . and yet that not even one of them can be exempt from

[1] Canon Westcott in his "Commentary on the Epistles of St. John," cites Bede frequently.

paying him tribute. . . There are numberless places, as we all know, enrolled under the name of monasteries, but yet having nothing of the monastic life.

He goes on to enlarge on the loss to the country of these extensive properties, and on the scandalous lives of those who thus shirk work and military service on pretence of being monks; and as large sums were sometimes paid for charters, the civil powers did not discourage these mock monasteries. He concludes thus:

These brief remarks have I made against the poison of avarice. But if I wished to treat at equal length of drunkenness, revellings, luxury, and all the other plagues of this kind, the letter's limits would be extended into immensity.

Bede's "Pœnitentiale" is an interesting document. What is often printed as his is a mixture of the genuine work with others of a similar character, especially the "Penitential" of Egbert.[1]

It was on Ascension Day, May 26, 735, that this beautiful life ended in an equally beautiful death. The description of Bede's last hours in Cuthbert's letter to Cuthwin is one of the most touching narratives in literature; it is too well known to need repeating here. Placed on the pavement of his cell, with his head raised in his pupil's hands, that he might look towards the church in which he had so often prayed, he recited the *Gloria* and died. He was buried in his dearly-loved monastery at Jarrow; but in the eleventh century a monk of Durham stole his bones, and placed them in the new cathedral there, beside the bones of Cuthbert.[2] At what period his relics were moved from ths shrine of Cuthbert to the Galilee is uncertain; either when the Galilee Chapel was first completed in the twelfth century, or more probably not until late in the fourteenth. Whatever of his body has not been scattered over Europe to furnish reliquaries rests in the Galilee still. Considerable portions were found when the tomb was opened May 27th, 1831. They were all carefully replaced; and it is now the privilege of resident members of the University of Durham to begin their daily round of lectures and study with

[1] It is perhaps impossible now to determine exactly how much is rightly ascribed to Bede. The text printed in Haddan and Stubbs ("Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents," vol. iii., pp. 326-334) is obtained by striking out of the conflate "Pœnitentiale" all that can be recognised as coming from other sources. It is remarkable to find in it that accidental homicide is visited with penance for a year, and justifiable homicide (*in bello publico*) with penance for forty days. The "Penitential" of Theodore has exactly the same penalties.

[2] The story of the theft is told by Simeon of Durham in his "History of the Church of Durham," chap. xlii.

common prayer beside the tomb of one of the earliest and saintliest of English scholars.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

ART. VII.—DR. LANSDELL'S TRAVELS IN CENTRAL ASIA.

Russian Central Asia, including Kuldja, Bokhara, Khiva, and Merv. By HENRY LANSDELL, D.D., M.R.A.S., F.R.G.S. Author of "Through Siberia." With frontispiece, maps, and illustrations. 2 vols. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1885.

BY "Russian Central Asia," as read in the title of Dr. Lansdell's work,[1] is meant the Tsar's dominions lying between the Oxus and the Irtish and between Omsk and Samarkand. This territory measures from west to east 1,250 miles, or the distance from London to Petersburg, and from north to south 1,100 miles, or the distance from Petersburg to the Crimea. It has a population of nearly four millions, which is at the rate of only five to the square mile. It is divided into two general governments or vice-royalties, the western portion being Turkistan and the eastern the Steppe.

In his third chapter Dr. Lansdell relates his journey from the Urals to Omsk; and in the fourth chapter we have a description of the vice-royalty of the Steppe. The Steppe is divided into the governments or provinces of Akmolinsk, Semipolatinsk, and Semirechia. Akmolinsk, it seems, is as large as France. On arriving at Omsk, says our author, "I noticed from the deck of the steamer[2] an officer on the landing-stage whose face seemed to be familiar to me. He turned out to be the police-master, who, three years before, had shown me the prisons of Tomsk. He recognised me, and kindly sent men to look after the baggage, by whose help ere long we were safely housed at the Hotel Moskva." In the evening, the travellers[3] took a droshky to make some calls, having introductions to some members of the Omsk branch of the Imperial Geographical Society. One of these gentlemen, Mr. Balkashin, who had met Mr. Mackenzie Wallace and Mr. Ralston at Yaroslaf, earnestly advised Dr. Lansdell not to try to spread the Scriptures among the Kirghese. In friendly warmth he said,

[1] The author's previous work, "Through Siberia," was warmly recommended in THE CHURCHMAN of February, 1882.

[2] In 1879 our author followed the post-road from Tiumen to Tobolsk. But in the present journey he made his way up the Irtish to Omsk, a voyage that occupied five days.

Mr. Sevier, M.B., a physician who had just finished his studies at Edinburgh, Paris, and Vienna, accompanied Dr. Lansdell as interpreter.

"*Dieu vous préserve, Monsieur, ne faites pas cela.* The Kirghese are such bigoted Muhammadans that they start back at the very sight of a cross. . . . You will very likely be injured, and get yourself into a row, and the Russians too." Mr. Balkashin, an Imperial Consul, naturally looked at the matter through official spectacles. Another agreeable acquaintance was a son of the Governor of Odessa, who spoke English well. He accompanied our author next morning with the police-master, to see the prison. In the evening, dining with the acting Governor-General, Dr. Lansdell met the Government architect, who had been to London for some days, and spoke English like a native.

Leaving Omsk, our author purchased an ordinary podorojna, for which to Semipolatinsk he paid £1 9s. 3d.; but in addition he obtained, through the Governor, a letter from the post-master to the station-keepers which helped him famously. In the course of a drive of nearly 500 miles to Semipolatinsk they changed horses 32 times—that is, at each station. One stage of twelve miles was done in less than an hour. The Cossack station-masters and *yemstchiks*, or postilions, were amiable, and did their best with little persuasion. The distance to Pavlodar —260 miles—was accomplished in 44 hours. When 120 miles from Omsk,

> We were now [says the traveller] well on to the Steppe, whose straight, unbroken horizon so frequently reminds one of the ocean. The soil is yielding, stoneless, and sandy, thus making the smoothest of roads, on which our horses dashed along. The country is nearly treeless, and the ground almost without vegetation, so that one had only to picture the surface covered with snow to see the necessity for the roadside wickerwork erections to mark the route in winter. We were crossing in the month of August this steppe, parched by the summer sun; but Dr. Finsch, who in 1876 travelled over the same route in spring, speaks with more appreciation of its appearance. The Steppe is not, indeed, a grass-covered flat, for the verdure is found only in patches, and then forms no turf, but grows, like the bunch or buffalo-grass of the prairie, in separate clumps, although the steppe-grass is longer. For great distances the steppe is covered with thickets of the *Spiræa* or *Meadow-sweet*.

At Pavlodar, and afterwards, there was no difficulty in selling Kirghese New Testaments, and none of the Muhammadans—not even the mullahs—displayed that fanaticism which the Englishman had been warned against. At one of the stations beyond Pavlodar Dr. Lansdell met the Governor-General, and obtained from his Excellency a most serviceable recommendation to postal and other authorities in the Steppe.

Semipolatinsk, the capital of the province of that name, is surrounded by a desert of sand. In the bazaars of Semipolatinsk Russian and Tatar merchants sell tea, sugar, and other

groceries; cotton stuffs, Chinese silks, porcelain, furs, wax, and honey. The principal trade is carried on in winter, when the Cossacks and peasants come in from the neighbouring districts, bringing skins, ropes, and other produce. The Kirghese also —some on horseback and others in camel carts—bring cattle and camel's hair.

A Crown podorojna, now kindly granted them, was a source of great comfort to the travellers; and in their journey onwards there was less of difficulty and distress than might have been expected. On one stage the road lay sometimes on rocky hillocks and sometimes over sand, in which the wheels occasionally stuck. Some distance beyond Sergiopol they arrived at a very desolate place, the most miserable station they had seen—a tumbledown house in the desert.

Here we breakfasted [writes Dr. Lansdell] and took our morning wash, but both under difficulties. One of the inconveniences of post-travelling in Asiatic Russia is the absence of good lavatory accommodation. The common method among the peasants of washing the hands, is to place them beneath a bowl of water fixed at a height, out of which a stream trickles. One accustomed, therefore, to the orthodox "tub" wherein to splash about, finds himself inconveniently restricted in his toilet. Moreover, as these washing contrivances in Asia are frequently placed out of doors in the yard, it will be understood what a comfort it was to have brought with me an indiarubber basin. Some travellers had arrived before us—an officer, I think, and his wife—who consequently occupied the guest-chamber; and, there being no room for us in the inn, the post-mistress brought the samovar outside the stable and spread for us a table in the wilderness. All around was a barren steppe, without a blade of vegetation the horses could eat. It was truly pitiable to see them crawling around us almost starved. It appeared that their usual supply of corn had not been brought, and the poor creatures were trying to pick up the handfuls of chaff lying about.

To travel from Omsk to Kuldja, a distance of 1,800 miles, was a fortnight's labour. The travellers had taken their clothes off to sleep only the two nights at Semipolatinsk. They arrived at Kuldja late in the evening, too late to present letters of introduction, and, as there was no hotel, they had to sleep on the bench in the dirty post-house. Next day they were invited to stay at the Consulate. The charms of this house have been praised by Dr. Schuyler, and by Mr. Ujifalvy the Hungarian traveller. On the Sunday, in the morning, Dr. Lansdell went to the Russian church, and in the evening conducted a religious service for a few Chinese Roman Catholics.[1] The following day, at the Buddhist pagoda,

[1] "I had heard and read of a small colony of Roman Catholics at Kuldja, amongst whom Christianity was introduced by French Missionaries who came from Peking, some say a hundred years ago, in ac-

the only one in Kuldja, he disposed of some Mongol and Chinese Scriptures; and in the bazaars he sold several copies. The Mussulmans seemed quite as eager as the others to buy the holy books; and several copies were judiciously distributed, so that three cases were emptied in Kuldja.

From Kuldja our travellers made their way westward to Vierny, the capital of Semirechia, where they made some pleasant acquaintances and had a refreshing rest. In this town are two churches and a mosque; the bulk of the people are of the orthodox faith, and the foundations are laid for a cathedral. A visit was paid to the Archbishop (Archbishop of Turkistan and Tashkend), who had served as chaplain at Rome, had a good library, and spoke Italian fluently. The Vice-Governor, M. Aristoff, had read of Dr. Lansdell's visits to the prisons of Siberia, and of his distribution of the Scriptures, of which he heartily approved. Accordingly, for the five hospitals and five prisons of the province 80 Scriptures and 100 religious publications were placed with the police-master.

The general government of Turkistan includes the four provinces of Syr-daria and Amu-daria, Ferghana, and Zarafshan. Of these provinces, their natural productions, peoples, rivers, mountains, and so forth, the work before us contains an interesting and very precise account. The metropolis, Tashkend, in size and extent, covers as much ground as Paris. It is one of the largest towns of the whole of Central Asia, and the number of its population is equalled only by Bokhara. It is, moreover, a very ancient town. It is situated on a high plateau, and is surrounded of course by a high castellated wall. European or Russian Tashkend, divided from Asiatic Tashkend by a canal, has developed rapidly during the twenty years of its existence. The streets are wide and regular, lined with narrow canals and stately poplars. The viceregal palace is a fine building, and the Governor-General has a summer villa in the outskirts of the town. His Excellency readily undertook (Sep. 15th) that copies of the Scriptures should be distributed as Dr. Lansdell desired; and as General Ivanoff, the Governor of the Zarafshan province, then staying in Tashkend, happened to pay a visit to the Governor-General at the same moment as the Englishman, an arrangement was made on the spot for nearly all the prisons and hospitals of Turkistan. As to the journey homewards,[1] it

cordance with which Mr. Ujifalvy states that he found among them Latin and French books of the last century and beginning of the present. Mr. Ashton Dilke, in 1873, stated that before the insurrection these Christians were nearly 400 in number, but that 300 of them, including their priest, Father Thomas, were then massacred."—P. 225.

[1] On Dec. 21st, in London, he ended his journey of 12,000 miles, during which he was absent from England 179 days, having slept in his clothes half the nights.

was arranged that the travellers should go, as they desired, to Samarkand and Bokhara, and to Petro-Alexandrovsk, floating 300 miles down the Oxus, and so to Khiva, whence they might cross the great desert to the Caspian Sea. The Governor-General promised all possible aid, including letters to the Emir of Bokhara and the authorities of Khokand. All this kindness was capped by General Ivanoff, who invited Dr. Lansdell during his sojourn at Samarkand to stay at the palace. Our author drove back to the hotel with a mind considerably relieved. Not only had he now virtually accomplished the major part of his desire respecting the distribution of the Scriptures, but he began to see the feasibility of entering Khokand and Bokhara, upon which no Englishman living had set eyes, and on the realization of which by himself his friends had been very sceptical. The afternoon was spent in a visit to the Central Asian Jews. He had received from the Lord Mayor (Sir W. Ellis) a commendatory letter, which had been translated by Dr: Herman Adler, the delegate chief rabbi in London, into rabbinic Hebrew, and, in addition, the document had been translated into Russian, Persian, Arabic, and Turki. At the new synagogue, in the Russian quarter, great interest was manifested in this letter; of these European Jews most had come to Turkistan as soldiers. Afterwards, Dr. Lansdell paid a visit to the old synagogue.

We drove [he writes] to the native town, to seek the meeting-place of the Asiatic Jews, and after going as far as the isvostchik, or cabman, could take us, by reason of the narrowness and miserable paving of the streets, we took to our feet, and passing through narrow lanes and alleys, came into a small yard, on one side of which was a miserable shed with a lean-to roof of poles, wretchedly covered, whilst under and all around sat a crowd of people assembled for prayer and reading. On the Friday evening the Jews assemble in the synagogue, which is compared to a bridegroom, to welcome the coming in of the Sabbath, that is beautifully personified in one of their prayers as a bride, whilst on Saturday evening they gather to bid the Sabbath farewell. Whether, on the present occasion, it was this stated Sabbath evening service, or something of a less formal character, I am not sure; but so surprised did they appear at our sudden visit, and above all so curious to get a peep at my letter, that, the service being speedily concluded, all crowded around. From hence we were led to an adjacent part of the bazaar to another assembly, where, within still narrower limits, under a straw roof, a number of grave and reverend elders were sitting on the ground and praying, or reading and intoning. This struck me as a remarkable sight, by reason of the magnificent faces of some of the old men. With their huge turbans of spotless white, and Oriental flowing robes, they reminded me of the typical Israelites, depicted by Holman Hunt in his picture of "Finding Christ in the Temple," and other works. The miserable accommodation of the Tashkend Jews, even for divine worship, brought vividly to one's mind to

how low a condition this people are sunk in some parts of their dispersion. They read my letter, and received my visit evidently with pleasure, and both showed me their copy of the Law, ornamented with silver and precious stones, and also permitted me to look into the cupboard containing their books; these last did not appear very plentiful, and as I had brought some Hebrew Old Testaments with me, I offered to sell them at reasonable prices, if they would come to the hotel. Their *Torah*, or manuscript of the Law, had been written and mounted in Bokhara, but was not remarkable. Their having no synagogue, together with the poverty and ill-furnished condition of their hired place of prayer, was explained to a large extent by the fact that almost all the Jews in Tashkend are traders and sojourners only, as also by the oppression to which, before the Russian occupation, they were subject under the Khans of Khokand.

The journey from Tashkend by Khojend to Khokand is well described, and is full of interest. On arriving at Khojend it was pleasant to find that the travellers were expected; and dinner was quickly made ready. "Whilst waiting," says our author, "I felt unusually tired and sleepy, though I know not why, for we had been travelling only forty hours, which was nothing in comparison with the nights upon nights spent in the tarantass north of Tashkend; but I suppose my training had been somewhat demoralized by sleeping in a bed, and the comparative comforts we had enjoyed at the capital." Beyond Khojend the road was far from good, in some places "atrocious." The country was interspersed by desert patches of shifting sand, which encroaches like a flood, destroying houses and cultivated fields, and so driving away the population. Some of the great sand-heaps are 100 feet high. Fortunately when the English travellers passed the air was calm and the sand at rest.

M. Ushakoff, their host at Khokand, a judicial functionary, had promised to send to the gate a djiguitt, or policeman, to await their coming; and when they arrived the man was there in flowing robes and white turban, ready to mount his horse and precede them. They had to make their way through by-streets with just room enough for their vehicle, until at last they entered grounds surrounding a house of native build, very pretty, which had belonged to the Khan's eldest son. M. Ushakoff had command of a number of djiguitts, and some of them always accompanied him in the streets. As one native after another rose from his squatting position and respectfully stood erect, or stroked his beard, or as another dismounted from horse or camel, Dr. Lansdell was invited to consider what his cicerone called Asiatic politeness. "But it had struck me," he writes, "in another way. The subservience of the Khokandians excelled all I met in Central Asia; and

when I remembered that Khokand had come but recently under the sway of the Russians, and that only after two or three sound thrashings, it occurred to me that this alleged politeness might be in reality fear. Dr. Schuyler, at all events, experienced no such politeness from the Khokandians when they were independent, nor did we from the natives in the town of Bokhara."

Dr. Lansdell's letter of recommendation obtained for him a speedy welcome from the Jews in Khokand. On arriving at the small square whitewashed room that served them for a synagogue, he found they had no ancient manuscripts, their quite modern copy of the Law having been written in Bokhara at a cost of £15. A Jew from Bokhara, in reply to a question about Dr. Wolff, remarked that his father saved the life of "*Yusuf Voolff*." Until the advent of the Russians, it seems, few Jews were content to reside in Khokand, inasmuch as they were harshly treated, and subject to many annoyances, as their brethren in Bokhara now are.

At the bazaar of Khokand, which Schuyler and Ujifalvy agree in praising as the best in Central Asia, one meets with silk and velvet from Bokhara; silk, stuffs, and camlets from Marghilan; hand-worked copper goods; Dungan hats from Western China; *Khalats*, or robes of startling colours, in satin and silk; Samarcand knives, jewellery, and objects cut in jade and onyx. For the manufacture of brass ewers Khokand is famous, and Dr. Lansdell secured a handsome one for the British Museum. From the surrounding mountains are brought into Khokand various kinds of furs, the prices of which vary from 2s. for a black cat or a black sheepskin to 40s. for a black lambskin, or 50s. for that of a tiger. Dark brown fox furs range from 16s. to 24s.

Of Samarcand, the one town of antiquities that Russia possesses in the whole of her dominions, our author's description is very readable. In the work on Bokhara by Professor Vámbéry, published twelve years ago, appears an interesting historical sketch of Samarcand.[1] "If we take into consideration," says the Professor, "all that this city has gone through in the two thousand years from the conquest by Alexander, during the struggles of so many different dynasties, at the hands of Greeks, Arabs, Turks, Mongolians, and Uzbegs, it would be difficult to find another spot in Asia with so chequered a

[1] In "1868, the Russian Christians," says the Professor, "took possession of Samarcand, the once splendid capital of Timour, the birthplace and the grave of so many men distinguished in the annals of Islam . . . . The first conqueror of the country, so far as we know, was Alexander (the Macedonian), and another Alexander (II. of Russia) has been the last."—"History of Bokhara," p. 411.

history of sunny and stormy days to compare with it." Our author's historical summary is as good as his description. He saw, of course, Tamerlane's tomb, and all the "lions" of the city, ancient and modern. He also visited the prison; and some of the most interesting chapters in the work follow his account of this visit. They answer the question, "Do we know the truth about Russian prisons?" For ourselves, we are inclined to think that Dr. Lansdell has proved his case. This at least will be admitted on all sides, that as regards both prisons and hospitals, his inquiries and investigations have been of real service.

In the second volume Dr. Lansdell relates his journeyings through Bokhara, Khiva, and Turkmenia. The chapter on the city of Bokhara[1] is especially attractive, while it is rich in information; and the description of his "camel cradle" experiences across the Aralo-Caspian desert is very enjoyable, with many tempting bits of adventure. But we must content ourselves with referring our readers to the volume.

To this notice of a most interesting work it should be added that the information with which both volumes are richly charged seems thoroughly accurate. The references to Old Testament expressions are welcome and informing. Several appendices are of value, in many respects indeed unique. The volumes are admirably printed in large, clear type, and the maps are excellent. As to the esteemed author's tact, good temper, courage, and devotion to duty, we make no remark; but at least in tendering our hearty thanks to him we may express our pleasure and satisfaction with the work as that of a faithful Minister of the Church of England.

Reviews.

The Congo, and the Founding of its Free State. A story of work and exploration. By HENRY M. STANLEY, author of "Through the Dark Continent," "How I found Livingstone," etc. Two vols., with 122 full-page and smaller illustrations, two large maps and several smaller ones. Low and Co.

THIS work has been eagerly looked forward to, and will be read with interest and enjoyment. It is dedicated to the King of the Belgians, Léopold II., "the generous Monarch who so nobly conceived, ably

[1] "I have a dim recollection, as a child, of hearing Dr. Wolff lecture on his travels. . . . How little I then dreamed that I should be the next of the Queen's subjects to enter Bokhara! yet on October 11th, 1882, I found myself approaching the very gate by which I presume Burnes had entered fifty years before."—Vol. ii., p. 78.

conducted, and munificently sustained the enterprise which has obtained the recognition of all the great Powers of the world, and has ended in the establishment of the Congo State." The work proves that Mr. Stanley's words about the Congo, spoken in the year 1877, were far from being idle or dreamy, the fond imaginations of a "Quixotic journalist;" and the question of that mighty water-way is a really practical one and of high importance. As regards West Central Africa, and indeed the whole Continent, Mr. Stanley has given, in the words of Gambetta, "an impulse to scientific and philanthropic enterprise," and has influenced Governments; nor can there be a doubt that the impulse which his work has imparted will "go on growing year after year."

In the opening chapters, Mr. Stanley traces the previous history of the Congo, and then he shows how the present volumes are a sequel to his book "Through the Dark Continent." On his return from Africa, he was met by King Léopold's Commissioners at Marseilles, in January, 1878; and after an interval of rest, in which a change of labour was afforded by the preparation of "Through the Dark Continent," he consented to serve the African International Association.[1] Accordingly, in January, 1879, the indefatigable traveller set off for Zanzibar, to enlist as many of his old comrades as might be willing to labour on the Congo again. On the 14th of August, 1879, he arrived before the mouth of the great river to ascend it. Just two years before (within two days), *i.e.* on the 12th of August, 1877, he had arrived at Banana Point,[2] after crossing the Continent, and descending the Congo. On the 22nd of August he arrived at Boma.

On September 27th, Mr. Stanley's band arrived at the site of their future greatest entrepôt, Vivi. Engravings of Head-quarters, Vivi, in volume i., add interest to the description of the work which was then done upon that rocky platform, after an agreement had been made with the local chiefs. From his road-making successes, specially in the pulverization of rock, he gained the title of *Bula Matari*, "Breaker of Rocks," a title with which, from the sea to Stanley Falls, all natives of the Congo are now familiar.

Vivi Station was completed in February, and Mr. Stanley placed in charge Mr. Sparhawk, its future chief, who acted as his principal agent in the Lower River. Under this chief were 12 Europeans, 81 Zanzibaris, 116 coast natives, Kabindas, and Sierra Leones, 6 interior natives: total 215. The officers at Vivi consisted of Augustus Sparhawk, chief; J. Kirkbright, second chief; A. Moore, storekeeper and caterer; A. B. Swinburne, secretary; F. Mahoney, waiting orders; captain, engineer, and mate, *SS. Belgique;* mate and engineer, *Espérance;* mate and engineer, *En Avant.* Touching Mr. Stanley's troubles with some of his European co-workers, at various places and periods, we may remark, in passing, that he seems to have shown good temper and tact.

In February, then, with a sufficient escort, Mr. Stanley left Vivi Station for Isangila, to explore the country for a feasible waggon-route; and after accomplishing much in negotiation and work, though feeling every day the lack of men, he returned to Vivi in June. In August, the *Bula Matari* set out again with a pioneer force, and much road-making, with carrying of material and supplies, was done.

In the following February[3] they set out from Isangila for Manyanga, where they arrived towards the close of April. Mr. Stanley writes:

---

[1] The Association had been founded in July, 1877.

[2] Banana Point and Boma are described in a review of Mr. Johnston's journey up the Congo, CHURCHMAN, vol. x., p. 128.

[3] February, 1881.

Thus we have completed within seventy days a total journey of 2,464 English statute miles, by ascending and descending the various reaches from camp to camp in fourteen round voyages, the entire distance of 88 miles of navigable water that extends between the cataract of Isangila and the cataract of Ntombo Mataka, abreast of the district of Manyanga. We were now 140 miles above Vivi, to accomplish which distance we had been employed 436 days in road-making and in conveying fifty tons of goods, with a force of 68 Zanzibaris and an equal number of West Coast and inland natives. During this period we had travelled 4,816 English miles, which, divided by the number of days occupied in this heavy transport work, gives a quotient of over 11 miles per day!

At Manyanga, four days after his arrival, whether owing to the chilly currents of wind that came rushing up the Congo Gorge day after day, or to the long-continued exposure to the heat of the fierce sun reflected from the rocks, or to the long strain on his system that the harassing work had caused, or to the cold season which annually recurs just at the close of the rainy season—to whatever it was owing, Mr. Stanley felt feverish, and soon was prostrated by fever. He lay for many days exceedingly ill. At the end of three weeks his sickness and weakness seemed to have approached a climax; and he thought he was going to die. He wished to pay the last offices of regard to his co-workers, and they were summoned to hear his farewell. Meantime, an attendant weighed out sixty grains of quinine, over which he dropped a few minims of hydrobromic acid, and poured an ounce of Madeira wine. This dose he delivered between Mr. Stanley's lips, for the sick man was too weak to lift the glass himself. He tried to speak to his comrades, but a cloud came over him, and he fell asleep. The crisis was past. After a long sleep, he was able to take a little food, and the fever did not return.

A body of recruits now came, and on the 12th of June Mr. Stanley felt well enough to begin to prepare for his journey to Stanley Pool (about 95 miles). On December 3rd a camp was formed at the landing-place near Stanley Pool, Léopoldville; the steamer *En Avant* was floating in the quiet haven of the Kintamo baylet, with no rapid or impediment intervening between her snug cove and Stanley Falls, a navigable length of about 1,000 miles being thus before her. On January 1st, large crowds collected to see the first steamer on the Upper Congo. The new station was named, of course, after King Léopold, the founder of the Association.

Early in April, the first Upper Congo Expedition set forth; *En Avant*, a whale boat, and her canoes; forty-nine coloured men and four whites. In June, however, the leader of the force fell sick; he soon waxed worse; he was obliged to return to Léopoldville, and there he remained for a time. In a brief interval of consciousness he gave orders for a caravan to be prepared; and as the Zanzibaris, who had accompanied him from Zanzibar, had performed their three years' term of service, they were to convey him to Vivi. At Manyanga, incipient gastritis made itself manifest: the system was thoroughly upset. During the interval of waiting for the boat from Isangila, Mr. Comber, head of the Baptist Mission, applied to the sick man for advice, and was recommended to found a settlement at Léopoldville.[1] Isangila station was found to be neat and clean. On July 8th, the caravan ascended the steep road that led up to

[1] On ground belonging to the Association, at Léopoldville, are two Mission stations: one is called the Arthington Mission of the Baptist Church; the other is undenominational, and is styled the Livingstone Inland Congo Mission. Mr. Comber presides over the Baptist Mission; Dr. Sims is the chief of the other. Our author praises the zeal of both, and remarks that "the prospect is infinitely brighter before them to-day than they could have anticipated some time ago" (vol. i., p. 497).

the Vivi rock platform, and at the summit the hammock was stopped and a group of strange Europeans, a band of recruits, appeared to tender a welcome. On the 19th, Mr. Stanley was in the harbour of St. Paul de Loando ; and in October, he laid before the Comité of the Association Internationale du Congo, the true condition of affairs.

In November, Mr. Stanley sailed away again for Congo-land, and towards the end of December he arrived at Vivi, with physical energies recuperated and freshened during his five months' absence from the expedition. In March (1883) he was once more at Léopoldville ; and in May he arrived at Bolobo. This concludes the first volume.

By the middle of June the expedition reached the spot henceforth to be known as Equator Station. The bush was cleared from the site of the new station, of which Lieutenant Vangele was appointed chief, with twenty-six men to form its garrison. The Bakuti made friendship with the Europeans after the customary forms of blood brotherhood ; all claims were settled and the necessary gifts distributed.

The Commander then returned to Stanley Pool. There was trouble at Bolobo ; the station had been burnt, with all its stores, and the force was fired upon. With his usual skill in dealing with the natives, Mr. Stanley soon secured peace. On September 29th, the steam-flotilla arrived again off Equator Station, from which he had been absent one hundred days. No better illustration could be desired to exhibit the effects of industry inspired by goodwill and zeal, than this station at the equator, he writes, "as it was seen by us after this comparatively short absence. We had left it a jungle of worthless scrub ; we returned to find an Equatorial hotel—commodious, comfortable, rain-proof, bullet-proof, burglar-proof, and almost fire-proof." The domestic adornments of the solid clay-house were tasteful ; and the garden was well supplied with European vegetables. Their goats gave them fresh milk, and the hens produced a supply of eggs. Each of the coloured men, imitating the chief, had built for himself a clay-hut in the centre of a garden, wherein the Indian corn was already over six feet high ; the sugar-cane was tall and thriving.

At Equator Station, well-governed, and peaceful, Mr. Stanley wrote in October: "We have abundance of food, obtained very cheaply, and the prices are now so established to everyone's content, that there is nothing left to complain of." "Brinjalls, bananas, plantains, sweet cassava, potatoes, yams, Indian-corn, eggs, poultry, goats, sheep, the native productions assisted by vegetables of Europe, flourishing in the gardens, with tea, coffee, sugar, butter, lard, rice, and wheat-flour from Europe, afford a sufficient variety for a sumptuous *ménu*." Equator Station, we may observe, is 757 English miles from the sea, and 412 from Léopoldville. Up the Congo, to Stanley Falls, some 600 miles further, the flotilla steamed away in October. At the beginning of December, Stanley Falls was reached ; a site for a station was soon selected, and the necessary negotiation concluded. Binnie, the engineer of the *Royal*, was appointed *pro tem.* chief of the station. Thirty-one armed men were left with him, sufficient supplies, and ammunition. "We committed him to the care of Providence," writes the Commander-in-chief, "and on the 10th of December we turned our faces homeward." On the 6th of June, 1884, Mr. Stanley left Vivi ; and in the beginning of August, at Ostend, he presented his report to the King of the Belgians.

We have mentioned the principal dates in our sketch of Mr. Stanley's course during the six eventful years of his mission in the Congo basin ; for the truth is that so little has been known of the great traveller's doings during that period (he himself having never written or published anything) one is apt to forget the length of time which that laborious

enterprise—the founding of the Congo State—took up. It is interesting, by a study of these volumes, to mark—month by month, and year by year—how the advance of the Commander-in-chief of this most remarkable expedition proceeded, station after station being founded, in the midst of difficulties and dangers which dauntless energy and singular skill, good-sense and judgment providentially overcame. The thread only of Mr. Stanley's course—in this imperfect notice of his work—we have set ourselves to trace. It must be added that the very readable volumes are admirably printed, and contain many pleasing illustrations. The maps are excellent.

The Rev. A. C. GARBETT has sent us the following remarks on the philosophy of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World.*

"From the unhealthy admixture of Divine and human things results not only a phantastic philosophy but also an heretical religion." So wrote Bacon; and as we have studied Mr. Drummond's famous book, the words have been constantly present to our mind. The truth, indeed, of the principle is owned by Mr. Drummond himself, though he holds the hope that the nature of his subject may create an exception in his favour. Nor would we deny that the "Defence," which the *Expositor* has lately published, goes far to take off the edge of some of the objections which have been naturally urged against it. Nevertheless, after all allowance has been made, the book still seems to us, in its present form at least, to be rash in many of its statements, unsuccessful in its main object, and in its letter at any rate opposed to important truths of Scripture which have been hitherto unquestioned by believing Christendom. We say "in its present form," because, in the case of many passages, a use of language more exact, and a study of Scripture more careful, might lead to such a change in Mr. Drummond's mode of speaking as would bring them into harmony with truths which Christians, trained in Scripture only, hold most dear. Mr. Drummond's command of words seems to us greater than his subtlety in their use, and so he may often mean right when he speaks wrong. Again and again we come across sentences which show that floating loosely in his mind are qualifications which he has not had the skill at the proper place to weave into the texture of his arguments. Even, therefore, the truths which he announces often look like errors by the want of caution with which they are stated, and from the same cause he seems sometimes to contradict himself.

At the outset, however, the "Natural Law," with other similar books, stands open in its principle to at least one strong objection. This is, that in the minds of many it may endanger Christian truths by the nature of the ground on which it seems to rest their proof. To throw a light on Scripture doctrines by an appeal to the natural workings of God's hand, as on all sides they are shown around us, is wise and safe and sanctioned by the example of Holy Writ itself. The facts from which the light is drawn remain the same from age to age, and are open to the minds and eyes of all. The growth, for instance, of the lilies, though not cited by our Lord in the connection urged by Mr. Drummond, abides for ever as a speaking witness to the providential care of God. But when, with Mr. Drummond here and throughout his book, men go further and argue from those subtle relations, which Science now discloses behind the open facts, the case is greatly altered. Not merely are these relations hidden from the common eye, and therefore only to be learned by most men through the eyes and minds of others, but even to those whose work it is to study them, they are themselves but known

imperfectly. All physical Science is of necessity progressive, and hence, in most cases, its statements are provisional only. That which seems proved in one age may be disproved in another. Not only, therefore, will the value of all illustrations, drawn from a scientific study of God's works, change or perhaps be wholly lost with the change or even revolution which may pass over that field of study from which they are drawn, but in proportion as the truths of Scripture have been presented in this their assumed scientific connection, will be the likelihood that they themselves will suffer. In the case of careless searchers after truth, the proved error, or at least inadequacy, of the alleged scientific statement will go far to shake the Scripture doctrine with which it has been rashly bound by way of proof or illustration. Scripture is thus hampered—not, as Mr. Drummond phrases it, with truth "as it is in nature," but with those partial and not seldom halting views of it which happen at the time to reign among the leaders of the scientific world.

In the case before us this objection falls with special force. Mr. Drummond's book is not a work on Natural Theology, in the spirit of Derham or Paley, where the reasoning is based on purely physical grounds, and where Science fitly bears the burden of its own conclusions. Still less is it, of course, a treatise on religion where Scripture is alone responsible for what is taught. Nor is it chiefly a collection of essays on doctrinal subjects, on which the light of Science has been thrown by way of illustration merely. Even this Mr. Drummond repudiates as far below the purpose which he has in view. This may be left for others. For himself, he aims at nothing less than the object of providing so sure a natural basis for many of the truths of Scripture as shall leave the scientific infidel without excuse. Though he is not always consistent, and on one occasion freely owns the evidential weight inseparable from the historical Resurrection of Christ, yet on the whole he seems persuaded that the ancient evidences for Christianity are insufficient for the demands of a scientific age. Men of Science may be pardoned, in his judgment, if they regard Theology with distrust. With the aid of modern Science, therefore, he proposes to ground more firmly many spiritual truths, or at least to arbitrate between conflicting expositions of the words of Scripture. The distinction, for instance, between the natural and the spiritual life, with the need of a special living Author for the one as for the other, are truths to be retained because both the distinction and the need are in a loose sense capable of proof on the principles of modern Biology. In the same way the whole temple of spiritual truth, in Mr. Drummond's eyes now tottering to its fall, may be rebuilt in even greater glory than of old, and its foundations cast so deep in physical truth that none will henceforth venture on a task so hopeless as its overthrow. The consequence seems plain. If in the late discussions on spontaneous generation the verdict of Science had been given for Pouchet against Pasteur, or for Dr. Bastian against Dr. Tyndall, then the spiritual truth, on which in this connection Mr. Drummond strenuously insists, must on his own principles be given up as false. To the verdict of Science, as the interpreter of infallible physical truth, he has pledged himself, and by this, therefore, he must stand or fall. Nor can we see how, in the case of any other Scripture truth, this result is certainly to be avoided so long as the scientific theory of the day is to be regarded as regulative of the doctrinal statements of Scripture. The fact that at the moment spiritual truth can be stated in the current terms of Biology does not render the principle itself, thus double-edged, secure to use. Granting even, for a moment, all for which Mr. Drummond pleads in the name of the so-called Law of Continuity, yet still the principle of reasoning by way of proof from the natural to the spiritual

worlds, could never be considered safe till we had before us a revelation of natural truth as full, as determinate and as assured from error as that which on the spiritual world the inspired Scriptures give us.

Much therefore of Mr. Drummond's complaint against the exceptional position of the science of Theology seems to be greatly misplaced. Divines, on the contrary, have done wisely in refusing the aid of a principle so uncertain at any time, and so dangerous in its possible results. Hitherto, indeed, as Mr. Drummond admits, the very materials for such a course have been almost entirely wanting; but even now that they are in a great degree more copious, it may be still unsafe to use them in the way that he proposes. At least there is no room for just complaint until the truth and value of his principle is recognised by all who are competent to judge. But, in any case, this refusal to build its conclusions on natural Science in no way implies that Theology is that lawless branch of knowledge which Mr. Drummond seems to consider it to be. Allowance being made for the special nature of its subject-matter, it may be fairly questioned whether as a science it is marked by less reverence for law or a strictly scientific method than most other at any rate kindred sciences. The sacred Scriptures, in their relation to God and man, combined perhaps with those spiritual experiences which they at once create and mould and satisfy, constitute its field of study as clear and well-defined as that which forms the basis of Biology. Many of its doctrinal statements are but the formulated expressions of God's varied workings in connection with Redemption—of laws, that is, in their own sphere and under their own conditions, as real and constant as those which mark the physical exertions of His power—laws, moreover, which have been ascertained by the exercise of man's noblest faculties as well as specifically by those methods of reasoning, both inductive and deductive, which were in use here centuries before physical Science can be said to have been born. Rash generalizations, varied interpretations, and even national peculiarities, have doubtless found a place in the many discussions to which the facts have given rise. But here, at least, Theology is not "the Great Exception." In their progress to maturity, the history of even the strictly physical Sciences has been marked by similar experiences.

But, whatever may be thought of Mr. Drummond's judgment on the scientific aspect of Theology, on one point at any rate there is no room for doubt. The novel principle, on which he rests the value of his book, must be judged by its conformity to actual fact. Even if we admit that those conclusions of Biology, which Mr. Drummond uses, will never be unsettled by the onward progress of the Science, and that so far an undoubting appeal may be made to what they teach, yet still the identity of these laws of the natural with those of the spiritual world can only be established by a careful study of the facts. The scientific method, of which Mr. Drummond speaks so highly, imperatively demands this. Abstract reasoning on the mere probabilities of the case is here wholly out of place. The Law of Continuity, therefore, seems to us to be quoted to very little purpose, even if we take that view of it which Mr. Drummond chooses to adopt. This so-called law is vague in character, and indeterminate in application. Even as it was first enounced by Leibnitz, it is not so much a physical truth as a metaphysical principle of reasoning—capable at best of only partial proof, and therefore no more fitted to arbitrate in matters of fact than any of those old Scholastic maxims whose falsity was long ago exposed by Bacon. The extension, accordingly, of the Law of Gravitation from the solar to the stellar systems was no conclusion from this principle, but the legitimate consequence of an ascertained series of facts. In the absence, indeed, of any

proof to the contrary, the existence of the law within the limits of our system created some presumption that it might be found in other systems also. Newton himself argued thus. On the other hand we hold with Whewell, that as in some respects the stellar systems clearly differ from each other, so each system might have had its own appropriate law of central force. Had this been found to be the case, it would be absurd to say or think that such a breach of continuity, as Mr. Drummond would regard it, would have wrought confusion on the intellectual aspect of the universe. In the interest of Science as well as in the spirit of Bacon's reiterated warnings, we protest against the voluntary bondage under which so many men of Science place themselves in deference to this so-called Law. In itself, therefore, and within those rational limits, under which alone it ought to be applied, this principle brings no sort of proof for Mr. Drummond's favourite position. Like all similar maxims, however generally useful, it must give way to the inexorable teachings of the crucial facts. To prejudge the question, on the ground of this or any other form of abstract reasoning, is to commit the very error which long ago so fatally opposed the growth of physical Science. Man neither is nor can be the measure of the actual universe, nor must a plausible anticipation usurp the place of a legitimate interpretation of the facts.

When, therefore, we leave Mr. Drummond's argument from Continuity and look at the question merely in the light of the phenomena to be explained, we are struck at once by the very limited application of which Mr. Drummond's vaunted principle seems capable. Decided limits Mr. Drummond himself owns that his principle has—so decided, indeed, that (apart from the vague suggestions of his Introduction) he attempts no illustration of it save so far as it may touch upon the laws of life. The title of his book so far misleads. Natural Law, not so much in the "spiritual *world*" as in the single department of the spiritual *life*, is really all its subject. At best, therefore, even were it fully true, this boasted principle is so confined that its ultimate results could be but small. The cause of the spiritual world at large would gain but little. Even, however, within these narrow limits we cannot think the principle in question proved. In spite of the *Expositor's* "Defence," much of the criticism in a recent number of the *Contemporary Review* seems to be very just. The law, for instance, by which, through the living instrumentality of parentage, God gives life and being to the offspring of the animal world, cannot be said to be identical with the law by which, without such instrumentality, God quickens into life the dead-born spirits of believing Christians. Only, in fact, by reducing the laws which he compares to their most meagre possible expression can Mr. Drummond's principle of identity be even probably proved. No one questions that a real analogy subsists between many of the correlated truths which Mr. Drummond touches, and though it may have but little scientific value in his eyes, this answers well enough for all the purposes of popular instruction. Nor do we doubt that from this popular point of view, most of what is essential in Mr. Drummond's chapters has long ago been seized and used by thoughtful minds in every age, however ignorant by necessity of the teachings of modern Science. Stripped of the scientific verbiage in which they are paraded, the natural truths which Mr. Drummond sets before us are such that none but scientific minds could need for them a scientific proof. The simple facts after all are here to most men plainer to understand, and more effective in their lessons, than when swathed in the laborious scientific pedantry by which they are supposed to be made clear.

Meantime to men of Science let us give their due. Their special work

is to search below the surface of appearances, and it would not be right for them to rest content with that which satisfies the minds and eyes of common men. We can understand, therefore, so far, Mr. Drummond's satisfaction as he contemplates the achievements of his special science, and rests no longer in things natural, upon appearances, but upon those secret laws of which the appearances are but the outward form and visible expression. No doubt, moreover, to many of Mr. Drummond's readers his reasoning will seem conclusive, and "the naturalness of the Supernatural" appear most fully proved. Grant, therefore, for a moment, this—nay grant, not only in the sphere of life, but in all the compass of the correlated worlds, that this identity of their respective laws should be made known hereafter beyond the power of disproof. Even then, the evidential value of the principle is surely overrated greatly by its ardent votary. At best, its worth would be illustrative and defensive only—powerful not to affirm positively, but to repel negatively the objections of the Deist, exactly in the spirit of that massive argument of Butler, which Mr. Drummond seems to rate so slightly. Against the ancient Atheist, or the modern Agnostic, it would have no force at all. The reason seems to be plain. The mere fact of the identity of natural with spiritual law, were it never so extensively found or abundantly proved, could never of itself be urged in proof of the existence either of the spiritual world or of the laws which regulate its conduct. The proved identity, for instance, not only of the nature, but also of the laws of solar and of stellar light, is in itself no proof of the existence of the light in either case, or of the laws which govern its transmission. The existence of the light of the sun and of the stars, with the respective laws of each, is first of all discovered, and afterwards, but not before, the identity of the laws is shown. This, surely, ought to be the order here. The existence of the spiritual world, and the nature of its laws, must first be proved, and then (if it be so) the identity of its laws with those of nature be made plain. On any other principle it would be as just to reason downward from the existence of the spiritual to the existence of the natural, as upward from the existence of the natural to that of the spiritual. In all his chapters, accordingly, Mr. Drummond appeals to Scripture for the only proof which he presents of the spiritual truths which he discusses. In other words, the existence of the spiritual world and its laws is really proved by him, on evidence distinct from that of Science, before he enters on the special subject of his inquiry. That identity of law, which he afterwards discovers, is but a mental link which binds in thought the worlds together.

But if this be so, we fail to see that positive evidential value which is claimed by Mr. Drummond for his principle in the interests of Christian truth. All that it really proves, on the assumption of its truth, is the general unity of the government which pervades the natural and the spiritual worlds. In the way of direct proof, it goes no further than this. That, on the other hand, which alone could really bear the weight of Mr. Drummond's claims, would be the proved discovery on purely scientific grounds of a spiritual world and its appropriate laws. Could this be ever shown beyond dispute by Science, in total independence of the guiding hand of Scripture, great indeed would be the confirmation of revealed religion. But as yet no one pretends that Science can do this—least of all Mr. Drummond, who more than once admits the impotence of Science here. Sometimes, however, he seems to speak as though the reality of the spiritual world were just as obvious and as little needed proof as the reality of the natural—seemingly forgetful that the hidden spiritual experiences of thousands (even were they always uniform) are no equivalent by way of argument for the uniform natural experiences of all man-

kind. A just evidential value, as the "Defence," in the *Expositor*, contends, belongs no doubt to the sphere of Christian experience—varying, and often ill-defined, and, save in its outward and often feeble manifestation, impalpable to others as it must be confessed to be. But on any estimate, if it be taken by itself, apart from the dogmatic Scripture with those outward evidences which guarantee its inspiration, we are sure that this Christian experience is utterly inadequate as a foundation from which to reason backward to the truths out of which, nevertheless, it springs. Full as it is of comfort and even of assurance to the individual believer in the truths of Scripture, it is yet powerless argumentatively to convince the unbelieving world at large. Bishop Butler's judgment is as philosophically true as it is Scripturally exact; and evil will be the day when Christian apologists desert the evidences, on which Revelation rests its own defence, for the insecure though tempting foundations which the advance of human knowledge seems sometimes to offer.

Short Notices.

Brief Memories of Hugh McCalmont, first Earl Cairns. By the author of "The Memoir of the Rev. William Marsh, D.D.," "English Hearts and English Hands," etc. Nisbet and Co.

THESE "brief memories" are dedicated to Lady Cairns, by whose desire they have been written. On the title-page appear Tennyson's verses:

"A life in civic action warm,
A soul on highest mission sent.
A potent voice of Parliament,
A pillar stedfast in the storm.

"I would the great world grew like thee,
Who grewest not alone in power
And knowledge, but from hour to hour
In reverence and in charity."

In the little book are seven chapters, of which the first is "Boyhood and Early Manhood." We read: "When the little Hugh was only eight years old, his sisters, to whom he was a priceless darling, with their own hands decked him out in his velvet tunic and large lace collar and cuffs, according to the fashion of the time, and then he was placed in a sedan-chair and carried to the Town Hall at Belfast, there to deliver a lecture on chemistry. This feat was accomplished by the little boy with so much ability, modesty, and self-possession as to win the surprised admiration of the whole audience." "From a child he delighted in going to church." "At twelve years of age he became deeply interested in the sermons of that prince of preachers, Hugh McNeile, late Dean of Ripon; and whenever he happened to be taking clerical duty in Belfast during the summer months, when the Cairns family were at their country-home, the boy would ride in early on the Sunday morning, and willingly spend a lonely day in the deserted town-house, for the sake of hearing him preach. The dignified eloquence of 'the eagle-eyed orator' captivated the boy's fancy; the clear reasoning and logical sequence of his arguments convinced and delighted the mind of the future genius of the Chancery Bar; whilst the

preacher's fervent setting forth of the love that passeth knowledge won that young heart for the Christ Who came to make known to a lost world, in His life and by His death, that 'God is love.'"

Mr. Cairns took a first-class in Classics and obtained other honours at Trinity College, Dublin, in his eighteenth year. Too young to enter a learned profession, he felt it would be well, as well as pleasant, to unbend his mind by lighter reading, travelling, and country amusements. He was always an excellent shot; and in later years, in days of deer-stalking, it was "his pleasure no less than his pride" "never to wound but to kill." So clear was his eye, and so steady his hand, that as lately as the autumn before last one of his exploits was to get his three stags with three shots —"one apiece."

He was called to the English Bar at the age of twenty-four.

Thenceforward he attended regularly at his chambers from ten to four daily, and allowed nothing to interfere with these hours, although for a long time he received no work to do. One summer's day some friends had arranged a water-party for Saturday afternoon, quite expecting that as it was Saturday he would not mind leaving chambers early to join them. He was very sorry to lose the pleasure, but having made it his rule not to leave chambers till four o'clock, nothing could induce him to break it. His friends tried to laugh him out of his resolution, and ridiculed the idea of his staying in when he had no work to do, and when, moreover, as they urged, there was no possible chance of work, as it was Saturday afternoon. He was not, however, to be turned from his purpose, and therefore remained at chambers. At a few minutes to four a gentleman representing a large and important firm in the City, called to request him to do some work for them, their own counsel having left chambers as it was Saturday. Mr. Cairns did the work with much courtesy and promptness, and showed an ability that fairly astonished the gentleman, and from that time all the work of his house of business was placed in Mr. Cairns's hands. Other houses followed suit, and before long nearly all the leading houses in the City had put their legal concerns into his hands; and thus his name became known, and his fortune was made.

Miss Marsh writes of Lord Cairns's sympathy with his friends in time of sorrow, and adds: "But his large-hearted and wide-reaching charity was also the 'charity that begins at home,' and his sympathy, so deep and full for the sorrowing, would flow forth just as freely towards the innocent mirth and gladness of his children. His consideration and tenderness as a father—'a central warmth diffusing bliss'—none but his children could faithfully depict:

Never, during many a visit to their Scottish and English homes, have I under any circumstance seen the slightest lessening of that fatherly tenderness, nor of the filial love responding to it. The warm affection of his morning greeting, and of his evening good-night, were but the consistent beginning and close of each day's lovingkindness. He was always ready to devote his little leisure to his children's pleasure. From August till November they lived at Dunira, the beautiful Highland home which he rented, and when there the fishing and the shooting parties, the picnics in the woods, the excursions on the lovely lakes and amongst the purple mountains, were pleasures not only provided by the father and mother for their children, but also heartily enjoyed with them.

An anecdote illustrating the piety of Lord Cairns may well be quoted:

When Lord Cairns was at the summit of his prosperity, he was heard to say, "Nothing in this world *satisfies*."

"Except the Lord Jesus Christ," said a friend who was standing near.

"Oh yes," he replied, with all the fervour of reverent devotion in his voice, whilst his eyes lighted up with the fire of Divine love. "He does satisfy even here! He does perfectly satisfy, when we are in true communion with Him. What will it be to enjoy it without a break between!"

Every page of this charming book tempts a reviewer to make a quota-

tion ; but our aim and desire—while paying a tribute of respect to the great statesman and consistent Christian whose character it portrays—is to invite attention to the book and most earnestly recommend it. It deserves, and will no doubt attain, a very wide circulation. No better publication could there be to show a lesson much needed in the present time, politics and law and philanthropy, all sweetened by a sense of the love of Christ crucified,—talents of a very rare order all consecrated to the service of the Redeemer. To no writer could the preparation of this memoir have been more happily entrusted: it is not only deeply interesting, but bright, suggestive, and winning.

The Homiletic Magazine. Vol. XII. Jan. to June, 1885. Nisbet and Co.

In this volume appear these sections : "The Foreign Pulpit," "The Modern Pulpit," "Practical Homiletics," "The Christian Year," "The Theological Section." "The Expository Section," "Reviews," and others. In the Theological Section appear papers on the foundations of the belief in the immortality of man, by Dr. Weathers (a Roman Catholic Bishop), Dr. Cairns, and the Rev. E. White ; and the question, "Is Salvation possible after death ?" is discussed by Dr. Leathes, Rabbi Simeon Singer, and Dr. MacEwan. Among the reviews appears a notice of Dr. Cox's "Expositions," opening thus :

The dispute which the late editor of the *Expositor* had with his publishers was an unhappy affair. But it is an ill wind that blows nobody any good ; and if on the one hand the public may be a little surprised at finding the "liberal" tone of that periodical rather accentuated than lessened under its new editorship, nearly everybody will be delighted at a difficulty which promises to result in our having Dr. Cox's new expositions in yearly volumes.

The Expositor. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A. Third series. Vol. I. Hodder and Stoughton.

In a prefatory note the Editor thankfully acknowledges "the great success thus far of the new series of the *Expositor*. The circulation has been far beyond any attained hitherto." Certainly this volume contains several papers of high merit, and many of the contributors are men of mark. As to whether the *Expositor* is less "Broad" than it was when edited by Mr. Cox, we ourselves are not in a position to be able to express an opinion. Professor Drummond's paper, "The Contribution of Science to Christianity," will at least be read with lively interest, as will also the (anonymous) defence of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." We have always rated highly Dr. Maclaren's sermons, and found it a pleasure to recommend them in The Churchman. His articles on the Epistle to the Colossians are as good as we expected to find them.

The Parson's Round of Parish Duty in Town and Country. By Rev. W. Holt Beever, M.A., Canon of Llandaff, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Llandaff. Pp. 220. Elliot Stock. 1885.

This is an ably-written and interesting book; and those who do not agree in all points with its suggestions, or accept every one of its statements, will at least be pleased with its tone, and perceive its honest and kindly purpose. Anyhow, the volume contains a good deal of informing matter ; and it will not be difficult to exercise the discerning faculty so as to gather wholesome instruction. The titles of some of the chapters will serve to show the character of the work: Of the parson ; the impostor ; charity ; visiting ; medical help ; study ; services ; the school ; clubs ; banks, etc. The learned author's lines—as he remarks in dedicating the book to the Bishop of Llandaff—are like George Herbert's :

Frequently underlined and frayed though they be, the pages of "The Country

Parson" continue even now to be the ready resort, and unfailing recreation of one's occasional weary or despondent hours . . . A volume at once so complete, profound, earnest, minute, compact, and precious, I cannot better recommend to those for whom I write, than, mutatis mutandis, in the words of the Roman poet's injunction:

"Vos exemplaria Græca
Nocturnâ versate manu, versate diurnâ."

Canon Beever only claims "to have set a few additional stepping-stones where the current has changed, with the lapse of years, since Herbert's day, or worn a wider course, so that his admirable but ancient structure scarce meets our modern need." Besides Herbert, he is indebted to Hooker and Bishop Harold Browne (quoting freely from both); but the book to a large extent is a record of the author's experiences.

Several passages we had marked with pencil as inviting criticism. For instance, on page 159 appears a remark as to the Evangelical party and musty corners of "barn-like" churches. "*A strange languor gradually overspread the country at large.*" To what period Canon Beever precisely refers, we cannot be sure; but we venture to express the opinion that if he had read Canon Garbett's article on "The Evangelical School" in THE CHURCHMAN of October, 1879, or any other paper of a similar character, he would have expressed himself in somewhat different terms. The fact is, that the Evangelicals were the first to set the example of restoring the churches. They "began the great work of restoration and extension, were the introducers of order in their services, and gave the impulse to church building."

Expositions. By Rev. SAMUEL COX, D.D., Author of "A Commentary on the Book of Job;" "Salvator Mundi," etc. Pp. 458. T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

Here are some thirty expository lectures or discourses, says Dr. Cox, "such as I used to contribute to the *Expositor* while I was its editor . . . I never once argued, in the pages of that Magazine, for the ultimate salvation of all men, or permitted anyone else to argue for it." Several expositions in which that theme is involved, he adds, which he could not use in the *Expositor*, he is free to use here; and the volume is dedicated to Lord Tennyson, from whom he "first learned to trust the 'larger hope.'" Every reader of this book, therefore, knows what to expect. On the literary skill, the thought, and vigour, of Dr. Cox's writings, it is unnecessary to make any remark. One only of his expository sayings may at present be quoted. "Children of wrath" (Ephes. ii. 3), he says, means simply "wrathful men," or men liable to "gusts of passion and excess."

Faithful Teaching. By Rev. C. BRADLEY, of Southgate. With Memoir by the Dean of Westminster. Pp. 225. Hatchards. 1885.

The Sermons contained in this Memorial volume, the preface tells us, were not written with a view to publication. They are a selection from the sermons preached in London after Mr. Bradley had retired from tuitional work. They show independent thought, and the points are put in a striking and suggestive way. The preacher's *realness* is strongly felt. Many readers who would like this or that altered, or this or that added, may derive help from the unconventionality and quiet earnestness of the style. We opened the book at a sermon on patient waiting ("*For neither did his brethren believe in Him,*" St. John vii. 5); and we may quote two or three of its sentences. Of the notion that "brothers" were "cousins" there is not a single trace till nearly 400 years after the birth of Christ. "It began in that time and in that Church," we read, "in

which the married state was, as it still is, regarded as inferior to the single state; and so they falsified Scripture, made brothers mean cousins. Up to that time the whole Christian Church (except one or two writers who maintained them to be *full* brothers of our Lord) had looked upon them as the sons of Joseph by a previous marriage, and *so* half-brothers of our Lord; this was, and is, the universal belief in the Eastern Churches." Mr. Bradley then dwells on the fact that these brethren did not believe in Jesus. But notice—"He passes no censure on them: not one word of rebuke is recorded; they showed their unbelief openly. . . . He bore it patiently, silently, lovingly." A lesson for Christians. Wait patiently! But further, here is comfort. What was the effect of *that* His conduct upon those His brothers? "A little later in the first Christian year, when the number of the disciples was but an hundred and twenty, we find those very brothers, continuing with one accord, in prayer and supplication with His first converts, His Apostles."

Mr. Charles Bradley, born in the year 1814, was the eldest son of the father whose name he bore and whose sermons have been so widely known. He died two years ago. Dean Bradley's brief Memoir adds to the interest of this volume.

Mary Roper's Story. What she told her girls over the class-room fire. S.P.C.K.

This book is virtually an autobiography, says a prefatory note; the person whose story it relates is still living and at work. Not merely for the inmates of a Servants' Home, but for all young women of that class, this is particularly an excellent book.

Kissing: Its curious Bible mentions. By JAMES NEIL, M.A., formerly Incumbent of Christ Church, Jerusalem; Author of "Palestine Explored," etc. Pp. 94. Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1885.

Mr. Neil is well known as the author of the two works, "Palestine Explored," and "Palestine Re-peopled." In the very interesting little book before us he shows the same learning, research, and independent thought. He remarks, that in the Bible, although the narrative portions do not amount to more than about one half of the whole, kissing is mentioned no less than fifty times, and about half this number of times the reference is plainly to men kissing men. Some of the allusions to the practice are obscure. Mr. Neil's own personal experience in Palestine enables him, as an earnest and well-equipped student of Scripture, to explain these passages, pointing out the appropriateness of each. The book has some novel features; the original words which, in one or other way, are rendered emphatic, are marked as emphatic for the English reader. In the third chapter, "Kissing the face," Mr. Neil gives a clear view of the Apostolic injunction to believers to salute one another in this way. Five times appears this command. St. Paul says, ". . . with a *holy* kiss;" St. Peter, ". . . with a *loving* kiss." Mr. Neil shows that the command must have been addressed to men with respect to men only, and to women with respect to women only. He quotes from the "Apostolical Constitutions" as to the interpretation put upon the command by the Primitive Church. "Then let the men salute one another and the women one another, with the kiss in the Lord."

Champions of the Right. By E. GILLIAT, M.A., Assistant Master in Harrow School. S.P.C.K.

An interesting book with many spirited passages. Bede, Wiclif, St. Hugh of Lincoln, Jeanne d'Arc, Sir Walter Raleigh, are some of the "Champions" whose lives are briefly sketched.

What I Should Believe. A simple Manual of self-instruction for Church-people. By ANTHONY BATHE, Editor of "A Lent with Jesus." Rivingtons. 1885.

This book may in one sense, perhaps, be called a strong book; its assertions are audaciously dogmatic. The tone is devout, and the language is mild and gentle; so that readers who are apt to accept positive statements when made as though there could hardly be any argument about them, may regard Mr. Bathe's assertions as axiomatic truths. Mr. Bathe, we suppose, is a Presbyter of the Church of England. One of his chapters is headed "The Other Five Sacraments;" and he says that "some people object to calling these" five other rites Sacraments, and "they are quite at liberty to do so." The five "sacraments" are "Confirmation, Absolution, Marriage, Holy Orders, and Anointing of the Sick."

In the June *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivingtons) appear—"In Memoriam, Bishop Ch. Wordsworth," "The Church of Utrecht," and "The Pseudo-relics of St. James in Spain."[1] The last-named opens thus:

"Apostolic Letters of N.S.P. Leo XIII., in which is confirmed the declaration "put forth by the Cardinal-Archbishop of Compostela concerning the identity of "the body of the Apostle St. James the Greater, and those of his disciples St. "Athanasius and St. Theodore.

"Leo, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, for perpetual memory. God Al-"mighty, admirable in His Saints, has willed in His wise Providence that while "their souls are enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, their bodies, entrusted to "the earth, should receive singular and religious honour from men.

"Thus God wonderfully manifests in them His mercy and His Providence, since, "by permitting that many divine prodigies should be wrought by those bodies, He "provides for our good and for the glory of the Saints on earth. And in fact, "whenever we visit the relics of the blessed inhabitants of heaven, we recall the "marvellous and splendid series of virtues of which they gave us the example "during their life, warmly exciting us to the imitation of them. Since the bodies "of the Saints, according to the testimony of St. John of Damascus, are so many "perennial fountains in the Church, whence flow, as from health-giving springs, "the celestial gifts, blessings, and those graces of which we have most need. For "which reason it is not to be wondered at that the bodies of many Saints which "have been all but lost in the darkness of oblivion, should have been restored to "the light precisely at those times when the Church is agitated by tempests, and "when Christians need to receive more lively encouragement to virtue. Thus in "the course of this present century, in which the power of darkness has declared "a cruel war against the Lord and His Christ, there have happily been discovered, "by divine permission, the sacred remains of St. Francis of Assisi, of Ste. Clara "the Law-giving Virgin, of St. Ambrose Pontiff and Doctor, of the martyrs "Gervasius and Protasius, and of the Apostles Philip and James. And to this "number must be added that of St. James the Greater, and his disciples Athana-"sius and Theodore, whose bodies have been rediscovered in the cathedral of the "city of Compostela.

"A constant and universal tradition, which dates from Apostolic times, con-"firmed by public letters of our predecessors, tells that the body of St. James, "after that the Apostle had suffered martyrdom by order of King Herod, was "secretly taken away by his disciples Athanasius and Theodore. They, through "fear that the remains of the holy Apostle would have been destroyed if the Jews "had taken possession of his corpse, embarked it in a ship, took it away from "Judæa, and after a prosperous voyage reached the coasts of Spain, and sailed "along them as far as to Galicia, where St. James, after the Ascension of Jesus "Christ to heaven, according also to an ancient and pious tradition, had by divine "providence discharged the office of his apostleship."

[1] From the *Boletin* of the Royal Academy of History of Madrid, tomo vi., cuaderno ii. February, 1885.

This is curious, and has an interest of its own. But we need not quote any more. Here is a comment upon it :

"That the Apostle James the Great came to Spain to preach the faith, contradicts equally the Bible and history ; but since the tenth century this has been in Spain unassailable fact : he is the patron saint of the land, and to-day every Spaniard maintains it in the face of the whole world. Sant Jago, the apostle of fishermen, has become a judge and leader of battles ; in thirty-eight fights he was seen riding in front on a white charger, and driving the enemy before him in wild flight. It was *a somewhat later invented fable* that his body was landed from Palestine on the coast of Galicia, and is there preserved, after having circumnavigated Spain. But Compostela thereby became for many centuries the most frequented pilgrimage-place of the West, and apocryphal literature was enriched by the book of Pseudo-Turpin, put together to recommend this pilgrimage, as also by the writings of Pope Calixtus II."—*Döllinger*, Lecture delivered before the Royal Academy of Science at Munich, July 25, 1884, on "Spain, her Political and Religious Development."

The first volume of "Short Comments on the Gospels for Family Worship," is *Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark*, by the Right Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, D.D. (Hatchards). Bishop Oxenden's works have been, happily, so well known during a long period, that we need say little in recommending this volume. The "Comments" will seem to some too "short," but many, perhaps, will say they are long enough, if read out slowly. The verses selected occupy a page, more or less, and the exposition usually fills a page. The type is large and clear, a matter of moment for many who conduct family worship.

We have pleasure in recommending a very interesting little book (one of Mr. Elliot Stock's shilling reprints), the *Imitation of Christ*, in Thomas à Kempis' handwriting, being a facsimile of the original MS., written in 1441.

To a little book published by Messrs. Nisbet, *Ethics of the Holy Ghost*, or "Bible Readings on the Fruit of the Spirit," by the Rev. P. NORTON, the Preface has been written by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Readers who are following after holiness, says Mr. Bullock, will find this book "a treasury of spiritual teaching;" its motto might well have been "more and more."

Homely Talks with Young Men (Hatchards) is recommended by Canon WESTCOTT. The lady who wrote it, he says, has "a keen insight into the thoughts and feelings of the young men among whom she has laboured long with winning devotion, a loving sympathy with their difficulties, and a directness of illustration and language which combine to give her counsels a peculiar force." The "Talks" are dedicated to members of the "Young Men's Guild of the Christian Banner"—a Society of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, apparently—for whom they were first written. This is the first series: "Young Men of the Old Testament."

An Officer's Experience of Foreign Missions, by Major CHURCHILL, has been reprinted from this Magazine, and is issued in pamphlet form by Messrs. Nisbet and Co.

The Story of a Short Life, by JULIANA HORATIA EWING (S.P.C.K.), has about it a peculiar interest as being the last work of a gifted writer. An interesting series, in which the pathetic and humorous are happily blended, is brought to a close.

From Calvary to Olivet, by Dr. CHARLES STANFORD (R.T.S.), is a sequel to "Voices from Calvary." The homiletic expositions are suggestive and stimulating.

The Sefton Boys is "a very pleasant little book," says a lady, who reads Tales sometimes to a class of boys: "simple and interesting; well-told all through." It is one of the many cheap and wholesome gift-books published by Messrs. J. F. Shaw and Co.

The Great Cloud of Witnesses, by Dr. LANDELS, may be safely commended as sound and earnest. There are seventeen chapters on "Faith and its Victories" (R.T.S.). This is the second series, Joshua to David; we do not remember seeing the first.

We have received from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge four pleasing little books: *A Sprig of White Heather*, with tinted pictures: *My Lass*, with one illustration; *After Five Years*, by the author of "How Willie became a Hero;" and *Number One, Brighton Street.* They are well got up, and cheap; suitable for parish lending libraries, or gifts to girls.

An interesting little book, a good gift for boys, is *Taken or Left*, a tale by Mrs. WALTON, author of "Christie's Old Organ," "A Peep Behind the Scenes," etc.—Another little volume, published by the Religious Tract Society, we are pleased to recommend, *Prasanna and Kamini*, or "The History of a Young Hindu." The chief part of the original of this story was written by the late Mrs. Mullens, of Calcutta; completed and revised, it was translated into the Hindi language of the N.W. Provinces of India. Prasanna is the husband and Kamini the wife. The illustrations have been prepared with a view to both the English and the vernacular Hindi editions.—A pleasing story, also published by the R.T.S., is *The Two Crowns* (pp. 300); a capital gift-book for young ladies. It contains some clever sketches—pleasing and instructive—of home life; and the lesson of marrying according to Christian principle is well enforced. The volume has a pretty cover.

In the June *Art Journal* (Virtue and Co.) appears the usual supply of interesting matter. The line engraving is "Requisitioned;" J. C. Armytage, after A. C. Gow, A.R.A. Mr. Hatton's "London Club-land," Part III., has illustrations of the United Service Club, the Junior United, and the Union. "Art Teaching at Charterhouse," and "Hammersmith and Chiswick," are very good. Altogether, we have a pleasing specimen of this excellent periodical.

From the June *Church Missionary Intelligencer* we take the following: "The financial result of the year ending March 31 is as follows. The Ordinary Receipts were £198,213; other receipts of all kinds, including the gifts for the enlarged C.M. House, and interest on various Special Funds, £33,328. The Ordinary Expenditure of the year was £207,283, besides £3,684 for the Extension Fund, and other sums on special accounts. The real result is seen by taking the two 'Ordinary' figures, which show that the receipts have fallen short of the outlay by £9,070. This sum has been drawn from the Contingency Fund, the reserve formed by the surplus receipts of previous years."

THE MONTH.

THE Marquis of Salisbury is spoken of as Prime Minister.[1] Mr. Gladstone's resignation has been accepted. At present, the 17th, the composition of the Cabinet is not certain; but Lord Randolph Churchill has been offered, it is said, an important post.[2] For a few days it has been doubtful whether Lord Salisbury would accept office in the present condition of affairs. To what extent the new Government—if the Conservatives take office—can count upon the forbearance of the Majority in the House of Commons will probably have been ascertained.

It was rumoured that the resignations of Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain had been sent in, and would have been accepted on the Tuesday. The *Guardian* says:

> A Government which does not take all the pains it can to bring its supporters together, and yet insists on dividing before there has been time to make good the omission, is naturally suspected of preferring defeat to victory.
>
> In this case, seemingly, Ministers had very good reason for such a preference. It is better to be beaten by an Opposition than to go to pieces from internal dissensions, and had they escaped shipwreck from the first cause on the Monday, it would in all probability have overtaken them from the second cause on the Tuesday. The smooth things that were said from time to time as to the readiness shown by Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke to waive their objection to any renewal of the Crimes Act rather concealed than expressed the actual truth.

In the *National Church* for June we read:

> It has been usual to keep the National Church Sunday on the first Sunday in November, which this year falls upon All Saints Day. In deference to suggestions from several friends, it has been decided to fix upon Sunday, October 25th, for the National Church Sunday for 1885.

---

[1] An adverse vote on the Budget on Monday the 8th was followed by the resignation of the Ministry on the 9th. The numbers were: for the Government, 252; against, 264. The speech with which Mr. Gladstone closed the debate seemed designed to leave Ministers no choice but resignation.

[2] The *Times* remarks that the new Conservative movement must be welcomed. "Nothing could well be worse than the stagnation into which the Conservative party has of late been sinking, or than the suspension of the functions of an Opposition to which we owe so much that is deplorable in the events of the last four or five years. The Radical party, though energetic enough on their own lines, and profoundly convinced that they are the people and that wisdom will die with them, are too narrow, too doctrinaire, and too contemptuous of experience fully to represent the instincts of an ancient people, or single-handed to guard the interests of a vast empire. There is ample room and urgent need for a new and living Conservatism, and we are willing to make large allowances for its inception and to look with hope upon its development."

At the seventy-fourth Annual Meeting of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, the Bishop of London occupied the chair. Lord George Hamilton moved the first resolution:

That the National Society thankfully recognises the self-denial and zeal of those managers of Church schools throughout the country who, in some cases by preserving their schools in the face of considerable difficulties, and in others by the erection of new and the enlargement of existing buildings, have done much to promote distinctive religious education in their several neighbourhoods.

The noble lord said that they met under exceptionally favourable auspices:

Last year there was a falling off in subscriptions and in the grants earned by elementary schools; but now the financial outlook was much more satisfactory. There was an increase in the subscriptions of between £17,000 and £18,000, and an increase in the amount of grants obtained by children in the schools of no less than £106,000. When they contrasted this increase with the loss of £6,000 on the earnings of the preceding year, they had something to congratulate themselves upon. Having had the honour to be connected with the Education Department in the last Conservative Government, he might say that £1 voluntarily subscribed did as much as £3 levied from the rates in promoting education. This was a strong assertion, but he would justify it by figures. Three-sixths of the total elementary education of the country was carried on by the Church of England, two-sixths by school boards, and one-sixth by various voluntary associations. Now, it was clear that if the National school system were to break down, the work of the other voluntary associations, which were so much weaker, would also fail. Hence it followed that two-thirds of the elementary education of the country was carried on by voluntary effort. Now the amount of subscriptions was £730,000 a year, and the amount which fell upon the rates for school maintenance was £915,000 entirely irrespective of interest on loans. The latter item was at least half as much as that for school maintenance; and thus it appeared that it cost at least £1,360,000 from the rates, to do half the work that was done by £730,000 of voluntary subscriptions. (Cheers.) It was fifteen years since the Education Act was passed, and no one could have expected that the voluntary schools would be subjected to so great a strain. He was, however, bound to say that the Vice-President of the Council, Mr. Mundella, had dealt very fairly with voluntary schools. With regard to over-pressure, although there was a tendency in some quarters to exaggerate, he thought that the evidence of mothers showed that in numbers of cases over-pressure had taken place. Something had been done to mitigate this by providing cheap penny dinners, but he thought all interested in elementary education ought to deal very tenderly with this complaint. He did not see any objection to allowing teachers—especially in view of the superior position and attainments of the persons entering the profession—to exercise a greater latitude with regard to classifying children for examination. (Cheers.)

The Bishop of Oxford, in seconding the resolution (which he did with great cordiality), observed that the difficulties with which the managers of schools had to contend were enor-

mous; but he could not help thinking that they might in great part be removed by a little good sense and good feeling:

For instance, the Great Western Railway ran through a great many parishes in his diocese; but the directors declined to subscribe to the schools, though some of them were maintained very largely for the sake of the children of their own servants, for whom he held that they were distinctly responsible. So much for the question of duty and good feeling; now for the good sense. If the result of refusing to subscribe a few pounds here and there for the support of voluntary schools and the consequent substitution of school-rates should throw upon companies a payment of some thousands that might have been avoided, he did not think that the shareholders would be pleased. Indeed, he thought they would have a good right to complain, and he was not sure that they would not do so. (Cheers.) It was not altogether a question of money; but it roused a feeling of indignation amongst the ratepayers when they saw the largest of their number refuse to bear its share of the common burden, and when they were asked to subscribe they said, "No, we wun't." (Laughter.) As to the general question of difficulties, he thought the managers of schools had some reason to be dissatisfied with the Government. In 1870 they heard the most beautiful and brotherly language. They were told by the most eminent members of the Ministry that there was nothing they desired so much as to support the voluntary schools. At the very beginning, the Government had come to the rescue of voluntary education, and at that time—he was speaking of 1845—many of them gladly welcomed the interference of the State. But now the Government seemed always to be jealously watching the promoters of Church schools as if there were some interest—he really did not know what that interest could be—that needed to be protected against them. He would not say that the Department was always hostile, but no promoter of voluntary education expected to find his best friend in Downing Street. (Laughter.) Yet why should the Department take that view of people who had contributed to schools £5,000,000 in the course of the last twelve years, and who were now spending £600,000 of their own money per annum? Why should the Government—just now there was no Government, and therefore he was not speaking politically—(laughter)—why should the Government want to throw away this magnificent aid to the cause of public education? Why did they wish to limit its area when they knew that for every sixpence which the voluntary schools spent the State would have had to spend ninepence? (Cheers.) He did not see why the Goverument should not co-operate with Church schools, which were sustained by faith and love, and which saved the public hundreds of thousands of pounds every year.

At the anniversary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel the Archbishop of Canterbury said:

I perceive that the Church of England raises £500,000 a year for Missions, and that all the bodies of Nonconformists put together—I am speaking in both cases with reference to the British Isles—raise £550,000. Now I am very eager that this present year the Church should raise that additional £50,000. (Cheers.) It is no question of rivalry. I think that while all those Nonconformist societies are our brethren, united in one common faith, striving for one common object, working in Christ's name, and for the good of all men, they would desire this thing also. (Cheers.) The aim of the societies ought to be mutual provocation to love and good works, and the Church of England ought to make her contributions equal to those of other Churches, but particularly in spiritual matters.

Especially ought we to lay to heart that this is no mere contest of money. We must lay to heart that gifts are but an index of feeling. Now that the Intercession Day has been moved back to the old day, which has been found to suit so much better the custom and habits of English society—(cheers)—I do trust that both the existence of that day and the change that has been made in deference to so many requests will be marked by very full churches, by churches open all day, and by a great deal of private prayer.

At the ninth Annual Meeting of the Yorkshire Clerical and Lay Union a paper on "Controversy in Relation to Rome and Ritualism" was read by the Rev. Canon McCormick, marked with his usual ability and judgment. Dr. McCormick said:

It is not controversy in the abstract, but the judicious handling of controversy that is really the question. The sermon of Canon Liddon serves as an illustration. Supposing that any leading Evangelical clergyman had been invited to occupy the pulpit at the consecration of one or more Bishops, and having accepted such invitation, had taken advantage of his position to treat of some controversial topic; what would have been said of him? Many of his own friends would have lamented over his injudiciousness. . . . We blame Canon Liddon, not for honestly stating his convictions, but for doing so on an occasion when good taste, to say the very least, ought to have led him to avoid a burning question and direct controversial matter, especially as one of the Bishops to be consecrated was a leading Evangelical clergyman, who must not only have dissented from his views, but been pained at them. It may be quite true that the great leaders of the Evangelical revival at the end of the last century and at the commencement of the present "cared little for mere polemics" as far as Romanism was concerned. Their controversy was of another kind. They had to fight against formality, worldliness, and notorious sin. Romanism was not making any progress in the land. So-called "Catholic Emancipation" was not then passed. They knew nothing of Ritualism. Had such a state of things existed as now prevails, it is a question as to whether they would have been content with spiritual work only. The absence of the flagrant evil, at any rate, accounts for the silence.

In an article headed "Canon Liddon's Retractation," the *Record* points out some remarkable alterations in the published sermon, rendered all the more remarkable by the fact that the sermon was originally a written one, and from the nature of the occasion must have been carefully considered. Here are the two versions of the crucial passage in parallel columns:

As Delivered.	As Revised.
But the greater English divines have also felt that when insisting upon the Episcopate as organically necessary to the structure of the visible Body of Christ, as necessary not merely to its *bene esse* but to its *esse*, they were indirectly raising a solid barrier against Ultramontanism.	But some English divines may also have felt that when insisting upon the Episcopate as organically necessary to the structure of the visible Body of Christ—as necessary not merely to its *bene esse* but to its *esse*—they were indirectly strengthening a barrier against Ultramontanism.

At the annual meeting of the Church Army the Bishop of Durham presided. The Bishop spoke of three of the chief features of the movement. First there was its magnificent hopefulness; secondly, there was the adoption of more various and less conventional modes of teaching and religious services than those hitherto prevailing; and thirdly, there was the feature of the highest importance—namely, the principle of the Army's sending out working-men as evangelists to working-men. Those were the three features which recommended the movement of the Church Army to his notice. That Army was loyal to the Church, said Bishop Lightfoot, to which it was a valuable handmaid. In his speech the Bishop of Oxford described how from early life he had been attracted by the ideal of the Church of England in the pages of George Herbert, and by the thought of having a scholar, a divine, and a man of some social standing, descending from his height to the plain people of his parish. But that ideal could, after all, only be in a very limited sphere, and even in his (the Bishop's) own short life the increase of population had brought them experiences quite outside of it. The Church, said Bishop Mackarness, must try to reach all classes.

To the Canonry at Winchester, vacant by the resignation of Canon Carus, Archdeacon Sumner—we record with pleasure—has been appointed by the Bishop.

At the anniversary of the English Church Union, the President (Mr. Wood), in pleading for unity (according to the *Record*) said:

> Peace with one another, not by the sacrifice of the truth, but through the truth, peace with our separated brethren at home, union among ourselves, and the restoration of the visible unity with the members of the Church abroad, East and West alike, but *above all with the great Apostolic See of the West, with the holy Roman Church which has done so much to guard the true faith—these surely should be our objects and the objects nearest our hearts.*

The general opinion touching the Revised Old Testament appears to be decidedly favourable, as we ventured to predict a month ago. Several critics, however, consider the work to be unduly conservative.

In an article headed "Minor Orders," the *Record* comments upon one feature of a Report lately issued by a Committee of the London Diocesan Conference. The *Record* says:

> We greatly rejoice at the acknowledgment of the necessity of enlisting Lay Help in the work, and especially the Evangelistic work, of the Church, a necessity long ignored and strenuously denied by all sections of Churchmen, except Evangelicals. Though tardy it is complete. The old prejudice has at last been broken down, and the question is no longer

whether the thing is to be done, but how it is to be done. We confess that the Recommendations of the Committee do not satisfy us in this latter respect. We doubt the need of these various grades of Lay Helpers each with a different title; and we most gravely doubt the wisdom of seeking to revive amongst ourselves the Minor Orders of the Roman Catholic Church. The advantages of Lay Help will, we fear, be greatly lessened and impeded if an attempt is made, even in appearance, to supply modern needs by the resuscitation of a set of ancient titles and offices connected to a large extent with a ritual and form of public worship of which our Church has known nothing since the Reformation. This objection appears to have been anticipated by the compilers of the Report, and they have endeavoured to meet it by a statement to the following effect: "There is reason to believe that it was not intended at the Reformation to abolish all minor offices in the Church of England." The Act 3 & 4 Ed. VI., ch. 12, is quoted which authorized the preparation of a new ordinal for "making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and *other Ministers* of the Church;" and in the appendix a passage from Strype's "Annals" is cited, second-hand from Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law," which gives certain conditions laid down by the Bishops in 1562 as required from all "Readers and Deacons." On the strength of these two authorities the Report finds that the Church of England after the Reformation "at one time proposed to make provision, and did actually at a later time make some partial provision for other ministers." . . . . Had greater pains been taken to arrive at the plain historical facts of the case, instead of hastily generalizing on the haphazard materials which chance seems to have thrown in their way, the Committee would have found not, indeed, any ground for their somewhat crude guess of the continuation of the Romish Minor Orders after the Reformation, but, what is far more valuable, ample support for the employment of Lay Help from the course pursued by the Reformers themselves when brought face to face with difficulties not altogether unlike those of our own day.

There is high authority for supposing that, even prior to the Reformation, Minor Orders had, except as a matter of form, fallen into disuse in England. But, however this may be, it seems reasonably certain that they were definitely and deliberately discarded in Henry VIII.'s reign. In the Cotton MSS. there is still preserved a document (1537-8), signed by Vicegerent Cromwell, the two Archbishops, eleven Bishops, and twenty Divines and Canonists, bearing this title, "A Declaration made of the functions and Divine institution of Bishops and Priests." In this very important manifesto the following passage occurs:

> Albeit the holy fathers of the Church which succeeded the Apostles, minding to beautify and ornate the Church of Christ with all those things which were commendable in the temple of the Jews, did devise not only certain other ceremonies . . . . but did also institute certain inferior orders or degrees, as janitors, lectors, exorcists, acolits, and subdeacons, and deputed to every one of those certain offices to execute in the Church, wherein they followed undoubtedly the example and rites used in the Old Testament; yet the truth is that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers and of priests or bishops, nor is there any word spoken of any other meaning used in the conferring of this Sacrament, but only of prayer and the imposition of the Bishop's hands.

Commenting on the above, Bishop Burnet says: "On this paper I will add two remarks. The one is that after this I do never find the inferior degrees under a deacon mentioned in this Church, so it seems at this time they were laid aside."

Thus, for the last ten years of Henry's reign, Minor Orders do not seem to have been acknowledged. It would perhaps be rash to assert that no evidence of them can be found, but we are not aware of any. The same may be said of Edward VI.'s reign. No special stress can fairly be laid on the words "other ministers" in 3 & 4 Edward VI. ch. 12. The draftsmen of Acts of Parliament, in Tudor times especially, loved to make assurance doubly sure by using what lawyers still call "general words," without much heed to whether they were wanted or not. Thus in the same Statute the expression "Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, *or Ministers*" occurs, though obviously the addition is not necessary to the sense. The best commentary on the Statute is the use that was made of it. An Ordinal for the three Orders was prepared under its sanction; but we do not read of any reformed method of admitting to Minor Orders having been even discussed. We may take it, therefore, that from 1537 to the death of Edward, Minor Orders were defunct and abolished. Bishop Gibson asserts this strongly. After enumerating the three Orders he added: "Besides these the Church of Rome hath five others, and that it may appear *what we reformed from* and how little they deserve the name of Orders, I will give a brief description of them." Later on he says, "because they were evidently elected for convenience only, and were not immediately concerned in the sacred offices of the Church, *they were justly laid aside by our first Reformers.*"

When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, the Church of England was in an extremely depressed and destitute condition. The monastic confiscations of Henry VIII. had seriously affected the parochial endowments also. The closing of the Ecclesiastical Courts under Edward VI. had produced a collapse of discipline and order which the subsequent creation of special Commissions had by no means completely removed. The violent retrogression of Queen Mary of course aggravated the existing evils in an overwhelming degree. Her successor therefore had to contend with grave difficulties. The deprivation of many of the Romish clergy, the non-residence of others, and the smallness of a large number of benefices produced many more vacancies than could possibly be filled by the regular clergy who had embraced the Reformation or were at any rate willing to conform. Even men very indifferently qualified by education or character for the oversight of a parish, were accepted in default of better. Thus Fuller in his irrepressible tone of quaint humour describes the condition of affairs:

> As for the inferior clergy under them [the Bishops], the best that could be gotten were placed in pastoral charges. Alas, tolerability was eminency in that age; a rush-candle seemed a torch where no brighter light was ere seen before. Surely preaching now ran very low if it be true what I read that Mr. Tavernour of Water Eaton, in Oxfordshire, High Sheriffe of the county, came, in pure charity, not ostentation, and gave the scholars a sermon in St. Mary's, with his gold chain about his neck and his sword by his side, beginning with these words: "Arriving at the mount of St. Mary's in the stony stage, where I now stand, I have brought you some fine biscuits baked in the oven of charity, and carefully conserved for the chickens of the Church, the sparrows of the spirit, and the sweet swallows of Salvation."

One of the first labours of Archbishop Parker was to draw up, in 1559, "An Order for serving cures now destitute." His plan was to give to one clergyman called a "principal incumbent," the oversight of several contiguous parishes, to enable him to discharge which, Lay Help was introduced thus:

. . . "The said principal incumbent to depute in every such parish committed to his care a Deacon (if it might be) or some honest, sober, and grave layman, who as a Reader should read the order of service appointed; but such Reader not to intermeddle, to christen, marry, or minister the Holy Communion, or preach or prophesy, but only to read the service of the day, with the Litany and Homily, as should be prescribed, in the absence of the principal incumbent.

These Readers were not ordained, and apparently admission by the Bishop was not necessary, for we read in the same "Order"—

The Readers not to be appointed but by the oversight of the Bishop *or his Chancellor*, to have their convenient instruction and advertisement, with some letters testimonial of their admission, how to order themselves in the said charge. The said Lectors or Readers always removable upon their disability or disorder by certificate and proof thereof.

Here then we have the true predecessor of the modern Lay Helper or Reader appointed for much the same purposes and under much the same circumstances, viz., when the supply of the clergy was unequal to the demands made on them. But the Readers of Archbishop Parker were an independent growth. They were not a survival of the old Romish Minor Orders. The Lectors, Acolytes, and Ostiaries of mediæval times were not intended to meet the same need as either the Reformation or the modern Readers. Instead of supplying the place of the regular clergy, they were used to give additional pomp to services in which a plentiful attendance of priests was already a *sine quâ non*.

In 1562 the rules, of which the Report gives a second-hand version, were drawn up in Convocation. They are interesting as showing what were the duties confided to Readers in the sixteenth century. These duties were practically confined to reading the service and a homily, and to keeping the parish registers. Preaching is strictly prohibited, and no wonder, if Thomas Fuller's quotation from Mr. Tavernour's discourse is at all typical of the style of lay sermons. There is one important point where the compilers of the Report have been led wrong by copying from Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law" instead of consulting Burn's authority for themselves. The last promise to be exacted from a Reader on admission is said to be, "I will not openly intermeddle with any artificers' occupations as covetously to seek a gain thereby." This, however, is an error. As before remarked, these conditions are said to be required of "Readers and Deacons," and this last one is, in the original, specially confined to the latter. Readers were apparently suffered to earn their living by any honest trade without impediment, a fact not without importance with reference to modern discussions on this subject.

It will be seen, therefore, that, although Archbishop Parker's plan supplies a very useful precedent for us to follow, it is wholly independent of any pre-Reformation or Roman Catholic practice. We confess that, apart from any question of historical accuracy, we are very unwilling to resort to mediæval models, or to countenance any attempt to assimilate our ecclesiastical machinery in any degree to that of the old dark days of Papal supremacy. By all means let us have Lay Help; but let such anachronisms as Minor Orders remain in the oblivion which for three centuries has covered them. At any rate, let us not sacrifice the plain truth of history in our ardour for their fanciful resuscitation.