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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1885.

ART. I.—THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

ALTHOUGH much has been written in recent years upon the history of French Protestantism, thanks to the unceasing labours of the *Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, one important period has hitherto remained comparatively neglected. While the origins of French Protestantism have received masterly treatment at the hands of Professor Baird and others; while the stormy period of the first Civil Wars and St. Bartholomew's Day, as also the subsequent times of Richelieu and Mazarin, have repeatedly found adequate survey and analysis; and while the exile and persecutions of the Revocation are familiar to most students in outline if not in detail—the remarkable generation which preceded the Revocation as yet lacks any history but that contained in the formidable volumes of Élie Benoist.

The reason is not far to seek. It is not a picturesque or a romantic period. There is no civil war, no conspiracy; no monumental characters like Coligny or Sully, or Duplessis Mornay; no tragedy like the night of St. Bartholomew. It is a time of transition and of preparation. But there are not wanting here—as indeed in every epoch—the subject of fruitful study and legitimate interest. At no other time can the strength and weakness of the Huguenots be so clearly estimated as when placed in juxtaposition with the Gallican Church, then in the plenitude of glory, with Antoine Arnauld, Pétau, Launoy, Bossuet, Fénelon, and Bourdaloue, either in maturity or in early promise. And the result of such investigation may lead to the conviction that, in respect of scholarship, solid learning, the graver eloquence, and that mastery which Goethe tells us can only be the offspring of restriction and hindrance, the period in question was fruitful

in good men, worthy successors of their great forerunners, and prepared, like them, to be confessors and martyrs of Christ's Gospel.

So far was Protestantism in France from being extinguished by the massacre of 1572, that within four years it reconquered the position gained in 1570 at the Peace of St. Germain. And not even the Holy League, founded by the Guises in conjunction with Philip of Spain, formidable as it was, could avail to break down the position of active resistance. The miserable King Henri III., despised by both parties, gave negative help in his destruction of the Guise faction. It was from his Protestant successor, Henri of Navarre, the hope of Evangelical Christendom, that a serious blow was impending, when, with hardly the affectation of gravity, he decided upon an abjuration in the light of a political necessity. It has been rightly urged by M. Charles Read and others that the political expedience of this step was as doubtful as its moral aspect was terrible. To argue with Stähelin[1] that the land, but for this step, would have been plunged into further civil war, is simply to beg a very complicated question. Still less can we endorse the suggestion of the same writer, that Henri might have proclaimed the old Gallican independence of Rome, and might then, from within a Catholic, but non-Roman Church, have effected all the needful reforms. All the possibilities of devious diplomacy passed under the view of the acutest statesman in Europe; and so little was he able to frame a justification for his perversion that to the earnest reproaches of Queen Elizabeth and others he could only utter the jesting excuse, "*Paris vaut bien une messe.*"

A great ruler, singularly endowed in body and mind for the highest functions, and having enjoyed the inestimable privilege of being tried by persecution, he failed in the time of prosperity; was morally enervated, lost faith, and laid himself the foundation of all the later misery of his former colleagues. For the nation was now on the path of centralization, in which all minorities—however safe-guarded by privilege—were finally doomed; and the keen eye of a Sully could not but foresee, in the political horizon, the sure foreshadowing of future disaster.

For the time, however, a sufficient bulwark seemed to be raised by the Edict of Nantes. Its preamble recognised that God is adored by all the subjects of France, if by different rites and ceremonies, and therefore the kingdom retains its old title, "Très-Chrétien." The following enactments were declared to be perpetual and irrevocable:

(*a*) Full liberty of private conscience.

[1] "Der Uebertritt K. Heinrichs IV.," Basel, 1856.

(*b*) Right of public worship in all places where it had been permitted in 1597, and in the suburbs of towns; in castles of great nobles (*hauts-justiciers*), and in the chapels of private mansions.
(*c*) All public offices to be open to the Huguenots.
(*d*) Their children were to share in the schools, their sick in the hospitals, their poor the alms of the parish.
(*e*) The right of printing was conceded in certain towns.
(*f*) For the purpose of securing equal justice, the so-called "*Chambres Mi-parties*" were to be established in the provincial parliaments, as well as a *Chambre de l'Édit*, at Paris.
(*g*) The right to found academies and convoke synods.
(*h*) Possession of certain cities and fortresses.

Perhaps the best proof of the immediate merit of the Edict is to be found in the bitter opposition it elicited on both sides. The old Leaguers, who had one and all sold their loyalty at a high price to Henri IV., professed horror at this legal permission of heresy. On the other hand, the Huguenots[1] were indignant at the clauses which enjoined the restitution of possessions taken from the Catholics, and the undisturbed celebration of the mass even in their own districts. But the real weakness of the Edict, considered as a final settlement, lay in its principles rather than in its details. The Huguenots were regarded as a separated body, and all their safeguards tended to make them still more an *imperium in imperio*, an ever-present danger in the eyes of an absolute ruler. The real need was for the fusion of the two parties: the Edict only gave protection; and it was the misfortune, and not the fault, of the Huguenots that they were soon forced to look solely to their separate resources, and never enabled to make any appeal to patriotic feeling or human sympathy.

The proof of this was experienced as soon as the dagger of Ravaillac had ended the reign of Henri IV. A series of gradual but ever-increasing encroachments on their privileges began: in 1617 a decree, confiscating some lands in Béarn, provoked resistance. The royal troops were sent to Pau, but hardly had they enforced the decree when the southern provinces were in revolt. La Rochelle summoned a synod, and in a few months the two parties were again in armed conflict; but the Huguenots had no longer the resources

[1] It is curious that the exploded derivation of this word, from "eidgenossen," is still repeated in some recent publications. The reader may be referred to Gieseler's *Kirchengeschichte* (III. i. 535) for an interesting and conclusive statement on the subject. The name arose in Touraine, where the Protestants were supposed to be the followers of a mythical "Roi Huguet," the leader of some outlaws.

needful for a combat against superior force. The old martyr spirit had been modified into political passion; the struggle for religious liberty into one for the conservation of privileges. The old leaders were either past activity, or had been gained over to the Court. Not even the hopes of English help, as little trustworthy as in Elizabeth's time, could prolong the contest. After a gallant resistance La Rochelle surrendered in 1625; and Richelieu's political wisdom re-enacted the Edict of Nantes, save only that the hostage-fortresses were razed, and all future means of defence removed.

In the peaceful generation which followed there is not much to attract the Church historian, except the declaration of union with the Lutheran churches, drawn up at the National Synod of Charenton in 1631, under the auspices of Mestrézat and Blondel. But during the troubles of the Fronde the Huguenots were given opportunity of proving themselves patriotic citizens, and of meriting sympathy from their fellow-subjects and affection from the throne. From 1652 to 1656 the condition of the Huguenots was greatly improved. Cromwell's influence was paramount in Europe, and a word in a despatch had saved Nîmes from the intended penalty for a riot; but on his death the hostile influence of the Queen-mother became paramount. The Huguenots determined on a great appeal: they secured the appointment of a commission to investigate their grievances. Its report was published in April, 1659, and brought dismay to the petitioners. All that was granted to them was the sending of certain official arbitrators. The Catholic clergy triumphed, knowing their influence upon these officers; the Huguenots felt that their cause was lost.

After the last National Synod, held at Loudun in 1659-60, began a time of gradual but unceasing encroachment upon the privileges of the Edict. But active persecution did not begin until Turenne, the *Maréchal-général* of France, the greatest of her citizens and soldiers, had followed the disastrous example of Henri IV. in abandoning the religion of his fathers. Many and various had been the influences brought to bear upon him. The vulgar temptations of military and court rank, even the title of "*Connétable de France*," were held forth in vain. It is probable that the ultimate success lay in an appeal to his fidelity to the policy of Louis XIV., based on false or exaggerated statements of Huguenot disaffection.

Once deprived of their great leader, the Huguenots were soon made to feel a change of policy. In 1669 a royal declaration suppressed the *Chambres de l'Édit* at Paris and Rome. This was rapidly followed by a "Règlement," or set of practical rules, intended to hamper as far as possible the

independence of social life. This first policy of Louis XIV. is simply and cordially stated in his own memoirs, the authenticity of which is unquestionable:

> I believed, my son, that the best way of proceeding with the Huguenots in my kingdom was, in the first place, not to employ any new severity with them, to observe faithfully all the concessions they had obtained from my predecessors, but to go no further in the way of indulgences, and even to restrict them as far as justice and decency would permit. . . . But as to the favours which depended on my own will, I determined from the first to grant none to the Huguenots. I also decided to attract by favours and recompense those who showed signs of yielding; and I neglected no opportunity of stirring up our bishops to labour for their instruction and conversion, and to remove the scandals which tended to keep them apart.[1]

The Chancellor of this Exchequer of perversion was Péllisson, himself a pervert from Protestantism, who had attained a rapid literary reputation by his "History of the Academy." A large annual revenue derived from the *Régale* was devoted to this purpose, and regular financial statements prepared, showing the cost per head in each district. It is noteworthy that the price gradually lessened as force was more frequently used to supplement bribery. In the month of June, 1677, we find him writing to a correspondent on the subject of economy, suggesting 100 francs as the maximum in the case of the poorer classes, proving very clearly that his successes were among the residuum without religion, to whom his function gave an unhoped-for opportunity of gain. This is the more to be emphasized, since later, when persecution was seriously practised, there is no question as to the numbers which, under pressure, abandoned their faith.

Together with this method, discreditable alike to those who gave and received, another system was employed. Historians of Louis's reign have sometimes marked as an epoch of particular glory the abandonment of the profligate life which had stained the Court of Versailles, and all who condoned it by their presence. There would have been more reason for congratulation had not that period of reformation been delayed till middle life, and conterminous with the commencement of persecution. Perhaps the two motives were combined: the fixed desire to get rid of the jarring political independence conferred by the Edict, and the conviction that he might atone for the profligacy of early life by the zealous extirpation of heresy. It may, indeed, be conceded that he was kept in ignorance of the *means* adopted by his subordinates; but it is the most terrible responsibility of absolute power that every act of a subordinate is the act of the superior, both in law

[1] "Mém. Historiques de Louis XIV.," i., 87.

and equity; and every deed of injustice and cruelty, wherever committed, is the act of the Sovereign himself.

Michel de Marillac, intendant of Poitou, had the questionable merit of discovering and suggesting a new method of pressure. Of all civic burthens, "billeting" was one of the most disagreeable. Hard work had to be done for nominal pay, which often did not cover the actual cost. Favour also decided as to distribution, and arranged exemptions. Marillac was the type of the inferior statesman in these times. Popular, trying to raise the credit of a decayed family rather than to amass a fortune—like others, he saw in persecution and forced "conversions" a way of gaining favour at Court. He suggested to Louvois that detachments of troops might be billeted on Huguenot households, with permission (explicit or implicit) to relax even the slender discipline on such occasions.

At first no extraordinary excesses were practised, but soon the soldiers learnt the half-prompted lesson. The terror spread. Those whom the fear of personal suffering would not have daunted trembled for their families, the honour of their wives and daughters. The very sight of a dragoon sometimes caused all the inhabitants of a village to abjure. The well-known narrative of Jean Migault gives a pathetic record of these incursions. "They demanded," he relates, "fifteen francs for each of the superior officers, nine for a lieutenant, three for each soldier, and thirty sols even for each subordinate person attached to the regiment." On the slightest hesitation furniture and goods were sold. But the loss by plunder was the least evil suffered. Jurien records that, at the village of Ville-Dieu in Poitou, a sick man was persecuted for days, and left at last without food. "At last, seeing that he could not be persuaded, they left him. He died of starvation, and those who found his corpse saw that he had devoured part of his own hands."[1] Élie Benoist's fourth volume is full of similar records. An officer of dragoons, called to account for his cruelty, naïvely declared that he had never heard of any severity, "*except burning the feet of the householders where his men were billeted.*" And at last the veil of seeming ignorance at Court was dismissed, and the worst excesses endorsed and enjoined by the direct command of the monarch:

Le Roy a appris de votre lettre du 17 de ce mois la continuation de l'opiniâtreté des habitants de la R.P.R. de Dieppe; comme ces gens-là sont les seuls dans tout le royaulme qui se sont distingués à ne se vouloir pas soumettre à ce que le Roy désire d'eux, *vous ne devez garder à leur égard aucune des mesures qui vous ont été prescrites, et vous ne sauriez rendre trop rude et trop onéreuse la subsistence des troupes chez eux.*[2]

[1] "Les derniers efforts de l'innocence affligée." La Haye, 1682.

[2] Louvois to Beaupré, quoted by Waddington, "Normandie," 2 *n.* 1.

Ribaldry, plunder, actual violence, ended in the ruin of the household visited by these *missions bottées;* and when a family was "converted" the soldiers moved elsewhere to repeat the process. At times one wonders that the descendants of the warriors of Moncontour and Jarnac had learnt so much passive submission. But it must be remembered that the Huguenots had now no leaders, no organization, and no practice in the use of arms. And we may also believe that the strong teachings of obedience to constituted authorities, in which the great Protestant theologians rivalled the Court preachers themselves, had sunk deep into the hearts of their hearers.

In one quarter alone was resistance shown, and an excuse furnished for completing the work of persecution. Claude Brousson, a citizen of Nîmes, had pleaded in vain before the Parliament of Toulouse for the retention of fourteen Protestant churches threatened with demolition. At last he planned open manifestation. An informal synod was summoned, and representatives attended from Dauphiné, the Vivarais, the Cevennes, and Languedoc. A letter was drawn up, addressed to the king, pleading their loyal purpose, but asserting their determination to obey God rather than man, and that if their temples were destroyed they would hold their meetings still on the desecrated spots. Twenty years earlier this firm but respectful language would have produced a great effect. *Now* it was too late. Moreover, there was division even in the ranks of the persecuted: on the one side the terrified majority, the so-called "*modérés,*" led by Ruvigni; on the other the small band of "*zélateurs,*" who were determined not to suffer without protest. It is sad to find Ruvigni angrily disavowing Brousson; and actually declaring that the king would be justified in destroying the temples for thirty leagues around, in case of resistance!

In spite of this protest, the appointed meeting was held. It took place at St. Hippolyte, in the Cevennes, and was marked by order and solemnity. Many others followed. But now the Catholic population began to arm, and the Huguenots followed the example. This gave the wished-for excuse at Versailles. The original petition, in all probability, had never reached the monarch; no answer, in any case, was vouchsafed. Saint-Ruth, a famous soldier of fortune, destined to contend more illustriously in Ireland afterwards, was sent in command of the royal troops. They came upon a Huguenot congregation in the act of worship. It resisted the onslaught, and defended themselves bravely against the charge of three regiments. Massacred, the remainder were burnt in a farm whither they had taken refuge, singing psalms to the last.

Prisoners taken elsewhere were tortured and executed. Isaac Homel, the proto-martyr of the Revocation period, was broken on the wheel. This ended the first and last attempt at resistance for many years.

And now the toils were closing round the victims, and the bishops felt confident that their long-continued importunities were at last to be granted. In vain do the more adroit apologists of the Gallican Church endeavour to prove that it had no responsibility in the Revocation. As far back as the year 1636, the clergy of France had petitioned for an interference and literary censorship upon Huguenot writings and utterances, which would have amounted to virtual suppression.[1] In 1651 Gilbert de Choiseul, Bishop of Comminges, addressed the king in these words: "We do not ask of your majesty *at present* to banish from his kingdom this unhappy liberty of conscience which destroys the true liberty of the children of God, *because the execution of such a step would be difficult.*"[2] From 1660 onwards, the demands of the Assemblies increase in vigour and distinctness. Step by step, their demands prompt and anticipate the successive inroads made into the few remaining privileges of the Edict. The severe laws against the *relaps*, the exclusion of the Huguenots from all public and municipal offices, the limitation and destruction of temples, the nullity of mixed marriages, the restriction of private education, all these were explicitly and specifically demanded by the Gallican clergy, and granted at their request. The Assembly of 1680 could hardly think of a new petition. Its successors of 1682 and 1685 addressed the Huguenots in honeyed words that barely concealed the sense of imminent triumph.[3] They prayed the Protestant brethren lovingly to consider whether the cruel separation should not end, and the "tenderness" which the Church had manifested meet with its reward. But the conclusion of the document left no room for doubt. In case of prolonged resistance, "you must await evils incomparably more terrible than all those which already have been incurred by your rebellion and your schism."[4] This was the announcement of the Revocation.

JOHN DE SOYRES.

(To be continued.)

---

[1] See "Recueil des Actes, titres et mémoires concernant les affaires du clergé de France, mis en nouvel ordre suivant la délibération générale du clergé, du 29 août 1705." Paris, 1716.

[2] "Remontrances du Clergé," in "Bulletin de l'Hist. du Prot.," xiv. 71 *et seq.*

[3] "Lettre circulaire du Clergé de France," 1682, p. 30.

[4] "Avertissement pastoral de l'Égl. Gall. à ceux de la R.P.R." 1685.

Art. II.—THE PASTORAL EPISTLES AND THE MINISTRY.

I SUPPOSE it is not uncommon for a clergyman to be often depressed by the many forms of error around him, and by the ungodliness of life too often to be met with. An earnest labourer in his parish in private and in public, in spreading the truth and in promoting holy living, is often grieved at apparent failure. To compare the present with the past, the anxious man takes down the Pastoral Epistles, and earnestly reads them once again. The first encouraging thing striking the troubled spirit—an old thought revived with new life—is:

I. *The Divine Call of the Pastor.*

This is certainly the claim of the writer of the three Pastoral Epistles. His Ministry is a divine thing. He is an Apostle of Jesus Christ. Speaking of himself he says: "The glorious gospel . . . was committed to my trust" (1 Tim. i. 11). He thanks Jesus Christ for putting him into the ministry. Expressions so great distinctly teach the heavenly origin of the Ministry. The standpoint from which the writer appears is congenial to the clergyman whom we have pictured in his anxieties amid surrounding difficulties. The situation is that of the leader of the mighty movement about to pass away himself, and to hand on the torch of truth to a successor. The several parts of these Epistles, facing such a position, breathe out a tone of overpowering earnestness. Our clergyman, catching up this tone, sees perhaps with clearer vision than before, that then, as now, a sound faith and a holy life had to maintain a sore conflict with many forms of error and hideous shapes of vice.

The very opening of the 1st Epistle to Timothy warns the Ministers of religion "that they teach no other doctrine" (ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν). But, according to the instruction to Titus, they are to be "teachers of good things."

Certain teachers would add to the Gospel the Jewish Law, and even the very frivolous traditions on it. The Teacher of Christian truth, as Timothy is instructed, is not to "give heed to fables" (1 Tim. i. 4). These fables, we learn from the Epistle to Titus, are "Jewish" (i. 14). One of the commands of "teachers of the law" (1 Tim. i. 7) was "to abstain from meats" (iv. 3). In Crete, where the Jews abounded, Titus is warned against "deceivers, specially they of the circumcision" (i. 10). The exhortation to the Teacher there was: "Avoid foolish questions and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law" (iii. 9). These are all errors in reference to the Jewish law and its surroundings.

There were the germs of the false teaching, called γνῶσις (*gnosis*), knowledge, eminently so called. Even then there were forerunners of those afterwards called "knowing" ones, gnostics, who in the second century professed by *gnosis*, knowledge, philosophy, to explain the doctrines of the Gospel. Timothy is warned against "oppositions of science (*gnosis*) falsely so called" (1 Tim. vi. 20).

Errors there were then, as now, touching not the outworks, but the very centre of the Christian Faith, as in the fundamental doctrine of the resurrection, a representative of which grievous error was found in Hymenæus (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18).

The surrounding errors of doctrine had not been merely speculative. Their bad fruits were seen in unholy lives. These teachers had put away a good conscience, speaking lies in hypocrisy, supposing that godliness is gain, or, as Titus is told, "teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake" (i. 11).

Besides errors present and pressing, the horizon was dark with the gravest, as seen in the well-known words: "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith." Amid such surroundings Timothy had need to keep his divine call ever before him. Set apart for the work of the ministry by the laying on of the hands of the Apostle, together with those of the Presbytery, he had within him the upholding strength of the Holy Spirit (1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6).

The Pastoral Epistles find their natural place after the first imprisonment of Paul, as mentioned in the closing words of the Acts of the Apostles. In 1 Tim. i. 18 the Apostle writes to Timothy as left in Ephesus, when he himself went into Macedonia. The only journey of Paul into Macedonia in the Acts is in company with Timothy, and in the Epistles to Philemon, to the Philippians, and to the Colossians, written during the first imprisonment, the name of Timothy is joined with the Apostle in his addressing those Christians, and therefore he must have been with him. The nature of the wrong teaching which Timothy and Titus were to oppose fixes the Pastoral Epistles to the end of St. Paul's life. The doctrinal errors of the Gnostics in the second century, about the middle of which Baur most audaciously fixes the Epistles, were utter abhorrence of the Jewish Creator, Jewish law and system—just the very opposite of the Judaic errors such as prevailed, before Jerusalem, with its temple and system were swept away in the siege of Titus.

The second Pastoral Epistle to Timothy, written by Paul in the near prospect of the martyr's grave, presses most solemnly the continued discharge of the Pastor's work in

II. *The Succession of the Ministry.*

The view of the Plymouth Brethren that the Church has no recognised ordained Ministry, is in the plainest opposition to the teaching of these Epistles. Not merely are divers orders of Church officers mentioned, but the qualifications for them are enumerated in detail (1 Tim. iii. 1-13; Tit. i. 5-9). To desire these offices is a commendable thing. The elders that rule well are to be accounted "worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine" (1 Tim. v. 17). Those in the lowest order, "that have used the office of a Deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree."[1] They have a claim to be advanced to a higher order in the ministry. The *theoretic* teaching, so to say, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, written during St. Paul's first imprisonment, directs a continuance of Pastors, "for the work of the ministry," to go on to the end, "till we all come unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Ephes. iv. 12, 13). This is now to be carried out into *practical* effect. In his second and last imprisonment the Apostle, in his most solemn anxiety for this, says to Timothy: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2 Tim. ii. 2). As to Timothy, so to Titus was apostolic authority given. "For this cause," says the Apostle, "left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee" (i. 5). It is true Titus was not permanently settled in Crete. He was to come to Paul to Nicopolis, near Actium in Epirus; and leaving the Apostle there, or afterwards in Rome, he went to Dalmatia.

Timothy is most earnestly entreated to come to the Apostle in Rome. He greatly desired to see his son in the faith once more before he sank into the grave of the martyr. These comings and goings are merely such as are common at all times in the lives of public men discharging high and important duties. There is no difficulty from this—as far as I can see—with regard to these men being permanently the chief Pastors of these places.

The progress Church government had made as seen in these Epistles suits exactly the state of things towards the close of the life of St. Paul, when the Pastoral Epistles were written. The names of Bishop and Presbyter are still interchangeable for the second Order of the Ministry, as they were some years before, when Paul addressed the elders of Ephesus. At the

[1] The R.V. has, "gain to themselves a good standing."

middle of the second century, at which time Baur most audaciously, as I have said, places the date of the Epistles, the words Bishop and Presbyter were no longer convertible, but the term Bishop was used distinctly for the first Order.

The anxious clergyman remembers well that at the most solemn time of his ordination the Ministers of religion were called "to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord." Prayerfully he reads once again what these Epistles say of

III. *The Qualifications for the Ministry.*

Timothy is taught what qualities he was to require in the Bishops or Presbyters, and in the Deacons whom he might appoint, as is Titus who was to ordain elders in every city. The spiritual character of such ministers was to be tested by time, and by a continuance in well-doing. This is seen by the very nature of the qualities named, as purity, sobriety, hospitality, patience, and generosity. Nearly the same list of virtues is put into the hands of Titus. A novice, or one lately come into the Church, would not be suitable for these offices. Forwardness and zeal, which then, as now, often marked the novice, were not to take the place of the steady practice of these virtues as seen by friend and foe.

While in the Epistles to Timothy the Bishop or Presbyter must be apt to teach, in that to Titus he is to be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers (i. 9). The very centre of spiritual life is pointed to, for the teachers were to be such as "call on the Lord out of a pure heart" (2 Tim. ii. 22). Following righteousness and virtue Timothy was to be "an example of the believers in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity" (1 Tim. iv. 12). With the shadows of his approaching end deepening on the Apostle, he lays on Timothy, towards the end of his second Epistle to him, the solemn charge: "Preach the word;" "Do the work of an evangelist;" that is of a Preacher of the Gospel. No Order of the Ministry is here referred to, but a plain duty is taught, incumbent on every order. This is well wrought out in our Ordination Service, where the duty is most solemnly impressed on the Bishop, as we know it is on the other two Orders.

Among the qualifications are found no counsels of perfection, such as the celibacy of the clergy. At the same time the Minister of the Gospel must be an example to the flock, as our Ordination Service, following the spirit of these Epistles, most impressively teaches. The resolute virtues then, as now, take a high place. In no age of the Church is the character of the Christian Minister complete in a dress of mere gentle inoffen-

siveness. Moral courage, tempered with discretion, finds a high place in the Minister at Ephesus. Surrounded there by learning and culture, he was to "reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine" (2 Tim. iv. 2). The same resolute spirit was to animate the Pastor among the less cultivated mountaineers of Crete. He was to "rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith" (Titus i. 13). Now, as then, the Minister's office is the highest in dignity and usefulness. The Apostle's description of the qualifications for it ought to encourage and elevate the Pastor amid his anxious surroundings.

The Ordination Service most earnestly impresses on each Order of the Ministry to be like watchmen, to "ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein." It most solemnly requires unfeigned acceptance of all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The earnest Pastor, whom we have represented to ourselves, has ever tried to give to God of his very best. There is a call on him for very various powers. In the morning of the day he sees before him the management of schools, the instructing of youth in religion; the reclaiming the intemperate, the visiting the sick and the dying, the making visits to rich and poor, and the winning of souls to Christ by the public preaching of the Gospel. Amid duties so varied and difficult he keeps close to the great Book of his study, the source of his teaching, and the standard of doctrine.

IV. *The Holy Scripture, his Rule.*

So it has been from the first. The solemn exhortation to Timothy was: "Keep that which is committed to thy trust" (1 Tim. vi. 20). "Hold fast the form of sound words" (2 Tim. i. 13). Among the other qualities of the chief Pastor, as laid down in Titus, he was to be "holding fast the faithful word." The Pastor at Ephesus was to "give attendance to reading," that is of Scripture in public. He was to exhort and teach the people out of it. At all times the earnest Pastor holds fast by this rule of Faith. From it he is led himself to Christ. His aim is, amid all doctrinal errors and viciousness of life around him, so to instruct out of the Scriptures as to lead to Him of Whom they testify. Wherever his duties call him, he makes the Scriptures reflect Christ, and thus he wins souls to Him Who is our life.

V. *The Pastor's Strength.*

In looking to the heavenly origin of his mission, and in stirring up the "gift" that is in him, the anxious Minister thinks less of his difficulties and more of his strength. The

Pastor at Ephesus with his divine gift (χάρισμα) was expected to realize the expectations raised by prophetic utterance with regard to him at the time of his appointment: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee" (1 Tim. iv. 14). "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare."

The men appointed in the spirit of the Apostle's teaching in these places were really a new power put into them, a salt in a corrupt society, a light in a dark place. Their strength was from without, as is ours from the Holy Ghost. The pastor is not to forget the weighty words of his commission: "Take thou authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God;" "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the congregation;" words spoken after the most earnest prayer for the Divine Spirit.

The weary man in a time of depression is not to forget that his life is in One Who is to supply him with all strength according to the word: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." His heart is stirred, as was that of Timothy, by being reminded to look on himself as a strong man, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. The strong athlete, looking forward to be crowned, observes the Apostle's wise rule to strive lawfully—that is, within the rules of honour, honesty, and truth. The appeal of the Apostle to him is to live much in the future: "Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel" (2 Tim. ii. 8). Titus was to be "looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (ii. 13). The arduous present, for which all the pastor's strength is needed, has ever been in sharp contrast to the blessed future.

Seeing the giant strength of false teaching, a strong craving may be felt for high intellectual gifts in the Master's service. Such, we are to remember, are bestowed at times few and far between. One thing is quite certain, that pastoral strength ever increases with advance in the spiritual life.

If not examples themselves, the lessons of the Pastors in Ephesus and Crete would not be blessed to their flocks. Titus was to be an example, not of ideal excellence and of unattainable virtue, but of good works; and Timothy was to be an example of the believers "in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity" (1 Tim. iv. 12). Holding firmly with the one hand to the soundness of doctrine, for to Titus it was said, "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of," the man of God was to hold on no less firmly with the other hand to purity of life,

that he may be "throughly furnished unto all good works." Increase of strength will come with steady perseverance in both. The Apostle who wrote the Pastoral Epistles is himself an example of increasing strength. In his first imprisonment St. Paul describes his spiritual state as one of progress; "forgetting those things which are behind," he was "reaching forth unto those things which are before" (Phil. iii. 13). In his closing words in his second Pastoral Epistle to Timothy the required strength had been supplied; and this is surely a great example to the anxious Pastor of whom I have spoken all through. In the assurance of faith Paul was able to say: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

THOMAS JORDAN.

ART. III.—JANE AUSTEN.

CLOSE upon seventy years ago, on July the 24th, 1817, a modest party of mourners separated to return to their own homes, after consigning to earth, in the north aisle of Winchester Cathedral, the remains of one who had been very dear to each and all of them. Brothers grieved for her who was their joy and pride; a sister returned to take up a desolate life; the beloved niece and friend mourned a guide and counsellor, doubly dear to her since her mother's death.

Jane Austen died, as she had lived, unnoticed and unknown, except by the narrow circle of friends and relations among whom her lot was cast. She is the gainer for it in one respect—if, indeed, the verdict of posterity can be gain to one whom it has ceased to affect. All that she accomplished, every jot and tittle of her work, are hers only. No Johnson directed the bent of her genius, as he did for Madame d'Arblay; no father urged on the timid workings of a mind cultured and trained by himself, as was the case with Maria Edgeworth. There was not even the experience of an eventful life, the intercourse with men of letters, or the interchange of thought, which her sister novelists enjoyed in so high a degree, to help her on the career she had chosen for herself. Hers and hers alone are the masterly conceptions clothed in words of pregnant simplicity; hers alone the observation and penetration which gave them birth. None can lay claim to a share in the creation of that fame, the enjoyment of which she was never fated to taste.

Glance over her life flowing smoothly along in the home-circle, and realize how great a genius it required to evolve from that passionless, uninteresting existence, the materials for any achievement worthy of more than a passing notice.

Jane Austen's father was a country clergyman, with a considerable family, living in a Hampshire village, not remarkable for beauty, the ordinary life of a respectable Englishman. Money was not plentiful in the Austen family. All through her letters runs the note of Jane's economy, brought from her parsonage home at Steventon; all through the letters, too, runs the vein of the essentially commonplace, the only society she ever knew. One wonders sometimes whether her heart never longed for a wider sphere, where her talents could have free scope, and her mind be cultivated. Now and then her letters betray a touch of impatience or sadness, but rarely even that. There is a cheerfulness in them which defies us to suppose her discontented, or repining at the fetters that bound her.

Some lives are formed to struggle. Some natures hold within themselves a force compelling them to wrestle with the world and with their surrounding circumstances, until they have burst their bonds, driven down the opposing forces, and stand forth as victors from the fray. Such a nature was Carlyle's, such a life was Charlotte Brontë's; such was not either the nature or the life of Jane Austen. For her, the quiet routine of family life held much that was delightful; the occasional gaieties of a neighbouring town afforded her unfeigned pleasure; the visits of friends brought variation to the monotony of daily life. If we may presume to judge at this distance of time, with the scanty materials at our disposal from which to form an opinion, we should say that Jane Austen never struggled. She was exempt from the passions of a strong nature. It was a family saying, that "Cassandra," the elder sister, "had the *merit* of having her temper always under command; but that Jane had the *happiness* of a temper that never required to be commanded."

It was a large family and a cheerful one, with ramifications not altogether easy to trace. The pages of her letters are filled with references to Austens, Knights, Bridgeses, Leighs, Leigh Perrots, Knatchbulls, and Lefroys, all related in a greater or less degree to the party at Steventon, all requiring to be communicated with. The marriages of brothers and cousins brought in fresh names and fresh interests, chaining more closely to the home sphere the thoughts that should have soared beyond it. Her letters are little else than chit-chat of a kind suited to the poorest capacity—chit-chat such as a girl of to-day writes for mere idleness' sake to her acquaint-

ance of a week's standing. She herself was only too conscious of the defect. More than once she recurs to the difficulty she finds in spinning out a letter long enough to be worthy of the price, or the frank required in those days of heavy postage. Still, there is an interest to us in her details of life in those days, when the dinner-hour varied from 3.30 to 5, followed by the wearisomely long evening, broken into by the welcomed appearance of tea at 6.30, or the unusual intrusion of a chance visitor; when, after driving some eight miles to a ball, it turned out a very poor affair of seven or eight couples, "hardly so large as an Oxford smack," or was considered a very good ball "with seventeen couples standing up and sixty people present." We learn how the long country-dances and cotillions were succeeded by the "inferior" quadrilles, now long since superseded in their turn; how the "laceman" came round with his precious wares; how Sloane Street lay entirely outside London, with many another characteristic touch.

To the female mind there is some interest, too, in the hat which cost a guinea, the cap at one pound sixteen, the checked muslin at seven shillings the yard, and the three pair of silk stockings just under twelve shillings the pair. But all this hardly compensates us after wading through endless trifles of health and household matters, of which the following, taken at random, are very fair examples:

I am very grand indeed (she wrote); I had the dignity of dropping out my mother's laudanum last night. I carry about the keys of the wine and closet, and twice since I began this letter have had orders to give in the kitchen. Our dinner was very good yesterday, and the chicken boiled perfectly tender; therefore I shall not be obliged to dismiss Nanny on that account.

Yesterday was a very quiet day with us: my noisiest efforts were writing to Frank, and playing at battledore and shuttlecock with William—he and I have practised together two mornings and improve a little; we have frequently kept it up *three* times, and once or twice *six*.

I really have very little to say *this* week, and do not feel as if I should spread that little into the show of much. I am inclined for short sentences.

I believe *I* put five breadths of linsey into my flounces. I know I found it wanted more than I had expected, and that I should have been distressed if I had not bought more than I believed myself to need for the sake of the even measure.

Nor can we get up any excitement on the subject of the health of dear Eliza, Tom, Elizabeth, Edward, or Harriot. Even the marriage of Miss J—— to the "cross, jealous, selfish, and brutal" Mr. G——; the Miss Blackford, who was very agreeable; the Miss Holwell, who belonged to the Black Hole of Calcutta; and the proceedings of Digweeds and Lyfords, fail to amuse us. Yet such was the monotonous domesticity

of her daily life, varied by the occasional visit or ball, which were her greatest sources of interest.

In short, Jane Austen's life may be summed up in a single sentence. She was born at Steventon, on December 16, 1775; removed with her family to Bath, in 1801; removed again, after her father's death in 1805, to Chawton Cottage, near Alton, in 1809; and finally died at Winchester in 1817.

Expand the life-history as you will, there is little to be gained from it. Her letters, numerous as they are, give us but scant help. Probably the chief episode in her life was the visit to Bath, although even here we find but little mention of any mixing in general society, still we trace the effect of it in her works. During the four years in Bath she wrote nothing, but she was storing up materials for the succeeding years of leisure. Bath, with its pump room, theatre and assembly rooms, its squabbles, its rank and fashion, were fair play for her critical observation. No doubt she enjoyed a full insight into them all from her place as an outsider.

But if her life as shown in her letters was dull to the eye of an outsider, and possibly not altogether satisfactory to herself, it was viewed in a very different light by those who were brought into personal contact with her. Her brightness and cheerfulness, the fond care with which she surrounded those whom she loved, her readiness to amuse and to be amused, made her the centre of the circle. To her brothers and their wives, and more especially to her nephews and nieces, she was the object of a fond affection. The younger generation of Austens—like the Trevelyans of later days with Macaulay, could scarcely realize that the aunt who played with them, laughed over their stories and sympathized with their troubles, wrote them absurd letters or joking advice, was anything more than just "Aunt Jane," important to them, and to no one beyond. The family in general, while entertained by her novels and thoroughly interested in them, never really understood the talent which showed itself in them, or gave their author credit for more than an excellent understanding. The gossipy neighbourhood, probably, never vouchsafed her novels a thought. To them the secret would not have been entrusted.

Such was Jane's home life; a life which, in most women, would have extinguished every spark of talent or latent fire of genius. Yet out of these very materials she built the fabric of her fame. "The inimitable Jane," as Lord Brabourne delights to call her, was as inimitable here as even he could wish. She used just what lay to her hand; the trivial minuteness of daily life, the petty struggles of spinsters striving after the forbidden sweets of matrimony, the checks and counter-checks of scheming mothers—all are there to the life.

Novels are the outcome of our modern society. Unknown among the ancients or the populations of the middle ages, they have grown since the beginning of the eighteenth century with a gigantic growth. The old Greek plays were the *relaxation* of a nation of warriors. Our modern novels are the *occupation* of a large portion of English men and women. The eighteenth century saw their birth and their rise; it has remained for the nineteenth century to aid, while it witnesses, their degradation. Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett might present to us coarse and disagreeable pictures of life: at least they were vigorous in word and powerful in effect. They wrote for a smaller circle, consisting of men, and their books were accordingly fitted for masculine perusal only. In our day, every man or woman of mediocre capacity conceives him or her self possessed of sufficient talent to give a novel or two to the world, and the result is that we are inundated by volumes of what we can only call in the most euphonious terms at our command—literary trash. Over this refuse heap of literature the young girls of our day are permitted, nay, expected to range at will, till they turn from the evil-flavoured food, filled to repletion with its poison. Very few novels are simply neuter—very few things in this world stand purely on the borderland between right and wrong. In some one point they overstep the boundary, and what might have been simply foolish becomes positively evil. So it is with hundreds of books, the outcome of idle hours, self-conceit, a love of notoriety, or, worst of all, the terrible love of money. That there are good novels, and good novelists, no one in their sober senses will attempt to deny. Refinement, nobility of character, heroism, resolution, perseverance, chivalry towards women, modesty in women, are the lessons taught by some writers in some novels, taught moreover to some minds which would simply turn aside from more serious works and miss entirely the good they unconsciously imbibe from these novels.

After all, life has its play-time as well as its working-time. It is not fair upon a youthful mind to demand of it a constant strain, nor is it wise to leave it entirely without resource in its leisure hour. Youth demands amusement as its right. Many a girl finds in a novel the safety valve for pent-up enthusiasm, the occupation for a busy or an inquiring character. It is not safe to deny them the vent for their feelings, lest they prey upon themselves until the repressed desires find a sudden outlet and the stream overflows all the bounds which should have confined it. Such cases are far from rare.

Without doubt, the novelist's position is a responsible one. Here it is that Jane Austen shines forth from among the crowd of lesser lights as one of the pioneers who opened out for a

later generation fresh scenes and fresh pleasures, while keeping strictly in view the grave duties inseparable from the novelist's vocation. To Jane Austen belongs the honour of having first created the novel of the home life: Miss Burney, Miss Ferrier, Mrs. Radcliffe, and the numerous minor writers early in our century, are all her inferiors in this respect. Their characters are from the *beau idéal; hers* are lifelike. True, it may be said that "Evelina" opened out before women the possibility of a new profession, and in a manner therefore may lay claim to a share in the production of "Mansfield Park," "Emma," and "Pride and Prejudice." But there all obligation towards Miss Burney ends. Jane Austen struck out a line of her own, for which we must ever be grateful to her. She, as a woman, wrote for men and women the details of daily life, just as they passed day by day before her eyes, just as they will continue to pass before our eyes and those of our descendants.

Let us consider the position in which the art of novel-writing stood, when "Pride and Prejudice" lay completed in her press. The male novelists of the eighteenth century have been already considered: "Evelina" and "Camilla" were the only novels of note besides, and had been published eighteen and fourteen years previously, respectively. Miss Edgeworth and Mrs. Radcliffe, if we may be forgiven for coupling the names, had not begun their career. "Waverley" and "Guy Mannering" appeared only when all the novels but "Persuasion" were already in being. Charlotte Brontë and George Eliot are again products of a later school. What Jane Austen did, she originated and did for herself.

The high honour in which her novels were held by men of the most opposite character and opinions shows us something of the value which we may be safe in attaching to them. Macaulay reckoned her as one out of the two novelists of his acquaintance who surpassed Miss Burney; and the sayings of Mrs. Norris and Mrs. Bennet were a proverb in the family at Clapham. He cherished for years the purpose of writing either an article or a comprehensive memoir upon her. Southey and Miss Mitford, S. T. Coleridge and Guizot, W. Whewell and Sydney Smith, combine in their praise of her. Whately has left his tribute to her memory in the article written, after her death, in the *Quarterly Review* for 1821. But perhaps the greatest testimony to her talents is that so generously rendered to her by Sir Walter Scott, himself the most gifted novelist of the day. In addition to his early article in the *Quarterly* for 1815, we have the following notice in his journal for March 14, 1826.

"Read again," he says, "and for the third time at least, Miss Austen's very finely written novel of 'Pride and Preju-

dice.' That young lady had a talent for describing the involvements and feelings and characters of ordinary life which is to me the most wonderful I ever met with. The Big Bow-wow strain I can do myself like any now going; but the exquisite touch, which renders ordinary commonplace things and characters interesting, from the truth of the description and the sentiment, is denied to me. What a pity such a gifted creature died so early!"

The periods of her writings divide themselves into two distinct portions; "Pride and Prejudice," "Sense and Sensibility," and "Northanger Abbey" were written at Steventon, between 1796 and 1801. Then followed a long period of sterility. It was not until she was again settled in the country at Chawton Cottage that she resumed her pen, beginning "Mansfield Park" in 1811, after ten years of silence. Her novels, let it be remembered, were all written in the general sitting-room, in the midst of the family bustle, and with the household cares weighing upon her mind.

The first thing that strikes us in these books is that they are essentially *women's* books, and as evidently a woman's work. The heroines are the characters *par excellence* intended to call forth our sympathies. They fill the largest space in the stories, while the woes or joys of the heroes are entirely subordinated to theirs. We have, in short, the woman's point of view. The scene never shifts for a moment, even in "Pride and Prejudice," to the hero's home and the hero's difficulties; we never meet him face to face or *en tête-à-tête*. When he is alone he is left to shift for himself as best he may, and we hear nothing of him. So soon as he appears in company with the heroine he takes his proper position, or we may perhaps be reminded of his existence by an incidental letter. But before and after the interview we see the heroine only; we are called upon to take a share in her enthusiasms or indecisions, her resolution or her despair. The gentleman disappears from the scene, and we learn only by chance, because the lady herself must be informed, what has transpired during his absence. Very naturally, it follows that the heroes are inferior to the heroines. The quick-witted, sensitive Elizabeth, and the loving, refined Jane Bennett are far above the reserved Darcy and good-humoured Bingly. Anne Elliot, with her self-control, leaves Captain Wentworth behind her. Catherine Morland's impulsive nature interests us, where Henry Tilney's character is almost a blank. Emma stands alone in her glory. It is the same with the disagreeable characters. Sir Walter Elliot cannot for a moment be compared with Mrs. Bennett without losing infinitely in the process. Mrs. Norris throws General Tilney into the shade. Perhaps the only instance of

even moderate resemblance is to be found in Mr. Woodhouse and the immortal Miss Bates; but even here we are forced to give the palm to the lady for garrulity and inconsequence.

The characters are well carried out, so that one is forced to own at every turn that however much surprised one may have been by what was said or done, it was, after all, exactly what might have been expected under the circumstances. Even the bores bore one inimitably well. We are not delivered over to the long harangues of "Poor Peter," or repeated pedantry of the "Antiquary." And yet we realize quite sufficiently for our own comfort that Miss Bates, for instance, was not the most sensible of womankind. Take the following example. Miss Bates came across the street to invite Emma and her friend Harriet Smith to hear the new piano, at the request of Mr. Frank Churchill:

Miss Bates *loquitur*—

"Oh," said he, "wait half a minute till I have finished my job:" for, would you believe it, Miss Woodhouse, there he is, in the most obliging manner in the world, fastening in the rivet of my mother's spectacles. The rivet came out, you know, this morning; so very obliging! For my mother had no use of her spectacles—could not put them on. And, by the bye, everybody ought to have two pairs of spectacles; they should indeed. Jane said so. I meant to take them over to John Saunders the first thing I did, but something or other hindered me all the morning; first one thing, then another, there is no saying what, you know. At one time Patty came to say she thought the kitchen chimney wanted sweeping. 'Oh,' said I, 'Patty, do not come with your bad news to me. Here is the rivet of your mistress's spectacles out.' Then the baked apples came home; Mrs. Wallis sent them by her boy; they are extremely civil and obliging to us, the Wallises, always. I have heard some people say that Mrs. Wallis can be uncivil and give a very rude answer, but we have never known anything but the greatest attention from them. And it cannot be for the value of our custom now, for what is our consumption of bread, you know—only three of us? Besides, dear Jane, at present—and she really eats nothing—makes such a shocking breakfast; you would be quite frightened if you saw it."

And so on, through a series of several subjects more, until—

"What was I talking of?" said she, beginning again when they were all in the street. "I declare I cannot recollect what I was talking of. Oh, my mother's spectacles. So very obliging of Mr. Frank Churchill. 'Oh,' said he, 'I do think I can fasten the rivet; I like a job of this kind excessively.' Which, you know, showed him to be so very——Indeed I must say that, much as I had heard of him before, and much as I had expected, he very far exceeds anything——I do congratulate you, Mrs. Weston, most warmly. He seems everything the fondest parent could——'Oh,' said he, 'I can fasten the rivet. I like a job of that sort excessively.' I never shall forget his manner."

And so on, and so on, through three pages and a half of closely printed matter.

This no doubt is fooling, but then it is admirable fooling, and we are not worried to death by it. The truth is, with

regard to all the women in her novels, Jane Austen takes us behind the scenes. We see their characters not only as they appeared to the world at large, but as they looked when viewed by the side-lights of family criticism.

She knew her sex thoroughly in its outward manifestations of whims and fancies, and its surface-touches of feeling. If the actual plot of the various stories be analysed it will yield little or no interest. All that excites and amuses us is really the result of her accurate representation of the personalities who played their part on the stage. The little country village of Highbury, with only five families as its select circle, and one outsider of interest, still delights us, when we "come acquainted" with the inhabitants. Emma, spoilt by her position, taking upon herself to make matches for all her acquaintance, and to spoil the life of her "charming little friend," shows a constant play of character. Her incipient love for Frank Churchill, the Dixon intrigue, her dislike of Jane Fairfax, together with her care for her old latitudinarian father, all carry out the description which greets us at the head of the opening chapter:

> Emma Woodhouse, handsome, clever, and rich, with a comfortable home and happy disposition, seemed to unite some of the best blessings of existence; and had lived nearly twenty-one years in the world with very little to distress or vex her. . . . The real evils, indeed, of Emma's situation were the power of having too much her own way, and a disposition to think a little too well of herself: these were the disadvantages which threatened to alloy her many enjoyments. The danger, however, was at present so unperceived, that they did not by any means rank as misfortunes with her.

So it is always. "Mansfield Park" is the history of two families living almost entirely in the country, and the scene rarely changes, because Jane Austen is almost independent of scene. The world around becomes of small importance, since it is all centred in the persons of her heroes and heroines and their belongings. She pretends to nothing extraordinary in them. They are very commonplace, everyday kind of people. "No one who had ever seen Catherine Morland in infancy would have supposed her born to be a heroine. The Morlands . . . were in general very plain, and Catherine, for many years of her life, as plain as any. She had a thin, awkward figure, a sallow skin without colour, dark lank hair, and strong features." This is very plain speaking, and is not much improved by the lapse of years. "*Almost* pretty" is the only epithet that even a fond mother can use in describing her child. But they all combine to be so witty, so charming, withal so natural, that we like them in spite of themselves.

There is a brilliancy in the writing of the novels, and a total absence of novel-slang, to which she had a great objec-

tion. Writing to a young relation, who had submitted to her a maiden effort, she says, referring to the phrase, "a vortex of dissipation," "I do not object to the thing, but I cannot bear the expression; it is such thorough novel-slang, and so old that I dare say Adam met with it in the first novel that he opened."

Of her humour it is impossible to give adequate examples in short extracts. Her allusions are so bound up with the rest of the story as to be inseparable from it. They have too fine a point to bear the disseverance. But of her shrewd observation a few instances must be given. Thus:

> Where people wish to attach, they should always be ignorant. To come with a well-informed mind is to come with an inability of administering to the vanity of others, which a sensible person should always wish to avoid. A woman, especially, if she has the misfortune of knowing anything, should conceal it as well as she can.[1]

The account of Isabella Thorpe's conduct in the pump-room is inimitable. So is the recital of Mrs. Thorpe's meeting with Mrs. Allen, when, "Their joy on this meeting was very great, as well it might, since they had been contented to know nothing of each other for the last fifteen years."[2]

Again, we read:

> Marianne would have thought herself very inexorable had she been able to sleep at all the first night after parting from Willoughby. She would have been ashamed to look her family in the face the next morning had she not risen from her bed in more need of repose than when she lay down in it. But the feelings which made such composure a disgrace, left her in no danger of incurring it. She was awake the whole night, and she wept the greatest part of it. She got up with a headache, was unable to talk, and unwilling to take any nourishment; giving pain every moment to her mother and sisters, and forbidding all attempt at consideration from either. Her sensibility was potent enough.[3]

Here is a portrait of Sir Walter Elliot's pride when driven by his extravagance to let his house:

> "As to all that," rejoined Sir Walter coolly, "supposing I were induced to let my house, I have by no means made up my mind as to the privileges to be annexed to it. I am not particularly disposed to favour a tenant. The park would be open to him, of course, and few navy officers, or men of any other description, can have had such a range; but what restrictions I might impose on the use of the pleasure-ground is another thing. I am not fond of the idea of my shrubberies being always approachable; and I should recommend Miss Elliot to be on her guard with respect to her flower-garden. I am very little disposed to grant a tenant of Kellynch Hall any extraordinary favour, I assure you, be he soldier or sailor!"[4]

The story of "Poor Richard" is equally charming in its bathos; so is the following short sentence:—"By this time the

---

[1] "Northanger Abbey." [2] "Sense and Sensibility." [3] *Ibid.*
[4] "Persuasion."

report of the accident had spread among the workmen and boatmen about the Cobb, and many were collected near them, to be useful if wanted; at any rate, to enjoy the sight of a dead young lady—nay, two dead young ladies, for it proved twice as fine as the first report."[1]

The state of society, and more especially the condition of the clergy and their duties, are never-ending sources of interest. The most conscientious of her clerical characters are men who habitually reside outside their parishes, going over once or twice a week for the Sunday services or perhaps a tiresome vestry meeting. It is the accepted thing, and creates no surprise, still less disgust, in the most religious minds. The clergy, too, were considered in a very different light then to what they are now. "Oh, ay, Mr. Wentworth, the curate of Monkford," says Sir Walter Elliot. "You misled me by the term *gentleman:* I thought you were speaking of some man of property."

A young lady's dissipations began much earlier then than they do now. Lydia Bennett was out at fifteen; Marianne at sixteen and a half fell in love with Willoughby, and was considered of a marriageable age. A mother appeared in the ball-room, nowise disconcerted, but rather proud of her train of five daughters. It strikes us as curious to hear the same young ladies talking of their "smart beaux" by their surnames: Tilney, Darcy, Crawford, Knightly, Wentworth, and Willoughby are constantly on their lips.

In those days a visit in the country was expected to last at least two months, for travelling was not of the easiest. The apothecary acted as doctor; a farmhouse ranked lower than a "cottage;" and Willoughby ate his *nunchion*—a term which has entirely disappeared from our vocabulary.

Perhaps at the bottom of all, the real reason *why* Jane Austen's novels charm or amuse lies in the fact that her characters, their circumstances, and all the side issues are entirely under her command. She never wrote on any subject of which she had not a personal knowledge. Her life was spent chiefly in good old English middle-class society. In her novels she never attempts to soar above it, but is content with a baronet as her highest attempt, and with the modest fortunes of ten thousand pounds for the richest heroines—a small sum in these days of millionaires who roll in wealth through all the thousand pages of a true three-volume novel. The talk of ships and of the sea she derived at first hand from the two admirals, her brothers; the clerical life she observed for herself. Bath, Lyme, and London she knew from having

[1] "Persuasion."

stayed there. There is never an attempt to describe what is outside her own province. We have no disputed wills or law-suits, no soldiers or West Indians, no counts, dukes, and earls. It is curious that the one departure from this rule, in "The Watsons," was atoned for by its being left a fragment, although it is by no means one of her latest works. She probably felt that she was taking her heroine into spheres of which she herself knew but little, and prudently withdrew from the attempt while there was yet time.

It is not too much to say that the novels are profoundly religious in the best sense of the word. Without constantly obtruding the name, or flinging in her readers' faces her own opinions, they are always being unconsciously led to admire religion in its highest form, in the practice of its virtues in every-day life. Edward Ferrars, Anne Elliot, Elinor, Elizabeth, Fanny, Emma—yes, even poor Miss Bates, are all genuinely and unobtrusively religious. There is a tone about them which forbids us to cavil at their uprightness and real honesty. Virtue triumphs, because it is virtue, through pure force of right. There is no intriguing in favour of what is good. It does not need it, for it has the power within itself to carry all before it. This is just as it should be. Unlike Miss Edgeworth's moral tales, we never fling away Jane Austen in disgust that the moral should need to be so plainly enforced that we can see it with our eyes shut. Rather the morality is bound up with the story so naturally, that we can only agree with it, and should never think of separating the two. How plainly it is written on every page of "Emma," "Those who meddle in matters that do not concern them will come to grief;" how vividly we realize in "Mansfield Park" the necessity of the old maxim, "Train up a child in the way he should go"; how well does Elinor, in "Sense and Sensibility," carry out the lesson, "Bear ye one another's burdens."

In the new edition of the novels we are introduced to three sketches, not usually included among their number. They are—"Lady Susan," a short story carried on entirely by means of letters, as was "Sense and Sensibility" in its earlier form; "the Watsons," of which we have already spoken; and a new novel, of which twelve chapters only are completed. This was begun on January 27th, 1817, and shows no diminution of power. Indeed, it bids fair to develop into a work as interesting as any of the preceding ones. Had she not been called away by death at a comparatively early age, we might have looked for many another tale from her mine, whose stores were as yet far from exhausted.

It is not easy to decide on the respective merits of her novels. Each has its peculiar excellence. Perhaps the ones

belonging to the later period show a greater minuteness of finish. "Northanger Abbey" bears decided marks of its early birth; and yet, on the other hand, "Pride and Prejudice" is worthy of a station beside the latest. On the whole, for perfection of detail, sustained interest and well-developed plot, we prefer "Pride and Prejudice" and "Emma."

As far as any monetary return for her work is concerned, Jane Austen was singularly unfortunate. "Pride and Prejudice" was rejected without even a perusal, on its first appearance. "Northanger Abbey" was sold for ten pounds to a bookseller in Bath, who thought so meanly of it that he was willing to cede the copyright to her many years afterwards, as he had never published it. Even at the time of her death, when her works were becoming known to a wider circle, she had received only £700 for her four published works—a sum not half as large as George Eliot's "Adam Bede" brought in within the year. Not that Jane was disappointed. She wrote for her own amusement, and thought the £150 received from the sale of "Sense and Sensibility" a recompense more than sufficient "for that which had cost her nothing."

It has been left to us of later days to appreciate her works—and we have not proved unworthy. The sole mark of recognition she received during her lifetime was the Prince Regent's permission to dedicate to him "Emma." This neglect on the part of her contemporaries has been redeemed by posterity. It is the more to our credit and hers that some of the interest attaching to contemporary records and pictures has necessarily passed away. Jane Austen skims the surface of her characters only. We are given no deep insight into individual thoughts and feelings. The touches are all life-like, but they are touches only; there is no impersonation of individuality. Again, the aspect of thought and science has greatly changed since her day, until it is hardly the same world in those respects. She belonged to her own age, for she had not the power to catch the feeling of the coming awakening before it was actually revealed. We are fairly in the midst of the problems which *then* were hardly in germ. She, in her simplicity, her old-fashioned mannerisms, scarcely touches our world at all. We are struck all through her pages by the fact that of the thought and the struggles of our nineteenth century she knew absolutely nothing. We have gone on and left her behind.

It is in this very fact that lies the greatness of our tribute to her fame. Despite the difference of interests, despite the diversity of opinion, and beyond all that is connected with the name of Progress, we admire and enjoy these old-world sketches which carry us back to an unknown region.

Jane Austen's fame stands secured. He who cannot appreciate her, condemns himself by that which he lacks. To us, Macaulay's saying carries truth, when he speaks of the books which are "old friends who are never seen with new faces, who are the same in wealth and in poverty, in glory and in obscurity;" and we can but echo his dictum concerning her, "There are in the world no compositions which approach nearer to perfection."

ALBINIA BRODRICK.

ART. IV.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR. XI. NOVEMBER. THE CALL AND WORK OF ST. ANDREW.

A. THE DOMESTIC BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.

"*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother.*"—JOHN vi. 8.

IF we were following the course of the ecclesiastical, and not that of the natural year, we should in this month meet, on the threshold of the new period, the figure of St. Andrew. As to the reason why this Apostle is placed first in the sacred cycle, so as to define the beginning of Advent, we need not here inquire what learned authors have written on this point. Leaving their researches on one side, there is one thought on the subject that may be suggested as quite worthy to occupy our first space.

St. Andrew seems to have been one of the two first called of all of the disciples of our Lord. Thus he may be said to be one of the two first Christians who ever lived in the world. This, however, is not the point to which I am referring. What I allude to is this: It is remarkable how St. Andrew's case exemplifies the *domestic beginnings of Christianity.*

And in this domestic beginning of Christianity a great principle is involved. For the family is the unit of society. Hence the Christian family is the unit of Christian society, *i.e.*, the Church. In proportion as the domestic life of a people is pure and affectionate and orderly, so is the state of the nation good; and according to the lives which we lead in our households, so will the Church, which is made up of these households, be truly honouring her Lord.

"*Andrew, Simon Peter's brother*"—this is emphatically the character in which he appears at the opening of the Gospel

history. For the *two facts*, that St. Andrew was one of the two first called, and that the circumstances of his call exhibited human life and Christian life on their domestic side, we shall refer, in the first instance, to the *first* chapter of this Gospel. There, after we are told that one of the two who, at the word of John the Baptist, "joined themselves to Jesus," was "Andrew, Simon Peter's brother," the next incident that is recorded is this: "He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah; and he brought him to Jesus."[1] Thus Christianity becomes a domestic religion at the outset.

And now, if we turn to the Gospel for St. Andrew's day, we find the same thing in another form, and in a form very beautiful and very attractive. St. Matthew says that "Jesus, walking by the Sea of Galilee, saw *two brothers*, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his *brother*, casting a net into the sea;" and He called them now to become His ministers, and they followed Him. "And going out from hence, He saw *two other brothers*, James the son of Zebedee, and John *his* brother, in a ship *with Zebedee their father;*" and they were called, and they followed likewise. Now here we have, in the four first-named of the twelve Apostles, two pairs of two brothers; and the fact that they were thus severally related to each other is very pointedly mentioned. Moreover, the father is mentioned in the second instance, and the family group made more complete.[2] I need not add that *their mother, Salome*, is conspicuous afterwards in the Gospel history.[3] The seed of the Gospel seems first to have been sown in unpretending households by the Sea of Galilee, such as that where Peter's wife's mother once "lay sick of a fever,"[4] or where Zebedee brought home to Salome the profits of his fishing.

And, proceeding onward from this point, we might trace indications of the same principle *throughout* the Gospel history. The *first miracle* was wrought in the midst of a marriage feast. The *greatest* miracle (if we may presume to draw comparisons among the wonders of God) was wrought in connection with the *household* of Mary and Martha. So in the Acts of the Apostles, when Peter was rescued at a critical time, it was in answer to prayer offered up in the *family* of Mary, the mother of Mark.[5] When Apollos was prepared for his high office, it was under what may be called the *domestic* training of Aquila and Priscilla.[6] So in the Epistles. Few things in the Bible are more touching than the blessing invoked in the

---

[1] See John i. 41, 42. [2] Matt. iv. 18-21.
[3] See Matt. xx. 20; Mark xv. 40; xvi. 1. [4] Matt. viii. 14.
[5] Acts xii. 12. [6] See Acts xviii. 26.

latest of the Epistles on "the *household* of Onesimus,"[1] or than the reference to the early study of Scripture by Timothy, under the care of "his mother Lois, and his grandmother Eunice."[2] *In every part of* the New Testament we are reminded through personal examples that Christianity is intended to be the religion of our homes.

But not alone through biography and through personal examples does this truth come to view. It is indicated likewise in the slight notices of public worship which the New Testament contains, and in some of the facts connected with the institution and the use of the Sacraments.

There is a phrase, occurring more than once in the Epistles, which is very full of meaning—"the Church in the House."[3] We are all quite aware that the earliest Christians did not possess any public buildings in which they could conduct their social worship, and one who is writing under the shadow of a cathedral is not likely to underrate the advantages we enjoy in having our public churches—in the seriousness which is promoted by the setting apart of such buildings for sacred purposes, in the manifestation they afford of our collective religious life, in the opportunities they supply for gaining spiritual strength through common prayer, common praise, and common instruction. It cannot, however, be fairly said that any such considerations attenuate the example of that primitive "*Church in the House*," of which the New Testament speaks. A fact well worth our pondering is this: that, chronologically at least, Family Prayer preceded Cathedral Service.

As regards Baptism, we need only remember this, that the administration of it is so recorded as to call very special attention to the blessings and responsibilities of household religion. When St. Peter relates the history of the baptism of Cornelius at Cæsarea, he speaks in a very emphatic way of the coming of salvation to the whole of that centurion's "house."[4] When the jailer is baptized by St. Paul at Philippi, similar words are used; "and he and all his" were baptized together.[5] These words in Holy Scripture were not written at random; and surely they convey a lesson to the whole of that Gentile Church to which we belong, and of which the households of Cornelius and the jailer were among the earliest examples.

In reference to the Lord's Supper this remark only need be made, that it was instituted during the celebration of the Pass-

---

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 19. [2] 2 Tim. i. 5.
[3] See Rom. xvi. 6; 1 Cor. xvi. 19.
[4] "*Thou and all thy house*," Acts x. 14.
[5] "*He and all his*," Acts xvi. 33.

over, and that the Passover was pre-eminently a domestic ceremony.[1] We must view the Lord's Supper as conveying with it, for all ages, a certain reminiscence of the Passover. In fact, St. Paul himself teaches us so to regard it.[2] Now the Passover was, as has just been remarked, a domestic ceremony. There seems to be in many minds a tendency to think of it as having something priestly in its character: but this is exactly what it was not. It had no connection with the Temple or with any acts of the Levitical priests. Aaron was not consecrated when the Passover was instituted. This ceremony symbolized and concentrated, as it were, in itself the religion of Hebrew households. The full meaning of the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood is, of course, by no means limited to what we see from this point of view; but it should not be forgotten that, in the moment of its outgrowth from the earlier Jewish Sacrament, it reminds us of that early teaching concerning the religion of the family.

There is surely something to be learnt by us from this train of thought. Our attention is called by it to home affections, to home duties, to the making of our households more consistently religious, to regret and sorrow for our neglect of these things in time past, to our need of God's grace for enabling us to be better Christians at home during the short fragment of the year that remains, and during our future years on earth, be they many or be they few.

B. THE GREEKS IN THE TEMPLE.

"*There were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast: the same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus. Philip cometh and telleth Andrew: and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus.*"—JOHN xii. 20-22.

The remarks made in the first paper justify us in saying that St. Andrew was the *first Christian missionary:* and the passage which is partially quoted immediately above justifies us in saying that *self-sacrifice is the condition of missionary success.* The words which follow are among the most solemn in Holy Scripture: "Jesus answered them, saying, 'The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.'"[3]

St. Andrew was the first missionary—self-sacrifice is the

---

[1] "*They shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for a house,*" **Exod.** xii. 3.

[2] 1 Cor. v. 2.

[3] John xii. 23-24.

secret of missionary success. Let us combine these two statements. Let us cause these two streams of thought to flow into one, as they very naturally can, so that we may at once properly keep St. Andrew's Day, place our hearts in serious sympathy with missionary work, and obtain a very useful lesson for our daily life.

As to the statement that St. Andrew was the first Christian missionary, this is in reality the literal truth. He was one of the first two men who, through the intervention of John the Baptist, made acquaintance with Christ; and his first act, after the benefit came to him, was to seek his brother, that he too might share the benefit. "One of the two which heard John speak, and followed Christ, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah; and he brought him to Jesus."[1] The first recorded act in this history of the earliest formation of the Church of Christ was a missionary act, and this act was done by St. Andrew.

That occurrence took place at the very beginning of Christ's ministry, on the banks of the Jordan, where John had been baptizing. In the text at the head of this paper we see St. Andrew again, at a later period, in a very different place, and on a very different occasion; while still we observe that he gives indications of the same helpful missionary spirit.

Our Lord was in Jerusalem at the last Passover; and among those that came up to worship at the feast were certain "Greeks." Who they were we know not; they certainly were not Jews. Their wish was to see Jesus, and they made application to Philip, perhaps because of some previous acquaintance—an acquaintance, it may be, connected with Bethsaida, which had Greeks in its population. Philip seems to have been timid, or wanting in sympathy and breadth of heart, or doubtful whether our Lord would favourably receive these strangers, and he came and told Andrew. The mere fact that he had thus recourse to this brother Apostle, seems to show that Andrew was recognised as one likely to supply sympathy and help in a difficulty. He did give this sympathy and help, and they went together to the Lord. "Philip cometh and telleth Andrew: and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." Thus Andrew appears on this occasion likewise as a true missionary.[2]

---

[1] See above in the earlier paper.

[2] On another occasion the same contrast between the two men appears. At the miracle of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Philip saw the difficulty: "*Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient.*" Andrew suggested a source of supply from whence, he knew not how, some result might come: "*There is a lad here with two barley loaves and two small fishes,*" John vi. 7, 9.

The answer of the Lord was, as has been said, remarkable. "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." The connection between the words and the incident which led to them is at first sight obscure, but by careful thought we discover it. The very appearance of these Greeks was a token that the Lord's glorification was at hand. As Gentiles from the East had come to His cradle, so now Gentiles from the West were come to His cross. His personal mission was to the Jews, but in reality, through death and resurrection and the coming of the Holy Ghost, His mission was to the world. Before these Greeks made their inquiry, He saw, close at hand, the accomplishment of His mission. In the first-fruits He beheld the harvest. But this glory could not be without suffering first. At this moment, when Andrew and Philip spoke to Him, there arose before His mind, in all its vastness and in all its agony, that redeeming work for the whole human race which was now about to reach its consummation in death: and He spoke those solemn words. They seem to say: "The gathering in of the nations will take place; the Son of Man will be glorified: but it must be done by suffering, by self-sacrifice, by death; and the time is now close at hand."

These serious and awful words, besides declaring a great central truth regarding Jesus Christ Himself, contained an instruction to St. Andrew: for though the Lord alone redeems, yet, in the spirit of self-sacrifice, the disciple must be as his Master.

Placing ourselves side by side with St. Andrew on that earlier occasion by the banks of the Jordan, we stand at the origin, and can watch the early growth of the Church of Christ. And how simple, how unobtrusive, how gradual, yet how strong is the process—through influence exerted by one man upon another—from heart to heart—from conviction to conviction. Soon Philip and Nathanael will be brought in the same manner. Two the first day—four the second day. So it has ever been. So it is now, as God's grace works amid a thousand difficulties, hindrances, temptations, and doubts. This is true missionary progress; and this is St. Andrew's example to each one of us. To be on the alert to do good—to make the most of family relationships—to make the most of private friendships—to make the most of casual meetings; thus it is that true religion has ever spread—from man to man—from heart to heart—conviction communicating conviction—love kindling love—holiness encouraging holiness. So we become apostles

and missionaries—each in his own measure, and in his own place, to all the world.

To all the world in a much more real sense than at first sight appears; for, turning from that earlier incident in St. Andrew's life to the later, we perceive how wide-spread the consequences may be of a well-used casual opportunity. If these "Greeks" had their desired interview with the Lord Jesus Christ—and we cannot doubt that so gracious a Master did receive them—then, without knowing at all what was actually said, we can easily imagine that very great results may have followed, to large numbers of Gentiles, from what might seem a very simple service performed by one man. And who can tell to how wide a circumference that which we do here at home in the spirit of St. Andrew may possibly reach? We all have influence; and influence exerted at one point produces influence beyond. We have friends in every part of the world. Our countrymen travel everywhere. Our trade connects us with every shore. Almost every Englishman can reach, through one or two intermediate links, both the Heathen and the Mahometan worlds. And there our countrymen, scattered on various errands, and in various employments, will, to a great extent, be good or bad representatives of Christianity, according as opportunities for exerting a good influence upon them at home have been used or neglected. So closely are our commonplace duties of every day connected with the hopes of the world at large.

And if one sure method of missionary progress is suggested to us by the action of St. Andrew on these occasions, so is the one great principle, upon which all missionary success depends, laid before us in our Lord's solemn words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." The selfish man is alone in his life. The self-sacrificing man, through the surrender of his life, finds many brethren. The dying of the corn-seed is the condition of fructification. Literally, this has often been true. St. Stephen probably did more for the cause of Christ by his death than a prolonged life of active service would have done. Even as an example to us, there is perhaps more permanent good in the story of his martyrdom, than there could have been in two or three additional chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. So with the missionary, whose life, in many cases, must be held ready to be sacrificed. So with ourselves at home. The habit of self-sacrifice is always potential for great results. No real good is to be done without this habit of mind. Unless there is this self-sacrifice—this willing *death*—our work in life, even if it is very active, even if it is much applauded, is, like the poor

bare grain, hard and dry, and isolated from the true spiritual progress of good in the world.

And another thought arises in the mind through connecting these words of Christ with the subject of missions. When we think of a true missionary with a gigantic heathenism around him—in Africa, for instance, or India—we always have, in regard to that man, the impression of *solitude*. He is not simply weak and poor, with vast difficulties before him, but he is alone. And when we study these words of Christ we feel that it is not merely the wealth of the harvest contrasted with the poverty of the seed on which we are invited to dwell, but the multitudinous character of the harvest contrasted with the isolation and solitude of the seed. What hope such a saying inspires when we think of lives and deaths like those of Henry Martyn, David Livingstone, and Charles Gordon!

J. S. Howson.

Art. V—LIFE AT THE SPRINGS; OR, HOMBOURG IN THE SEASON.

In spite of all that has been written in the form of newspaper articles and pamphlets on Hombourg and its surroundings, there will always be room enough for one more attempt if the writer can succeed in sketching his own impressions of the scenes and circumstances which passed before his own eyes, or with which he became personally identified. In no other health-resort in Europe can such a gay and graceful assemblage of people be seen. The number and the variety of the visitors which throng the parks and promenades of Hombourg when the season is at its height can hardly be exceeded by any other fashionable watering-place on the Continent. Taking it all in all, Hombourg, as regards its peculiar climate, mineral waters, baths, sanitary arrangements, and adaptation of means to meet the comfort and convenience of visitors, may justly be considered a most agreeable and invigorating place of residence for those who are either in search of renewed health or who desire to make a pleasant sojourn for three or four weeks amid cheerful associations and the bracing breezes of the fresh mountain air.

The local authorities have done, and are doing, everything in their power to provide innocent amusement for the visitor, by the aid of music at the springs, in the park, and in the various grounds all round. Illuminations about twice a week on a very extensive and effective scale tend to enliven the

evening hours; and from four o'clock till nine a very good band is always engaged in playing some of the best selections of music in the public promenade at the back of the Kursaal. Very early hours are rigorously observed. Early to bed and early to rise is the general rule. It reminds one of the famous remedy for a clear head, so eulogized by Mr. Culpepper, as mentioned in the life of Dean Swift. He used to put it in the following doggrel style of poetry:

Would you have a settled head,
You must early go to bed:
I tell you, and I tell it again,
You must be *in* bed at ten.

The Hombourgians have evidently adopted this wise advice; for really at half-past ten the town, with all its inhabitants, indigenous and imported, might be taken by a stranger arriving at that hour as if it were the city of the dead. With the exception of one or two soldiers on guard, and some occasional straggler on his way home, not a soul besides is to be seen in the streets. All have retired, or are retiring, for the night, in order to be up and stirring by six o'clock next morning.

The first event of the day is to visit the celebrated Elizabethan spring. This mineral water is in most request, and enjoys the widest reputation. It is a curious sight to see the visitors assembled round the well, each with glass in hand, sipping slowly the contents. Some prefer the water cold, and others warm; but in either case the water-drinkers—round a circular pit, of small elevation from the ground, and beautifully constructed—crowd in to get a glimpse of the "water-girls," in order to attract their attention and obtain the prescribed draught. The fashionable hour of the morning is when the band begins to play at seven o'clock. But the health-seekers begin their morning devotion to the sparkling fountain as early as six. In candour, however, it must be admitted that few, and those mainly Germans, are to be found there at that time. There is an air of dulness about the place just then. The Mädchen-Brunnen, the "girls of the springs," have not yet settled down to their morning work. They may be seen quietly sitting on one of the seats on the ground above the "pit," and pleasantly conversing with each other, probably on the events of the previous day, or having an innocent flirtation with some of the young men belonging to the establishment. No music as yet breaks in upon the dull process of water-sipping. For one whole hour there is nothing to while away the monotony of the alternate drinking and the regulation-walking for the conventional quarter of an hour after each potation. One water-girl is quite enough to supply the demands of the morning devotees. She manages with practised skill, as all

these girls do, to carry five or six tumblers in each hand, stoop down and plunge them in the ever-bubbling spring, and then, with quick step and a pleasant cheery face, distribute them to the water-worshippers according to their turn. From seven to half-past eight o'clock the concourse of people begins to enliven the situation. Such a confusion of tongues! One might imagine that it was a revival of Babel. German, French, Italian, Dutch, Spanish, Russian, Swedish, Danish, and, with evident preponderance, English—fall in bewildering concentration upon the ear.

It is very pleasant, and in every respect according to the fitness of things, that the first musical performance of the day should commence with some one of the well-known hymns which are admirably rendered by the band. Everyone seems to be impressed, and an air of solemn stillness exists all round, while the strains of the sacred melody are borne upon the ears of the visitors. That over, the programme of the morning's music goes on in regular sequence until half-past eight o'clock. By that time most of the *habitués* of the Springs have taken their prescribed number of tumblers, and are steadily going through their moderate exercise after they have taken their last drink. Those who are ordered by their physicians to imbibe three tumblers, have to spend at least one hour and a half in the park before breakfast. The great event of the morning with them is to dispose of their first draught not later than seven. Then they walk about for a quarter of an hour, and return to the well. Then another glass is slowly sipped, and another quarter of an hour's gentle exercise. Back again for the third dose, and once more they go through the allotted exercise, which should be continued for at least an hour before sitting down to breakfast. Thus it will be seen that anyone who is doomed to drink three glasses, and who takes the first exactly at seven, must, if he wishes to be *en règle*, walk about for one hour and a half at least before he partakes of the first meal of the day.

It is curious to notice the manifest falling off of the visitors with the departure of the band at half-past eight. As there are only very few before the music begins, so there are almost just as few after it ceases. At six o'clock I have counted again and again not more than ten, at half-past six not more than twenty, at seven about a hundred, and between that time and half-past eight they were too numerous to admit of accurate enumeration. At nine o'clock some few solitary laggards put in an appearance, who evidently have no intention to break their fast before eleven or half-past.

Of all the motley mixture of human beings that I have ever seen assembled at any given time or place, there was nothing

to be compared to the variety which crowded around the Elizabethan Spring in the early hours of these summer mornings in the height of the season. Princes, grand-dukes, peers, bishops, Church dignitaries of every grade (mostly English); soldiers, sailors, merchants, lawyers, scholars; rich and poor, mechanics, shopkeepers; Jews, Turks, Egyptians, Parsees, Hindoos; contingents from almost every continental nation in Europe; ladies of high and low degree, the conscientious and painstaking worshippers at "Fashion's Fane," and the more sensible and economical women to whom dress in its manifold varieties is not the main object of their daily care—all gather round the healing waters. Some go there for form's sake, in the pursuit of new excitement, and others for their life's sake, in the pursuit of health. Here may be seen all sorts and conditions of men and women, as regards the appearance of the flesh. The fat, the lean, the gouty, the dyspeptic, the rheumatic; the rubicund old gentleman whose free-living conviviality has left its traces on his features, and the pale-faced girl whose hectic and all but transparent cheeks tell their tale of fading bloom and delicate decline. All assemble round the one source of real or imaginary recuperation of the damaged machinery of the over-taxed, neglected, or ill-used body. Whatever may be the nature of the latent malady of any of these health-seekers, one thing at least is evident. There is an air of cheerfulness all around. It would almost seem as if the sparkling Spring was charged with elements of electricity capable of imparting temporary elasticity of spirits to each sufferer, to whatever degree he may be labouring under the pressure of ill-health. Here, too, may be seen, mingling freely with the crowd, the Nimrods and the Ramrods—the hard riders with hounds, whose defective processes of digestion have been more or less impeded by too copious draughts of the sparkling but insidious champagne. Here may be seen also "the old stager" whose fame is in every hunting and racing calendar, and the youthful aspirant after similar celebrity. All congregate around the effervescing water, and merrily talk of the vanished past, or discuss the political topics of the period, tumbler in hand, slowly sipping as their conversation flows on.

If the face be in any respect an index to the habits of a man's life, there may be seen plenty of indications suggestive of the results of a too generous dietary in their ordinary and everyday mode of existence when at home. Purplish discoloration of the capillary tissue, or dusky tints of bluish hue, visible on the most prominent feature, or diffused with impartial colouring over the entire face, tell a tale of over-supply of nutriment in solids and liquids, specially the

latter. The over-taxed bodily functions in the end repay with retributive vengeance the undue liberties taken with the sensitive structures so sadly ill-used and so utterly misunderstood. Nowhere do we see stronger proof of the connection between cause and effect than in the ill-conditioned appearance which the neglected body of such a man presents. Here, too, is the saying true, "As we sow, we reap." When we call to mind the numbers of persons who, not exactly with "malice prepense," but certainly with unthinking unconcern, treat their bodies as if they were no part of themselves, it suggests an anecdote told of Addison. He was lodging in a house off the Strand, and it happened to take fire. The landlady, finding that there was no chance of extinguishing the flames, rushed into Addison's room, where he was fast asleep, and shouted to him. "Get up, sir—get up, the house is on fire!" "Don't bother me," said Addison; "what do I care—I am only a lodger!" In like manner, we might suppose, judging from the broken-down health of the majority of Hombourg visitors in the season, that they were of opinion that there was no reciprocity of interest between the man and his body—as if the intelligent mind was totally distinct, materially and morally, from its environment; and that there existed no indissoluble co-partnership between them for the present. In spite of all the sublime abuse which mystics have heaped upon the body, a body man has, and what is equally certain, any neglect of that body will assuredly be visited sooner or later with retributive reaction. Happy that individual may esteem himself if he be not rudely awakened to realize the fact that "the neglecting of the body" cannot be done, whether from religious or irreligious motives, without undergoing a penalty proportioned in most cases to the offence. We are all such fools in this respect that we do not pause to reflect sufficiently upon the dual control of body and mind. Corpulence, gout, dyspepsia, and all the thousand ills to which flesh is heir, are due mainly to our insufficient attention to the reasonable demands of our bodily functions. Natural heritage, no doubt, inflicts upon many an innocent sufferer a good deal of congenital ill-health—an heirloom of blood-poisoning entailed upon posterity. The sins of the fathers are often visited upon successive generations, owing to ancestral irregularities, which run their inevitable course through the family history. We are told that "the blood is the life;" and if so, whatever we do to poison the living tide produces a corresponding effect upon the current of the blood as it flows on through the veins of those who are lineally descended from us. It certainly seems very hard that anyone should, without any fault of his own, inherit an impaired and enfeebled

constitution. But this is the result of a law which has existed from time immemorial, and is coeval with the history of man.

There are two classes of invalids who visit Hombourg. One of them may not be generally classified among those who are out of health. But when viewed rightly it will be seen that both are legitimately within the limits of the sick-list. One of these classes is the gouty; the other is the corpulent. In many instances the two misfortunes are combined in the same person, and *that* makes his treatment a matter of some difficulty. The remedies which are good for the corpulent are bad for the gouty, and *vice versâ*. Still, the cures which are effected by the regularity of living and by the water-drinking are a sufficient proof of the advantages of Hombourg as a health-resort in such cases.

As regards the inconvenience of corpulency, it is astonishing to notice the extraordinary dimensions in this respect of some of the visitors. Men and women present specimens of disfigurement that must render "the burden of the flesh" more than ordinarily burdensome. Of late, owing to the clever and well-reasoned treatise by a very eminent physician, Professor Eortel, attached to the university of Munich, there is the best of good news for all persons who desire to get rid of their corporeity, and be fined down to reasonable if not elegant proportions. By this process such persons can be reduced almost to the condition in which they were during the days of their youth; at least, their early manhood or womanhood. One of the most successful results of this plan has been witnessed in the case of Prince Bismarck. Owing to the celebrity of the public position which he occupies, any new remedy necessarily obtains a degree of notoriety not likely to be bestowed upon it when applied to persons enjoying the privilege of obscurity.[1] The secret of the "cure" is the absolute and total avoidance of liquid in any form during meals. Neither wine nor water, nor soup, nor any liquid is allowed while partaking of food. An hour afterwards liquid may be taken, and even then only to a limited extent. All sugar and sweets, potatoes, beer, bread, butter, vegetables that grow underground, rich sauces, salmon, eels, pork, veal, are rigorously prohibited. But although this list debars the individual from many things which the strong habit of action has set up, still there are so many good things left to his choice that he need not despair.

[1] This "cure" is popularly called the "Schweninger cure" after the name of one of Eortel's pupils who utilised his preceptor's teaching in his treatment of Prince Bismarck.

This discipline may be thought very severe, and all but impossible in actual operation. There can be no doubt that it requires a strong will to be able to undergo and to keep up the process of training in conjunction with strict regard to regimen. Still, there are many of the good things of life left for the selection of the man who desires to get rid of the superfluity of the flesh. For example, the following nutriments are allowed, and from the list of permitted things it is not difficult to choose something palatable: Beef in every form, mutton, venison, fowls, rabbits, hares, game of all sorts, all kinds of sea fish, except lobsters and eels; of vegetables, asparagus, cauliflower, young peas, haricots verts; all sorts of cooked fruits; rice, sago, soft-boiled eggs. Then as to beverages, he may have light Moselle or Rhine wine, good claret, coffee, tea, seltzer-water, soda-water, St. Galmier water, etc., etc. If a man cannot manage to live on this bill of fare he must be indeed hard to please. Exercise in the early morning. Rise at 6; out for a brisk walk of four miles or so; home again, and immediately on entering the house a cold bath; then dress and go to breakfast.[1] A small cup of coffee without milk or sugar, two or three rusks, or pieces of toast hard baked; an egg if he likes, or a mutton-chop. Nothing more, if the patient be very corpulent, till 1 o'clock. Then some fowl, and rice or sago, green vegetables as per list—no bread. Nothing except the meat and vegetables. On no account anything in the form of liquid. An hour after luncheon he may take two glasses of Rhine wine or good claret, with or without a tumbler of water, mineral or plain, just as he pleases. Dinner at 6.30 or 7 o'clock. Lean beef or mutton, and vegetables as before; stewed prunes or compote, but no sugar or sweets of any kind, and no liquid in any form. An hour after dinner two glasses of wine as before, and a tumbler of water. At 9.30 two baked apples and a small piece of dry toast, and a tumbler of whisky and water—half a glass of the former, or a glass of claret with water; and to be *in* bed at 10.30 at latest—better if it be 10 o'clock. After breakfast and until luncheon the patient may read or write his letters, and keep quiet until luncheon. From that time until 6 o'clock he must be taking exercise in the open air, climbing up hills, or walking briskly along the road; and if it be hilly, so much the better. In this new "cure" it is said that it is necessary to give the heart a fair amount of muscular work. Professor Eortel says that when he began to try this experimental process upon himself he had been for some time suffering from the effects of a feeble

[1] This system of training is suggested rather for life at home than at the Springs.

circulation—his heart was weak, and dropsical symptoms as the result had already set in. He reasoned in effect with himself thus: "If my heart is weak, it may be that I have not given it enough of work to do. Its muscular action may be impeded from want of reasonable exercise. I shall try the opposite plan from that generally adopted in such cases; and instead of giving myself up to repose and reclining on a sofa, I shall try if walking will be of any use, and if possible walking up hills, so as to give some play to the action of the heart." He did so, and the result was that by judicious exercise and strict regimen he cured himself of the dropsical symptoms, and restored the action of his heart to its normal condition, and is now in good health.

That this plan is thoroughly practical, and when fairly tried is invaluable in removing poverty of blood, muscular debility, and inordinate corpulency, has been indisputably proved. I am responsible for what is here stated only in proportion to the fidelity with which I desire to record the opinions of Eortel, and the physician whom I have had the pleasure and satisfaction of consulting at the watering-place, where I spent some time. Of one fact I am very certain. If anyone who is suffering from a degree of corporeity which renders exercise almost impossible, at all events very difficult, will only give a fair trial to the Eortel treatment, he may be perfectly satisfied that after a few months of persistent and rigorous attention to the prescribed dietary and exercise, not forgetting the early bedtime and the early rising, he will be agreeably surprised to find the burden of the flesh becoming "small by degrees and beautifully less."

This is one of the chief advantages of a visit to Hombourg by all such patients—for, strictly speaking, patients they are. Let no very fat man deceive himself by supposing that because he has a good appetite, and enjoys the good things of life, and sleeps soundly, and looks comfortably nourished, that therefore he is in a good condition of health. Many such persons have feeble hearts and unhealthy livers, because fatty deposits interfere with their proper and normal action. A friend of my own, a man of this type, extra stout, fat, ruddy, and "well-nourished" as to his face, found it hard work to walk up anything like a steep hill. Puffing and blowing like a steam-engine, he moved along with many a toilsome step and slow. He weighed eighteen stone, and in stature he was only five feet and nine inches. He led a sedentary life, had a good appetite, enjoyed his food, was a teetotaler, and everything he ate seemed to agree with him. He had been warned again and again by his physician to take care of fatty degeneration of the heart. He laughed at all such counsel, for he said that he felt per-

fectly well. One day, being a little late for the train, he ran faster than usual, and more than he could well afford to do, to be in time. He succeeded in catching the train at the station. He took his place in the carriage. He was out of breath by the undue exertion he had taken, and in less than five minutes he expired. It was subsequently found that he had been suffering from fatty degeneration, and the heart, being unduly pressed, it gave way under the strain, and my friend died.

In Hombourg I have seen many persons, enormously fat, who by a diligent and conscientious course of the waters, and strict attention to diet, gradually become thinner, and enjoyed better health than they had known for years. To reason from the particular to the universal is bad logic. But, in the matter of this "cure," it is the universal experience of all extra-corpulent persons who have fairly tried it, that it works wonders in the reduction of useless materialism, while at the same time it promotes the general tone and health of all the functions of the body. Unquestionably, the majority of people eat too much, drink too much, sleep too much, and exercise too little. It would surprise some gourmands if they could see on how little a healthy man can live, and work both body and mind, and be at the same time in perfect health. And not only so, how well he can walk and run, without any risk of life by the effort!

Anyone who wishes to visit Hombourg for health's sake, must from the very first day go into training if too stout; but, under any circumstances, he should give the closest attention to what he is to eat and drink and avoid. To apply the foregoing principles, as mathematicians say, to a particular case: I am acquainted with a gentleman who was a visitor this season at Hombourg. He remained there exactly twenty-seven days. On his arrival he was weighed, and was found to be exactly eighteen stone and five pounds. The same day he went to his physician, who put him on the Eortel system of treatment. The doctor exacted from him a promise to attend to the letter to the instructions given by him. He did so. Among other things, he was to walk every day at least five miles at first, and towards the Taunus Mountains, being all the way uphill. The first day he had to give in after three miles, the heat being just then excessive. Next day he tried again, but with very little better success. Accordingly he gave up the Taunus Mountain walk, and confined his exercise to the park. At the end of a week he found that he had lost seven pounds. After another week, he had gone down altogether ten pounds from his original weight. At the end of three weeks he had lost thirteen pounds and a half, and on the day he left Hombourg

he weighed—under the same circumstances as at the beginning, same dress, etc.—exactly seventeen stone and six pounds. Two days before leaving he walked towards Saalburg—the same road on which he first took exercise—when he had to give it up. But now he walked with comparative ease, and without "the bellows to mend" at every step uphill as formerly. On going away from Hombourg he went to another watering-place in Switzerland, where he continued the Eortel treatment. He now weighs, after two months of such training and discipline, only sixteen stone and two pounds; but he is a man over six feet in height. He can run uphill, walk four miles an hour before his breakfast, is on the best of terms with himself and with everyone else, and the electricity of his renewed bodily framework keeps him all day long in a state of happy-go-lucky cheerfulness, and, altogether, he has taken a new lease of life. Whereas he measured forty-eight inches round the chest, and forty-seven round the waist, he tells me that he now measures forty-six round the chest, and thirty-eight round the waist; and as the result of his reduction in flesh and weight, he is able to take violent exercise in running and fast walking every day from six to eight o'clock in the morning. But he rigidly keeps to the rules of the "cure," and life has become to him a source of perpetual enjoyment. His brain is as clear and his perceptive faculties as bright as possible; and, on the whole, he has to thank Hombourg and Eortel and his clever doctor at the Springs for a state of health, and activity of mind and body, which certainly seems to be altogether extraordinary.

There are very few persons who, to use a pithy saying, "know how to run the machine." Let anyone look over the "bill of fare" for a dinner-party—soup, fish, entrées, and so on and so on, concluding with ices and dessert, while all through the dinner, wines adapted to each course are handed round. Would any man with a grain of common-sense attempt to maintain that such a commingling of food and liquid of all kinds is conducive to the easy "running of the machine"? There are many who, during the London season, dine after this fashion almost every day; and is it very wonderful that, after three or four months of such a mode of living, it becomes necessary to seek some health-resort to counteract the indiscretions arising from over eating and drinking?

It may be taken for granted that the effect of the Hombourg waters, accompanied with the collateral exercise and regimen, is a pretty sure one, if the unhealthy condition of the visitor have arisen from a luxurious mode of living. For the purpose of the "cure," from three to four weeks are sufficient so far as

the drinking of the waters is concerned. But anyone who desires to benefit permanently by a sojourn in Hombourg should continue the good habits he may have acquired there after he has returned to his home.

It must not be supposed that all who visit this queen of watering-places are victims either of overfeeding or of luxurious living in any form. Many, very many, go there simply because the climate is very dry and bracing. It is a most agreeable place of residence, and it affords abundant opportunities for walking and driving for many miles round the town. The air of the Taunus Mountains is perfect, and is charged with ozone to a very considerable extent. Fashion asserts its despotic sway here as in London. Ladies seem even more particular about their toilette than when at home. The number and the variety of dresses worn by each fair devotee in the Temple of Vanity must entail much time and trouble, to say nothing of expense in getting them up. Some ladies, during three weeks of their visit, have almost as many dresses as there are days in that period. The morning, the forenoon, the afternoon, dinner, the evening reunion at the Kursaal—all demand different styles of costume; and it is not considered in the best form to be seen too often on those occasions in the same dress. "Vanity in the faces of the young, and vexation in the faces of the old seem, sir," said a clever American lady to me, "to be the order of things here: the young are in the full enjoyment of their day, the old look back regretfully that theirs is past." This may be a little severe, and perhaps not strictly according to fact. Still there is a fair share of truth in what this lady says. It has been remarked that there are very few marriages made up at Hombourg. There is a fair share of mild flirtation, but seldom anything comes of it. Lawn-tennis in Hombourg is carried on with more than the usual *furore* at home in England. Almost every young lady may be seen carrying in the afternoon her tennis-racket quite as regularly as her parasol. The park presents a very gay appearance when it is full of the proper complement of players, and some of them play remarkably well. What a boon to them is the Ludwig Spring! When tired, they go down and take a draught of this water, which in its natural state resembles Seltzer-water in its best condition, only much better and more palatable. There is no spring in Hombourg so refreshing; and it has the advantage of being used advantageously for the table day by day. The lady from the tennis-ground, the labourer from his work, and all sorts and conditions of men and women, repair to this spring in the afternoon. To many who are going through "the cure" it is almost the only drink except the morning waters, they take during the whole day;

and to them it is more than ordinarily grateful. "I generally say grace before meat," said a gentleman to me; "but since I have tasted the waters of this well, I say grace before water. It is one of heaven's choice gifts."

It is hardly possible for anyone to be low-spirited in Hombourg. The air, the surroundings, the universal cheerfulness, everywhere, contrive to make one feel free from care. And yet there is no place where the "has been" is so painfully forced upon the mind. The vanished years with the vanished friends who shared them, with those who like themselves sought the pleasant retreat of Hombourg, come crowding upon the memory. Several persons told me that for twenty years they never missed a season at Hombourg. But, as they look back upon the past and think of the changed scene around them—the absence of so many whom they valued and loved—a shade of sadness steals over their thoughts. Of all the gay and graceful crowd who throng the parks this year there will be many fallen out from their ranks by this time twelvemonth, or circumstances of various kinds will render it impossible for them to return. And so each year the old *habitué* of the Springs finds himself surrounded with increasing new faces, while he painfully misses the old and familiar ones.[1]

Viewing Hombourg in the aggregate, it is a most enjoyable place to pass a month in summer, specially if one is not bound down by rigid laws of regimen to enter upon a process of semi-starvation. The people whom one meets with in the principal hotels—the Victoria, and the Four Seasons, and the Hôtel de Russie, etc., etc.—are for the most part either English or Americans. Everybody seems to lay aside the stiff and stilted exclusiveness of home-life in England. We are more natural, and therefore more genial. Friendships are formed which are likely to be lifelong. The fellow-feeling which makes us wondrous kind cements in closer bonds the friends whom Providence has thrown together under the pressure of similar exigencies. The artificial barriers which society has, perhaps, found it necessary to erect for the protection of our individualism are in a great measure thrown down on such occasions. The electricity of the heart gets fair play. Spiritual affinities draw people closer together. We experience almost, if not altogether, that form of human sympathy which consists in a community of souls, and we turn

[1] There is a very good English Church here, and it is well looked after by the active and popular Chaplain, who resides all the year round in Hombourg. It is crammed from end to end in the height of the season—indeed, sometimes many have to go away from want of accommodation.

our backs on Hombourg with many pleasant memories, and retaining souvenirs that shall remain fresh and green for ever.

G. W. WELDON.

ART. VI.—MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON FREE EDUCATION.

IN several meetings during the recess, Mr. Chamberlain has handled the question of national education; and no educationist is likely to criticize the right hon. gentleman's utterances as hesitating and ambiguous. Mr. Chamberlain's speeches, as a rule, are marked by singular skill, and his eloquence is of a very pointed and practical cast. About the Established Church, and about national education, his meaning is sufficiently plain. He has addressed himself especially to the working classes, the artizans and labourers of the towns, and the new voters throughout the country; and he has taken pains to let them know that he has the courage of his convictions. A main point in his tempting programme is gratuitous education.

At the eighth annual Conference of the Council of the "National Liberal Federation," held at Bradford, on the 1st, resolutions were carried touching education and the Church. About the Church, of course, little was said. A resolution that "the disestablishment and disendowment of the English and Scotch Churches are urgently needed" was carried unanimously. For an amendment that disestablishment should not be made an issue at the approaching general election a seconder could not be found. With regard to schools Mr. Jesse Collings, M.P., moved the following resolution:

> That, in the opinion of this meeting, the public elementary schools of this country should be free, and placed under the management of duly elected representatives of the people, and that any deficiency caused by the abolition of fees in the schools under the control of the ratepayers should be supplied from the national exchequer.

As to the method by which the work was to be done, said Mr. Collings, there were the denominational and other difficulties, which the Act of 1870 made greater than they need have been; but let them first get the principle admitted, and when they came to deal with that still greater question of religious equality they would then eliminate all sectarian ascendency, whether it be in Church or school or University. Mr. A. Illingworth, M.P., however, in seconding the resolution, declared that schools receiving aid from the rates and taxes

should be under representative control only. He deprecated haste, and said there should first be obtained for the people's representatives absolute control over State-aided and rate-aided schools, and then they might proceed to set up the institution of Free Education. He suggested, therefore, that the words "should be ultimately freed," should be inserted in the resolution after "representatives of the people," and that the words "free and" after "country" should be deleted. Mr. Collings said he was willing to agree to Mr. Illingworth's proposal, but objected to the introduction of the word "ultimately." Mr. Lyulph Stanley, M.P. (member of the London School Board), thought the resolution much better in its amended form, because it now pointed to the importance of the people having the control over their schools, whilst at the same time it recognised the importance of their being free. After debate, the resolution was adopted, with the addition of the words suggested by Mr. Illingworth, and agreed to in the following form:

That, in the opinion of this meeting, the public elementary schools of this country should be placed under the management of duly elected representatives of the people, and that they should be ultimately freed, and that any deficiency should be made good out of the national exchequer.

This action on the part of Mr. Chamberlain's uncompromising friends was possibly—judged by electioneering balances—a mistake; but Mr. Collings and Mr. Illingworth know their own minds, and they appear to think the pear is ripe. The right hon. gentleman, it may be, is of the same opinion; at all events, he showed himself equal to the occasion. Voluntary schools are not consistent with advanced Liberalism; they are "sectarian." The first aim of Radicals, and Liberationists of every shade—according to the Bradford programme — is to bring denominational schools under the control of elected representatives of the people; in other words, we suppose, every elementary school in the country must be a Board School. Secondly, all schools must be "*freed.*"

Mr. Chamberlain replied to objections "on the one hand" and "on the other hand," in the following terms:

On the one hand, it is said that free education will close denominational schools, and will therefore throw upon the rates, already sufficiently burdened, an enormous additional charge in order to supply their place; and, on the other hand, there are many good Liberals who are afraid that free education may give a new vantage-ground to the sectarian system, and may retard the complete assertion of religious equality. In my opinion it will do, or need do, neither one nor the other. It is perfectly possible to imagine an arrangement which would leave the position of the denominational schools exactly where it is to-day, which

should neither diminish nor increase the obligation which is placed upon them of finding a proportion of their expenditure out of voluntary subscriptions.

The "arrangement," we learn, is an increased support from the taxes—not from rates.

Mr. Chamberlain proceeded as follows :

> The existence of sectarian schools supported by State grants is no doubt a very serious question in itself, and one which some day or another ought to receive consideration. Whenever the time comes for its discussion, I for one shall not hesitate to express my opinion that contributions of Government money, whether great or small, ought in all cases to be accompanied by some form of representative control. To my mind the spectacle of so-called national schools turned into a private preserve by clerical managers, and used for exclusive purposes of politics or religion, is one which the law ought not to tolerate. But this is a question which can be treated by itself. It is independent of that which I have brought before you, and it seems to me it should not be mixed up or confused with the just claims of the working class to a free education in all the common schools of the country.

This question, namely, the disestablishment of Voluntary Schools, "can be treated by itself," said the right hon. gentleman. First, obtain representative control; then abolish school fees; and an agitation against religious teaching will naturally follow.

Mr. Gladstone, in his Manifesto,[1] had spoken of the difficulties in regard to a gratuitous primary education — "difficulties which demand at any rate grave consideration." But Mr. Chamberlain, whose influence over the advanced sections of the Liberal party seems to be increasing every day, presses forward the subject with unabated zeal.

In his speech at Newport, on the 7th, the Prime Minister, remarking that as to Free Education he had the singular and unusual felicity of being very much on the same point of view as Mr. Gladstone, said : "I think that this question cannot

[1] The main portion of the Midlothian Manifesto, as regards gratuitous education, runs thus : "According to the habits of this country, a contribution towards the cost of the article tends to its being more thoroughly valued by the receiver. It seems necessary to consider with care what will be the effect of the change on primary education, other than that which is supplied by public authority. The rule of our policy is, that nothing should be done by the State which can be better or as well done by voluntary effort; and I am not aware that, either in its moral or even its literary aspects, the work of the State for education has as yet proved its superiority to the work of the religious bodies, or of philanthropic individuals. Even the economical consideration of materially augmented cost does not appear to be wholly trivial. Again, will there not be under the new system an increased jealousy of the introduction into the schools of any subject not strictly rudimentary? There remains the religious difficulty. The nation does not appear to be disposed to confine the public teaching in the primary schools to matter purely secular."

be dealt with in the summary way in which Mr. Chamberlain has dealt with it."

I have no doubt whatever [said his Lordship] that the effect of the compulsory character of education does give to the poorer classes of the community a considerable claim. If they ask for a thing and cannot get it, it is unreasonable to tax the rest of the community to give it to them. But if you say to them, "You shall have this thing whether you like it or not," and then they cannot pay for it without enormous pressure on their resources, I must say there is a considerable claim that they should be assisted. But they are assisted under the present law, though I do not think that the law is liberal enough. I should like to make it more liberal; but I do not see—because I think it reasonable that those who are in very poor circumstances, and to whom a portion of the fee is remitted—that we should therefore make a present of large sums of public money to a great number of people who are perfectly competent to pay for the education of their own children.

The laws may well, said Lord Salisbury, be made more liberal on behalf of those upon whom the present law presses with undue severity. "But I should shrink very much before I gave to every subject of the Queen a right—whether he was rich, well-to-do, moderately well off, or poor—to have his children educated at the public expense. I do not see any reason for adding to such an extent to our public burdens; and I believe it will be some time before the taxpayers of this country will accept it; but I cannot help seeing in this proposal—as, indeed, Mr Morley has clearly indicated—a desire to get rid of that which we cherish as one of our most important privileges—the right of religious education. I am not speaking," added the noble Marquis, "for my own Church alone—what I claim I would extend with equal hand to the Nonconformists of Wales or to the Roman Catholics of Ireland." And accordingly he proceeded, speaking in behalf of "all the denominations of this country": "I commend to you earnestly to defend, as the most cherished possession which we as the citizens of a free country have in this land, the right that our children and the children of those who think with us should be taught the whole truth of Christianity as we believe it, and that no theories about State interference, no secular doctrines, shall be allowed to interfere to diminish or to frustrate the highest privilege that Christianity can possess."

Now, many Liberal Churchmen, we are aware, had pronounced in favour of gratuitous education; but the recent utterances of several members of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, pointing strongly the other way, will no doubt be carefully considered and duly weighed. Lord Hartington, Lord Derby,[1]

[1] Lord Derby said: "I cannot admit any right on the part of the individual to have his children taught at the public expense. Schooling

and Mr. Childers have shown that they are not inclined to follow Mr. Chamberlain. Such representative Liberals, too, as Mr. Courtney and Sir T. Brassey, and even Mr. Bright, have virtually condemned the Bradford programme. Mr. Goschen has criticized it severely. Nevertheless, Mr. Chamberlain is a very able, clear-sighted, and vigorous politician; and he has addressed himself in particular, as we said, to the masses. Disputes between different sections of the Liberal party we have no desire to discuss; with "party" politics THE CHURCHMAN has no concern. But upon two great questions, the National Church, and Religious Education, we are clearly bound to speak; and it is necessary to point out that, of those who are agitating for gratuitous education, the leaders advocate the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church, and have given tolerably plain indications of their feeling towards "sectarian," that is voluntary and denominational, schools.

Mr. Childers is not willing to deal a blow at voluntary schools, or in anyway to upset the covenant of 1870. The right hon. gentleman's utterances on such questions, like those of Mr. Forster, we quote with sincere respect. The "covenant" made fifteen years ago, is now, of course, "ancient history." But it may be well to quote Mr. Forster's statement, which we heard him make in the House of Commons, February, 1870. "We must take care," said the right hon. gentleman, "not to destroy in building up—not to destroy the existing system in introducing a new one. In solving this problem there must be, consistently with the attainment of our object, the least possible expenditure of public money, the utmost endeavour not to injure existing and efficient schools, and the most careful absence of all encouragement to parents to neglect their children. . . . Our object is to *complete the present voluntary system, to fill up gaps, sparing the public money, where it can be done without, procuring as much as*

---

for children is not more necessary than food, or clothing, or lodging, which we expect men to find for themselves, and that attendance at school is compulsory seems to be no argument. The wearing of clothes is compulsory, but the State does not undertake to provide clothes. But if the electors in general do not object to heavy increase of rates or taxes, or both, for that purpose, they are the masters. They will only be carrying the load on the one shoulder instead of on the other." Lord Derby, however, understates the case: "the load" to be carried would be a heavier load. Lord George Hamilton, we observe, in a recent speech, said: "It was clear that the object of the advocates of the free system, was to overthrow voluntary schools which educated two-thirds of the children attending elementary schools. The amount payable for the remaining one-third was between two and three millions a year. If, therefore, the other two-thirds were thrown upon School Boards there would be an increase in the rates of not less than seven millions a year."

we can the assistance of the parents, and welcoming as much as we rightly can *the co-operation and aid of those benevolent men who desire to assist their neighbours.*" These are the words of a Christian statesman; and we have pleasure in recalling them. But this wise and liberal policy in national education was supported by the illustrious philanthropist, to whose memory Nonconformists, no less than Churchmen, are at the present moment paying worthy tribute, the Earl of Shaftesbury. At the great meeting in the metropolis, summoned in defence of religious education, Lord Shaftesbury asserted, with eloquence which Lord Salisbury said he had "seldom heard rivalled," the right of the people to religious teaching for their children. In spite of the Birmingham League, the noble Earl called upon the men and women of England to rise with one heart and soul and say: "By all our hopes and all our fears, by the honour of the nation, by the safety of the people, by all that is holy and all that is true, by everything in time and everything in eternity, the children of Great Britain shall be brought into the faith and fear and nurture of the Lord."

Art. VII.—THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

The following Paper was written for the Chichester Diocesan Conference, Brighton, October 29th, 1885.

THE subject upon which I have been requested to read a paper is—1st. The advantages of the Established Church; and 2nd. The best means of maintaining it.

I am fully aware that the remarks I am about to read are only an imperfect sketch of my own opinions upon a very large and important subject. I will, however, endeavour to state as clearly as I can, in so brief a paper, what these opinions are.

I will then observe, first, that by the words "Established Church" I understand that branch of the Christian Church which is established in England by law.

In support of this view, I have no thought of citing the various statutes by which the connection between the Church and the State has been secured. I have not space for this, and, moreover, the nature of this connection is generally understood by most educated Englishmen. I do not propose to discuss the disadvantages, such as the restraint upon the Church's freedom, and other objections, which are alleged with more or less truth and cogency against our present constitution.

My present business is to point out what appear to me the chief advantages of the connection to the English people.

In the first place, the Church enjoys the protection of the law for its rightful property, and also for the just administration of its own laws.

I may add that the Sovereign is not only the supreme authority in all causes civil and ecclesiastical, but is by the Act of Settlement a member of the Established Church, and by the Coronation Oath bound to defend it. Now, Christianity being, as Blackstone says, a part of the law of England, it seems right and for the honour of God that the Sovereign should be a professed member of that branch of the Church to which her subjects are supposed to belong.

I would next mention that the selection and nomination of Bishops by the Crown through its responsible advisers is in my opinion an advantage, though one requiring to be guarded, as liable to abuse.

There is, I think, a real advantage in the fact that our ecclesiastical laws, being parts either of the common or statute law of the realm, cannot be altered or repealed without the consent of Parliament. I should consider this an unquestionable advantage if the Church had, which she has not now, a representative body or synod, to whom all proposed alterations in its laws or canons might be submitted for approval before the necessary sanction of Parliament was obtained. Without some such sanction of the representatives of the whole body of the Church, it will be always difficult to obtain the consent of Parliament to any reform or alteration of the law, however desirable.

I could mention several other advantages of an Established Church, but will only add one more, which seems to me the greatest of all, I mean the parochial system, which is an institution scarcely compatible with a Free Church, or practicable in any country where there is no national or privileged Establishment.

In rural districts especially, it must be largely for the social good of the people to have resident amongst them an educated gentleman, who is not only the appointed minister of Christ to instruct them in the truths of the Gospel, but one also to whom the law has delegated the pastoral office of ministering to their spiritual and bodily wants. This is what Dr. Chalmers defines as the "territorial" in opposition to the congregational system. No one understood this subject better than he did, and though he ultimately became a Free Churchman, he retained to the last his preference for an Endowed and Established Church.

In thus noticing some of the chief advantages of the

Established Church, I have purposely omitted any allusion to the fact of its being a branch of the Church Catholic, to its liturgy, its doctrines; in short, to what concerns its spiritual character, the consideration of which I have omitted as not coming within the more abstract and limited subject of this paper. Moreover, these are advantages which might equally belong to a Free Church.

I now come to the second branch of my subject: "The best means of maintaining the Established Church."

I would say, then, that the Church's light must shine brightly; in other words, its teaching and the lives of its members must be manifestly in harmony with the doctrine and example of our Lord and Saviour.

The Church must be Protestant, adhering loyally to the principles of the Reformation.

It must be earnest and aggressive in its Missionary work both at home and abroad.

In its parochial work, to which I have already attached so much importance, it must employ an increased number of lay workers, both men and women; and I would venture to suggest that the minister of a parish should endeavour to associate with himself a certain number of lay members to assist in the promotion and superintendence of all parochial and evangelistic work.

It seems to me also of some importance that the divines and preachers of the Church should, as far as practicable, keep abreast with the modern advancement of science.

I say nothing of reforms, or alterations in the laws and canons and other kindred matters, which in my opinion require well-considered amendments; for these would afford ample material for a separate paper.

I would next, and lastly, mention a spirit of toleration towards other churches.

I do not mean merely that personal toleration which Coleridge describes as "the toleration of each other's intolerance," though this is a good maxim for men of peace; but I mean, rather, a feeling of respect and brotherly love toward the members and churches of Nonconformists, who hold equally with ourselves the great doctrines of the Gospel. There have been amongst us men of eminence in the Church who were wont to speak of these bodies as "sister churches, more or less orthodox." These words very nearly express what I venture to recommend as the feeling we should cultivate towards our nonconforming brethren. Of course, in our intercourse with them, the closeness of our mutual relations would vary in degree according to the similarity or otherwise of our views.

But if the Church of England is to be Catholic in its character and Protestant in its doctrine, and if otherwise it will not long continue an Established Church, I contend that brotherly intercourse with Evangelical Nonconformists is not only a Christian duty, but a chief means by which the Church may secure the affection of the people, and also the continuance of its connection with the State.

If we admit these Nonconformists to be Christians, we must consider them as brethren and fellow-citizens of "Jerusalem, which is above, and which is the mother of us all"—therefore members of this one Established Church, which cannot be shaken, "whose builder and maker is God."

CHICHESTER.

Short Notices.

The Endowments and Establishment of the Church of England. By the late J. S. BREWER, M.A. Second Edition, Revised. Edited by LEWIS T. DIBDIN, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. John Murray.

THIS volume, at the present moment, is of great value, and we hasten to invite to it the attention of our readers. It should be in the hands of all the Clergy, and of all the thoughtful laymen who are rallying to the defence of the National Church.

Mr. Brewer's work, probably, is known to many of our readers, and they will have pleasure in recommending a new, revised edition. The Archbishop of Canterbury, if we remember right, last year, in his Diocesan Conference, spoke warmly of Mr. Brewer's book, and it has been commended by representative men of various shades of opinion in the Church. Of the learning and judgment of the Author—particularly in regard to the Reformation period—it is needless here to write. Everybody who has fairly studied the reign of Henry VIII. knows something at least of the patient investigation and matured scholarship of Mr. Brewer. As an ecclesiastical historian, with regard to both research and ability, he stood in the highest rank. Few writers—it is well said—have "combined so successfully a glowing style, full of life and interest, with sound, solid reasoning." It is matter of regret that such an accomplished Professor should have left to us so little of his own writing.

The book before us (a revised edition of one of the Professor's valuable writings) will be heartily welcomed on all sides. The able Editor, Mr. Dibdin, who happily combines literary power with preciseness and positiveness, that clearness of detail which springs from laborious research, and who seems likely to take the place in ecclesiastical questions so long filled by Dr. Stephens, has made no needless alterations. The revision, indeed, we can well understand has been thorough, but everywhere the alterations and annotations—so far as time permits us to judge—have been judicious. Mr. Brewer's work has been made a *present-day* treatise. Mr. Dibdin has added two notes of some length, one on the historical origin of Parochial Tithes, and the other on the nature of the Establishment as an existing institution.

The book is divided into two parts : the first deals with Endowments, and the second with Establishment. As to Part I. Mr. Dibdin acknowledges in his preface the valuable aid he has received from the Bishop of Chester. To that eminent historian it would no doubt be a pleasure to be consulted in regard to revising a work on the National Church by a scholar to whose almost unrivalled qualifications for such a task his Lordship could well bear witness.

From lack of time (for the book has reached us too late for a worthy review) we can only quote one or two brief paragraphs from Part I. On page 90 we read :

> Nothing can be more futile, preposterous, and absurd, than the popular notion that the parochial tithes and endowments of the Church of England were given by the nation as such, and were not the private charities of individuals, as much, to all intents and purposes, as a subscription at a missionary sermon in a Baptist Chapel, or a contribution at a Wesleyan Centenary.

On page 97 Mr. Brewer shows how unfounded is the notion (we fancy a very prevalent one) that there is a *common treasure* for the Church. There is no such thing. "Each parish has its Endowment for the sole benefit of the parish, which the Church may augment if it please, but cannot transfer or diminish."

On page 124, touching the energetic efforts of the Established Church, we read : "Its various funds, raised exclusively by the voluntary con- "tributions of its members, for building new churches, for propagating "the Gospel in foreign parts, for improving the condition of its clergy, "for providing for their widows and orphans, for the relief and educa- "tion of the poor, for the promotion, in short, of every good work, are "greater, more exemplary, more munificent, than any other nation "exhibits or ever has exhibited, or anything like it. They are a "permanent monument to the vitality and energy of the Church of "England.

> As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
> Sweeps from the vale and midway leaves the storm,
> Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on its head.

"But so far as its churches and its endowments are concerned, "whether before the Reformation or since, previous to its establishment "by Henry VIII. or subsequently, the Church of England owes no more "to the State than the dissenter owes. It owes the right of building its "own churches and supporting its own ministers—that and no more. It "owes the privilege of receiving the alms, oblations, subscriptions, and "endowments of those who are willing to give them—that and no more. "It owes its right to its own tithes, to the same source and no other. And "like the dissenter, like every other individual and every other society "and corporation in the nation, it owes to the State the protection of its "own property. That, and that alone, is the one gift, the only endow- "ment—if endowment it can be called—for which the Church is "indebted to the State ; that and nothing more."

"Popular County Histories."—*A History of Norfolk.* By WALTER RYE, editor of "The Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany." Pp. 300. Elliot Stock.

This is the first volume of a new series of County Histories, and if other volumes equal Mr. Rye's the series will—to use a common phrase —supply a lack. A series of handy volumes, County Histories by competent writers, "popular" and yet precise, attractive and yet thoroughly accurate, is sure to find readers. The history of a county has a value beyond what may be called local and personal, and many readers who have a

spice of antiquarianism will find county chronicles, with various bits of social, political, religious, and literary interest, an enjoyable study.

We might quote many brief passages from the volume before us, to show the thoroughness of Mr. Rye's work. Here is one specimen :

Of their personal conduct [Parliamentarian bands] we know little, and it was to supply this want that an impudent local forger concocted the "Squire Papers" which fairly took in Carlyle, who printed them as an appendix to his "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches." In my "Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany" I dissected these papers at some length, but it is hardly worth while going over the ground again here. It will suffice, perhaps, to any one acquainted with the subject, to point out that at a time when double Christian names were so extremely rare, that a single example can hardly be found, one list only of a hundred and forty-nine names has *four* examples. The proportion of very unusual and Scriptural names, too, is ridiculously large. . . .

Here is a specimen of dialogue given to Mr. Rye the other day, as taken down from the mouth of an East Norfolk gardener. Emphasized as italicized :

As I was *jumping* t' holl from *Far*mer *Thir*kettle's little *pigh*tle inteu t' rhoed, she come up teu me and say :

"Can I get trew *here?*"

"Iss," said I, "but it is no *mat*ter of a rhoed."

"Whawt?" said she.

"It's only a *drift*way," sed I.

"Eh?" sed she.

"Nobbut a *pack*way," sed I.

"Oh," sed she; "and which way deu I go?"

"Yew go as the *rhoed* go, for tew or tree hundred *yard* till you come teu a *par*yard," sed I.

"Teu whawt?" sed she, etc., etc.

A Norfolk man, it may be added, cannot pronounce *h* when it comes after *t*, and so is compelled to say "teu" and "tree" for "two" and "three," and "trew" for "through."

Christmas Letter Mission—Samples (Hazell, Watson and Viney, 5, Kirby Street, Hatton Garden, E.C.)

We have much pleasure in inviting attention to this album, and inserting the following notice of the work of this excellent Society, which an esteemed correspondent has sent to us. The selection of samples in the album is really interesting. Many of the cards are exceedingly cheap.

"Some unexpected gift for our people at Christmas and the New Year!" How often does the wish for such a commodity rise to the lips of the clergyman and his workers? This need has been met by the Letters of the CHRISTMAS LETTER MISSION. Begun in 1871, in the parish of the late Rev. E. B. Elliott, of Brighton, by the distribution of a few hundred letters to the sick in hospital and infirmary, it has grown so rapidly that last Christmas more than 500,000 of the beautifully illustrated Letters, with Scriptural Text Cards, in ten different languages, carried greetings to all classes scattered in different parts of the world. The following, from a Kent Rector, gives an idea of their adaptation for parochial distribution :

"I advise any clergyman, who knows what it is to come home with a weary head from work, to get a supply of these charming letters. They carry wearied or volatile intellects along with them, and leave a substratum of spiritual help. I was delighted to have appropriate, letters for the sick and aged. These could not join us in public worship, nor could I pay each of them a visit of sympathy. But the letters assured them of communion with us, and invited to communion with our incarnate Lord). One thing I learned was to secure a supply of C.L.M. envelopes. They at once announce the object of the letter, and their prettiness

arrests and pleases. In the *Letters for General Use* I found pleasant gifts for every member of my choir, who were thus confronted with a special token of Christmas kind feeling from the rector as soon as they assembled. Every one, too, of the often-neglected class of domestic servants in my parish thus received a reminder of their pastor's goodwill, from the squire's butler to the little 'general' of the lower middle class. And among them, too, to my great joy, I found tokens of loving remembrance to young people whom I had prepared for Confirmation, and who had left us, chiefly for service. The post took them to town, and all over the country, and even to America! As to the *Children's Letters*, it was quite a eureka to have them for the dear young ones of all classes, to carry the Gospel of Christmas on the wings of pleasantness and affection into the drawing-room and the nursery. Truly it was sowing seed beside all waters, and I believe every one who will sow these annuals will hereafter find they have produced perennials."

For further particulars readers of THE CHURCHMAN may consult an advertisement on another page. It may be added, however, that full information concerning the work and plans of this Mission may be obtained by sending an addressed Postal Wrapper to the Central Secretary, Miss Bewes, 67, Ladbroke Grove, Notting Hill, W.

Cassandra's Casket. By EMMA MARSHALL. Nisbet and Co.

We are always glad to welcome another book by Mrs. Marshall. Few have written so many tales, and fewer still have written so well. No matter on what lines the gifted writer builds and fashions her work, the story is sure to be "a story," readable and also profitable. Readers who value culture and refinement, but above all seek for truth and unction, will recommend her Tales, especially for young ladies. "Cassandra's Casket" is not unworthy to rank with preceding volumes of a charming series. School Girls will enjoy its descriptions of school life. The picture of Nesta's heroic self-sacrifice with the sinking boat, is graphically drawn (though a nautical pen might correct certain details with advantage), and the scene in which Cassandra thanks her dying friend is very touching. We may add that this volume is a handsome present.

Cairnforth and Sons. A Tale. By HELEN SHIPTON. S.P.C.K.

This book is likely to be helpful to some for whom a story of a conventional, common-place character would have little attraction. It is well written, strong and suggestive, with freshness of tone as well as skilful work. Scenes in factory life are graphic. Launcelot Cairnforth, the son of a Lancashire mill-owner, is cleverly drawn. He was a thorough "gentleman," after a fashion religious, but selfishly indifferent, well pleased with his luxurious life. Then came a change—

> At least not rotting like a weed,
> But having sown some generous seed,
> Fruitful of further thought and deed.

The Mill in the Valley; or Truth will out. By C. E. M. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

A pleasing, wholesome tale of country life. Old Jesse Crump, who hoarded his savings, is well drawn; and the thief's end is dramatic. George Broome marries happily.

Norwegian Pictures. With a map and 127 illustrations from sketches and photographs engraved by E. Whymper and others. By RICHARD LOVETT, M.A. Religious Tract Society.

Another volume of the "Pen and Pencil Series" (one of the most successful ventures of the time) will be heartily welcomed by numbers on every side. Swiss Pictures, Indian, Scottish, American, French, and so forth, not forgetting Dr. Macaulay's charming "Sea Pictures"—there is

no more attractive and enjoyable shelf in our library. "Norwegian Pictures" is worthy of its companions, and is just now very timely. Mr. Lovett has done the "pencil" and editorial portion of the work with skill and judgment. A bit of Sweden is happily given, and the volume is as usual admirably finished.

The Rover of the Andes. A Tale of adventure in South America. By R. M. BALLANTYNE. With Illustrations. J. Nisbet and Co.

We have sometimes wondered what has been the total circulation of Mr. Ballantyne's books for the young. He has written many—a very large number, indeed—and all of them, so far as we can judge, have been remarkably successful. The present writer, within the last fifteen years or so, has had the pleasure of reviewing "The Iron Horse." "Fighting the Flames," "Shifting Winds," "The Lighthouse," and many other excellent Tales; all of them good—*very* good; bright, sensible, wholesome, stirring; just what boys like, and withal what parents should be pleased to see boys like. In the present day, when to boys—and for the matter of that to girls—so many stories, easily obtained, are sadly mischievous, such books as Mr. Ballantyne's have a special value. We heartily welcome a new Tale by this esteemed and able writer; the scenes, as usual, are cleverly drawn. There is a good description of a storm in the Andes, and of an earthquake; adventures in hunting, and among the Indians, also, are attractive.

The Life of Jesus Christ the Saviour retold from the Evangelists. By Mrs. S. WATSON. With Maps and Illustrations. Pp. 450. The Religious Tract Society.

The aim of this volume, says the preface, "is to present the narrative of the four Gospels in a compact and consecutive form, with so much of illustrative detail and occasional comment as may make the earthly life of the Saviour a deeper reality to the reader." Again, "Faithful narration is the purpose of the work." The purpose has been well carried out. We are much pleased with the book, and think it likely to do good service. Sunday School and Bible Class Teachers, and other thoughtful and devout young men and women, who wish to study a "Life of Jesus Christ," and are not able to use Farrar, Edersheim, and Geikie, will find Mrs. Watson's work—which embodies the results of researches of these and other eminent authors—very interesting and really helpful.

The book is admirably printed in clear, large type, and has several illustrations and maps.

Three Martyrs of the Nineteenth Century. Studies from the Lives of Livingstone, Gordon, and Patteson. By the author of "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." S.P.C.K.

A welcome book; deeply interesting; worthy of the accomplished author. In heartily recommending it, as we do, it is hardly necessary to say more. But we may add that the book is beautifully printed in large type.

"*Tzeénah Ureéneh.*" *A Rabbinical Commentary on Genesis.* Translated from the Judæo-Polish, with Notes and Indices. By PAUL ISAAC HERSHON, author of "Treasures of the Talmud," etc., etc. With Introductory Preface by Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S Pp. 320. Hodder and Stoughton.

By his previous writings, says Canon Farrar, in the introductory preface to this curious book, Mr. Hershon "has placed within reach of English readers such a knowledge of Rabbinic literature as it would

previously have been impossible for them to acquire without long and laborious researches. . . . In the translation which he now lays before the reader, Mr. Hershon once more furnishes abundant methods of the singular methods of exegesis which prevailed for centuries in the schools of Tiberias, of Babylonia, and of mediæval Europe." *The Tzeênah Ureênah*, "Go ye and see," Cant. iii. 11, is a commentary on the Pentateuch for the use of Jewish families. It is said to be the work of Rabbi Jacob (Frankfort, 1693), and among the communities called Polish-Jews it has always been popular. Mr. Hershon's translation is made from a copy published at Wilna, in 1877, printed in the Judæo-Polish dialect. The work, it seems, can be easily purchased in London, where there are now many thousand Polish Jews. Mr. Hershon selected the Book of Genesis as a fair specimen of the whole.

Purity Treated Purely. A Sermon preached at the Foundling Hospital, Sunday Morning, August 23rd, 1885. By the Rev. C. LLOYD ENGSTRÖM, M.A., Rector of St. Mildred's, Bread Street, and St. Margaret, Moses, and Barnard Hyde, Lecturer of the Salters' Company. Rivingtons.

A vigorous and valuable discourse. We regret that we cannot give any extracts.

Unbeaten Tracks in Japan. An Account of Travels in the Interior, including visits to the Aborigines of Yezo and the Shrine of Nikko. By ISABELLA L. BIRD, Author of "Six Months in the Sandwich Islands," "A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains," etc., etc. New edition, abridged. John Murray.

This charming work was reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN as soon as it appeared. We are pleased to welcome a new, a cheaper edition, and to recommend it heartily. The record of long journeys in Japan on "unbeaten tracks," has an interest and value of its own. One of the best books of travel (written with singular skill), it will bear reading a second time.

Who was Philip? A Tale of Public School Life. By the Rev. H. C. ADAMS, M.A., Author of "The Mystery of Beechey Grange," "Schoolboy Honour," etc. Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh.

Mr. Adams is so well known, and so much valued, as a writer of Tales for Public School Boys, that we need say very little in commending this story. The conversations and the cricketing sketches are, as usual, inimitable. The volume is tastefully got up and has eight illustrations.

The first Article in the new *Quarterly Review* is on the "Revised Version of the Old Testament," and an able, vigorous, and interesting article—of the kind which everybody anticipated—it surely is. "The Predecessors of Shakespeare," "Taxes and Taxation," "Taine on Jacobinism," "England and Egypt in the Soudan," are other ably-written articles. "Our duty to South Africa" is excellent. Owing to the pressure on our space we are unable to give, as usual, two or three extracts from the *Quarterly*. But for one passage from the article on "The Coming Elections" space must be found. Lord Salisbury has "warned us, in language which cannot "fail to produce a powerful and lasting effect upon the country, against "the insidious attempts of Mr. Morley and others to banish all religious "influences from the education of the young. Mr. Chamberlain's scheme "of 'Free Education' would add so immensely to the local rates, that "the public could not and would not support the burden, and the demand

"for relief would soon become irresistible. This contingency has, of "course, been foreseen by Mr. Chamberlain and his friends, and it falls "in well with their plans. Their anticipation is, that the new require- "ments created by the additional cost of education to the State, would "have to be provided for out of Church property, and that in this way a "plausible pretext would be given for confiscation. Religious education, "and voluntary and denominational schools, are all to be thrown aside. "We are, as a nation, to repudiate Christianity. The design is at once "bold and crafty, but we cannot believe that it will succeed. It was most "necessary and most desirable that at such a moment as this, the people "should receive the most emphatic assurance, that the Conservative Party "will have no share in this evil work; that it will stand resolutely by the "'principles of Christianity,' which Englishmen were once ready to die "for, much as they are now decried and defamed by Radical pedants and "adventurers. The Church, as part of the body which represents these "principles, will be defended to the last. 'It is,' said Lord Salisbury, 'a "matter of life and death to us.' He will have no vacillation and no "compromise: the 'two voices' of Mr. Gladstone's manifesto are put to "silence, and we hope to shame. It is at once the duty and the privilege "of the Conservative Party to support that 'sacred institution' which "'has held up the torch of truth, and has maintained the truths of "Christianity before the world.'"

From Messrs. R. Bentley and Son (New Burlington Street) we have received copies of the new, complete, edition of Jane Austen's works: *Pride and Prejudice*, *Northanger Abbey* (with *Persuasion*), *Sense and Sensibility*, *Emma*, *Mansfield Park*, and *Lady Susan*, with a Memoir by Miss Austen's nephew. The six volumes, well got-up, and printed in clear type, are "handy" and cheap.

Gwendoline, by Miss GIBERNE (R.T.S.), is a well-written story, pleasing, and suggestive withal. Lady Halcot is drawn with skill, and so is Gwendoline, who in the end is happily married. The volume is tastefully "got up," and is a really good gift-book.

Many readers will be pleased with a simple and suggestive little volume, *Bible Flowers and Flower Lore* (Hodder and Stoughton). It has thirty chapters; the balsam, myrtle, aloe, rose, etc., etc. As to the "Rose of Sharon," the author, following Canon Tristram, says it must be the sweet-scented Narcissus.

One question not seldom occurs to a Reviewer—How much shall I quote from this book? "*This*," of course, means that the book is really good, with graphic descriptions, and so forth. A friendly pencil has marked several passages in one of that class of Missionary works which for the present writer has peculiar attractions, *In Southern India:* "a visit to some of the chief Mission Stations in the Madras Presidency." Limits of space, however, are rigid, and practically unsqueezable, and quotations, at all events in our present notice, cannot be made. We must content ourselves with assuring our readers that they will find *In Southern India*, by Mrs. MURRAY MITCHELL, author of "A Missionary's Wife Among the Wild Tribes of South Bengal," not only readable, but highly informing. "Madras; Female Work;" "Dindigal, its Medical Mission;" "Tinnevelly—Palamcotta;" "Cottayam, its Missions; the Syrian Christians of Malabar;" "Cochin, its White and Black Jews," are some of its Chapters. The book, well printed, has a map and has many illustrations.

We have pleasure in recommending a very readable story by ELLA STONE, published by Messrs. Nisbet, *Grace Murray*. The character and life of the heroine are admirably portrayed. The doctor did not "propose" to Grace, but to Nellie. It is a touching scene—years afterwards, Grace promising the dying father, a widower, that his children should receive from her a mother's love and care. The religious tone of the tale is excellent.

Short Biographies for the People. Vol II. is like Vol. I., very good. The new biographical series of the Religious Tract Society has more than once been commended in these pages.

The Annual volumes of the *Boy's Own Paper* and the *Girl's Own Paper* are as attractive and interesting as usual. Wonderfully cheap. The monthly numbers have been several times noticed in these pages.

**** Several notices of new books are unavoidably deferred.*

THE MONTH.

THE TWENTY-FIFTH CHURCH CONGRESS was held at Portsmouth; and some of those who took part in the proceedings—representative men, well qualified to express an opinion on the point—observe that the Congress of 1885 will favourably compare with not a few of its predecessors. An esteemed correspondent writes to us: "There was a very good tone at this Congress—no friction, the most perfect temper; and I am sure it will do good. As to numbers, it was rather a disappointment; the elections were an adverse influence." The absence of influential laymen is probably to be accounted for upon political grounds. "Church and State" was naturally the key-note of the sermons and the most striking speeches.

On Monday evening at an enthusiastic assemblage of the C.E.T.S., in the Congress Hall, Bishop Wilberforce presiding, Canon Ellison, the founder of the Society, stated that the members now number 650,000, while there are branches for women, agricultural labourers, soldiers, merchant seamen, etc.; and that, by the co-operation of the Missions for Seamen Society, 24,000 pledges had been taken among the sailors. Alluding to the immense help that the Society had experienced in the grand organization of the Church of England, he wound up, amidst enthusiastic cheers, by saying that he believed the work of the C.E.T.S. would teach a large majority of our countrymen to write after the word "Disestablishment" "NEVER."

The Congress sermons on Tuesday morning were preached by the Bishops of Carlisle, Derry, and Ripon. The Bishop of

Carlisle, in the parish church, taking for his text, "Watchman, what of the night? . . ." thus concluded:

Who is sufficient for these things? For these things! Nay, I have but touched the tithe of that which has to be done in this dear old England, which with all its faults we still love with the dearest affection of true children's hearts. Who is sufficient? Well, Christian brethren, no person, or party, or organization, or Church is sufficient to do these things; but of this I am certain, that the Church of England can do more than any other existing instrumentality to carry forward the whole work of God and His Christ. I believe she is doing more; and while doing it she does not interfere with others, who are trying to do the work in their own way; she raises no voice in favour of crippling other religious bodies; her churches are open to all without exception; her ministers minister to all who are willing to accept their ministry; the very principle of her life and operation is that of pure, simple, unbounded charity. I cannot believe that Englishmen will allow their Church to be thrown down. The day must be coming as well as the night. The light which has shone hitherto cannot be doomed to diminution: extinction is impossible, for it is the light of Christ. O ye statesmen, O ye members of Parliament, O ye old voters and ye newly enfranchised millions, put aside all party feelings as concerns this great question! make up your minds that the Church of your fathers shall be the Church of your children! purge her that she may bring forth more fruit! strengthen her where she needs strengthening! supply what is wanted! renew that which is decaying! but do not give her over to her enemies, do not cripple her usefulness, do not combine to lay her in the dust.

A very pleasing incident formed a prelude to the opening of the Congress. As soon as the President (the venerable Bishop of Winchester) had reached the platform the Mayor and Corporation, in their full-dress robes, were introduced, and the Mayor, who is himself a Nonconformist, in a few well-chosen sentences, offered to the Congress, in the name of the Corporation, a hearty welcome to Portsmouth. He cordially acknowledged the great and successful work of the Church of England, and assured the Bishop of the sincere prayers of himself and co-religionists for the success of the Congress. The Bishop thanked the Mayor in the name of the Congress for the hearty welcome accorded them. Upon the retirement of the Corporation, Mr. Griffin, J.P., appeared on the platform leading a goodly body of Nonconformists, and read an address, conceived in a truly catholic spirit, and expressed in language of Christian generosity.

In his opening address the President spoke of the various subjects to be debated, and of the Congress itself:

This is an era in its history [said the Bishop]. It has lived and worked for just a quarter of a century. Five-and-twenty years ago it was a new and doubtful experiment. It has steadily won its way. It has held its annual sittings in every part of England, once in Ireland, and once in Wales. It shows no signs of decadence, as it grows in age. This is a proof that it has met a want, and in part has satisfied it.

My right rev. brother, who presided last year at the Carlisle Congress, referred to the revival of Convocation some years earlier, in

1852, and to the feeling which then grew up in favour of consultation with laymen as supplementary to the reanimated councils of the clergy. I am the only living Bishop, I am one of but three or four of the clergy now living, who sat and took part in that Convocation of 1852, after its voice had been silent for some century and a quarter. I can well say that we who then met together in but small numbers at the Jerusalem Chamber, rejoiced with trembling. Parliament was hostile to us; public opinion was unfavourable to us; Church and even clerical opinion was divided concerning us. By the year 1860, however, Convocation had, newly established its constitutional right to meet and to debate. Still there was an anxious questioning whether there ought not to be a lay element either in Convocation itself or outside of Convocation, but able to take common counsel with it. Difficulties of many kinds were in the way, and perhaps happily in the way. It is due to the zeal and energy of two clergymen, both at that time Fellows of Colleges at Cambridge—one of whom has (alas for us!) passed to his rest, the other with us still, thank God—that this expedient of a Church Congress was devised and tried.[1] It met first at Cambridge in the Hall of King's College. The numbers were small. The College Hall could have held twice as many. The Bishop of the Diocese was too old and feeble to preside. The Archdeacon of Ely represented him. There was no member of the Home Episcopate with us. My old and revered tutor at Eton, Bishop Chapman, formerly Bishop of Colombo, was the only representative of the then living Bishops. But the meeting was a success; so much of a success that it was resolved to repeat it the next year at Oxford. Bishop Wilberforce gave it his presence and countenance, and it has ever since gone on growing and advancing.

The first subject handled in the Congress Hall was the Revised Version of the Old Testament. Papers were read by the Bishop of Bath and Wells and Dr. Driver; Professor Kirkpatrick, Dr. Wright, and others spoke.

The opening paper on "Church Work among Men" was read by Rev. George Everard. The Hon. J. G. Adderley spoke of Working Men's Clubs in the East-end.

At the meeting on the Prayer Book, a very practical paper was read by Canon Venables, Vicar of Great Yarmouth, whose contribution to THE CHURCHMAN on this subject some of our readers may remember ("Liturgical Improvements," CHURCHMAN, vol. vii., p. 194). As to rearrangement of existing Services, said Canon Venables, no great change was needed; the chief one was a shortening of the Baptismal Office, so that it might always take place in the service. But there should be a liberal interpretation of the rubrics. He thought that a few additions and varieties to some existing Offices were needed. He submitted, thirdly, that the enrichment of the Book of Common Prayer is required. Among the needs he specified a third Sunday service, a hearty office for the institution of an

[1] The Rev. W. Beaumont was one of the founders. A presentation was made, by Bishop Harold Browne, to the other founder, Archdeacon Emery, to whose energy, tact, ability, and generous sympathies, the success of the Congress is so greatly due.

Incumbent, and a catechism of leading events from the Day of Pentecost. He said: "I believe great benefits would be secured if under episcopal authority such services were permitted as would be little more than such as many pious Dissenters are accustomed to hold within their own houses of meeting, much though I dislike them." Another paper was read by the Rev. A. J. Robinson, Rector of Whitechapel.

The Working Men's Meeting was a great success. There was a most attentive audience; and the necessary overflow meeting was large. After the singing of the Old Hundredth and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer, a telegram was read by Archdeacon Emery from the Leicester Congress of Railway Servants, calling upon the Church Congress Meeting of Working Men to join them in resisting any further encroachments on the day of rest. The Bishop of Winchester, who presided, began by putting this request to the vote, and it was agreed by acclamation to accede to it. The Bishop of Carlisle, as usual, made a very effective speech. His Lordship's points in regard to the Church as the Church of the people were heartily applauded. The Dean of Gloucester, also, referred to the Disestablishment agitation, and, although there was evidently a good sprinkling of Liberationists present, the great bulk of the meeting cheered to the echo all references to the good work the Church has done for the people and the loss the poor would suffer if Disestablishment became an accomplished fact.

The subject of Emigration was worthily debated. The Bishop of Newcastle, who presided, read the first paper. The Bishop repeated the United States oath of naturalization, in which stress is particularly laid upon abjuring Queen Victoria, "of whom I was formerly subject," and expressed a wish that the tide of emigration should be as much as possible directed to our own colonies. The Hon. Mrs. Joyce, in an admirable paper, said, according to Mr. Samuel Smith, if our population went on increasing at its present rate it would be 150,000,000 by the close of the century. A practical paper by the Rev. J. F. Kitto, who was away in Canada studying this question on the spot, was read. Mr. Kitto was not aware of any case in which the Church of England had taken the oversight of a new colony, but on this point Captain Field, in the discussion, referred to the establishment of the Canterbury colony in New Zealand, in which an original shareholder having kept his share, found the £25 share now worth £24,000, The Rev. J. Bridger, the indefatigable Emigration Chaplain, mentioned the thriving condition of the nineteen families sent from the Rev. H. Huleatt's Bethnal Green Parish at the expense of the Baroness Burdett Coutts. Having secured the Sherbrooke Home, he was going to take out the last of his first

batch of girls. He was trying to get a home for boys. He proposed that each English diocese should raise £5,000 to be employed in loans in kind to emigrants, and to found each a settlement to be named after the diocese. The Rev. H. C. Marriott Watson, from New Zealand, as one born abroad, was struck with the depression of London, and explained that their periods of depression were due to functional derangement, whilst in England they seemed due to organic causes. The New Zealand labourer's Magna Charta was:

Eight hours' work, and eight hours' play,
Eight hours' sleep, and eight bob a day.

"The Teaching Work of the Church" attracted a large assemblage. Canon Westcott was enthusiastically welcomed, and his paper, of course, was rich and emphatic.

Among the many subjects discussed by the Congress, writes the *Record* correspondent, none has excited so much real enthusiasm and drawn together so large an assembly of members as the question of Church Defence.[1] The Bishop of Winchester, at the opening, remarked that the subject was not a political one; and he hoped it would not be treated in a

[1] An important Conference of members was held on the platform at the close of the Thursday afternoon sitting. Some 200 leading and influential gentlemen, both clerical and lay, remained behind to discuss what plan of action should be adopted in defence of the Church from the danger with which she is threatened. Mr. Beresford Hope remarked that Church Defence was a very pressing duty just now. Archdeacon Emery, who had convened the Conference, spoke of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals for free education as a conspiracy against the National Church. All present were thoroughly with him in this, and, indeed, the meeting throughout was of a most enthusiastic character. He declared that it was the absolute duty of Churchmen at this crisis to take steps at once to let it be known how tremendous was the danger threatening the Church, and to stir up the nation at large on the subject. In his own Archdeaconry, he said, a Vigilance Committee had been formed, and if every Archdeacon and Rural Dean, yea, every clergyman, were to take up the work vigorously, he said it would not be too late, even now, to ward off the attack. He pointed out that it was essential that they have some Society as a basis for their operations, and he recommended that it should be the Church Defence Institution. He moved: "That this meeting, recog-"nising the great work which is done by the Church Defence Institution "through its lectures and publications, commends it to the liberal and "immediate support of all Churchmen at this time." Bishop Macdougall, Archdeacon of the Isle of Wight, seconded the proposal. The Church had to her hand in her parochial system, he said, an organization which nothing could equal. Several members then made practical suggestions, and all agreed that if anything were to be done it must be done *at once*. It was encouraging to hear from the Rev. H. G. Dickson (writes the *Record* correspondent), the Secretary of the C.D.I., who was better capable of judging than most other men, that the country is already arising to the importance of this question, and he prophesied that if we only organized the matter at once we shall win all along the line.

political spirit. Some of those present were Liberals and some were Conservatives, while some of them were both Liberal and Conservative. They were Liberal in that they were desirous to remove all abuses, and Conservative in that they desired to retain and preserve all that was good. They might therefore be Liberals or Conservatives or both, but whatever political party they belonged to, he felt he might confidently say that before all things they were Churchmen—all Churchmen to the backbone. Mr. Moore (author of "The Englishman's Brief") and Mr. Beresford Hope read the Papers. Dr. Jessop and Prebendary Harry Jones were the selected speakers. Mr. Dale Hart, the Rev. Henry Roe, Canon McCormick, Mr. Bemrose (the well-known publisher), Archdeacon Emery, Canon Eliot, and Canon Hoare were called upon to speak.

On rising to deliver what must justly be termed a noble speech, writes the *Record* correspondent, Dr. McCormick was enthusiastically received by the Congress. He spoke of the work of the Church concerning philanthropy, and in connection with this mentioned the work of the lamented Earl of Shaftesbury as that of a Churchman and a peer of the realm. Need I add that the mention of that revered name was the signal for loud applause in all parts of the hall. "Lord Shaftesbury," Canon McCormick added, "is the answer to the calumnies that are cast against the upper classes." He warned the meeting not to unduly magnify the fact that the Church is the Church of the poor, for it is the Church of all classes alike, and he charged the Liberationist Society with widening the breach that existed between Churchmen and their Dissenting brethren.

At the Soldiers' and Sailors' Meeting, the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, Headmaster of Harrow, said that, after the last Congress, one of the Secularist papers dubbed him "a conceited young beetle":

He pathetically recounted the losses Harrow had suffered in old Harrovians; amongst whom, tablets to General Earle, Lord St. Vincent, and Colonel Burnaby were in the Harrow Chapel. He further told them the masters and lads had raised enough in the school to nominate one boy to the Gordon Camp, and he that day had attended the funeral service of Lord Shaftesbury, who was an old Harrovian, and in whose funeral procession was a detachment from the Shaftesbury training ship. If there was one name of which a public school might be proud, it was that name.

At a special meeting for Working Women, Bishop Wilberforce, Canon Venables, the Rev. A. J. Robinson, and others, made appropriate speeches.

Among all the weary and anxious news which comes from Ireland, the following paragraph will give widespread pleasure and satisfaction:

The Lord-Lieutenant has addressed a letter to Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, in which he states that he has thought it right to

obtain for his information and guidance the opinions of the Law Officers of the Crown on the subject of the legality of the title "Church of Ireland." They are of opinion that this matter has "been practically settled by the Legislature, and that the title of the distablished Church in Ireland is 'the Church of Ireland.'"

The Archbishop of Canterbury has put forth three Forms of Prayer in reference to the approaching General Election. One of them, which may be used in Divine Service, is the prayer for the High Court of Parliament, with slight alterations.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, at Salisbury, counselled electors to require from candidates a distinct pledge upon two questions — the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church, and the maintenance of the hereditary principle in the House of Lords.

In an article headed "The Radical Programme," the *Spectator* says:

We cannot approve or support the methods by which the Radical chiefs seem determined to seek their beneficial ends. They seem to us to be wandering out of the path of Liberal tradition by keeping to which we have advanced so far, and to be plunging into that Socialist wilderness within which wild beasts crouch.

The scent of bribery is in it [*i.e.*, the Programme]. We hold it to be a frightful misfortune—a misfortune which may demoralize a generation —that, just when the Democracy has been enthroned, Liberal leaders should go before it and offer direct pecuniary inducements in return for power. Instead of asking the new voters for sacrifices, instead of bringing home to them responsibilities, instead of even offering them cautions, Radical speakers say: "Give us but power, and you shall all be happy. Your children's school-fees shall be paid for you. You shall have stores to cheapen groceries in every village. You shall have the land you want at less than the market price. You shall, through the Councils, be your own landlord, and you shall be as well housed as your betters, yet pay the rent you pay already." Mr. Chamberlain actually declared on Wednesday that he thought it possible to make poverty cease out of the land; and he never makes a speech which has not for its real drift that whatever happens, and whoever suffers, the poor, that vast corporation to which every one who works with his hands claims to belong, shall be made comfortable at last. What is that but bribery?

At the Peterborough Diocesan Conference a masterly paper on the question of the day was read by the Bishop. It will, no doubt, be largely circulated.

At Monmouth, the Premier gave an answer to the Midlothian Manifesto. Lord Salisbury spoke with effect upon the Land Question, Local Government, Religious Education, and the National Church. He suggested the sale of glebe lands, we gladly note (a permission we have long pleaded for), a method of increasing the number of labourers' allotments which, as the *Guardian* remarks, "is, at any rate, more practicable than Mr. Chamberlain's plan." On the National Church he said:

You have read, no doubt, what I call that long and dreary epistle from

the retirement of the late Prime Minister. You have seen how, amid other things, he has consigned to the category of doubtful matters which depend upon the majority of voices, his convictions and his course in reference to the Established Church of these islands. It is his last surrender, it is the last of the opinions of his youth that he has given up, that he has sacrificed upon the altar of party. ("Shame!") I could have wished that this crowning abandonment of the convictions of his youth had been spared to us. I confess I never believed that I should see Mr. Gladstone among those who would attempt to disestablish and disendow the Church of these islands. It means that the time of ultimate and supreme conflict is at hand—that the danger which we have foreseen for many days is now close at our doors.

In an able article on Lord Salisbury's Newport speech, the *Guardian* says it will reassure Conservatives and attract Moderate Liberals. The *Guardian* proceeds: "Lord Salisbury is in possession. If a Moderate Liberal helps to turn him out of office, in whose favour and for whose benefit will he be working? Nominally, and for the moment, in favour and for the benefit of Mr. Gladstone. Really, and after a short, possibly a very short interval, in favour and for the benefit of Mr. Chamberlain. The vote of a Moderate Liberal, then, should be determined by this consideration. In the last resort, and assuming the choice to lie between the two, does Mr. Chamberlain's programme embody my conviction and wishes better than Lord Salisbury's programme?"

THE INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND IN THE MAINTENANCE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AS A NATIONAL CHURCH.

THE following paper was read at the Peterborough Diocesan Conference, October 15th, by the Very Rev. J. J. S. Perowne, D.D., Dean of Peterborough:

MY LORD,

It is under a very deep sense of responsibility that I rise to open at your Lordship's desire the discussion on the subject which stands upon the paper, "The Interest of the People of England in the Maintenance of the Church of England as a National Church," and to move the Resolution of which I have given notice. Your Lordship reminded us yesterday that it would be well if those who use terms would be precise in the definition of their meaning. I am not responsible for the way in which this proposition has been framed which we are invited to discuss. But if it will help us to a clear conception of the subject, I will venture to say that I understand by the National Church, not the Church of the Reformation only, nor the Church of Augustine only, but that Church which, owing its existence to the earliest Christian missionaries who set foot on our shores, has ever since been part of our national history, entwined with all our institutions, more ancient than some that are most venerable, older by some hundreds of years than the House of Commons itself, which is now asked to get rid of it as a useless and even pestilent excrescence on the national life. By the maintenance of that Church I

mean the maintenance of it in its integrity as an essential portion of the constitution. I do not mean the maintenance of the abuses. There are abuses which I think every honest and loyal Churchman must deplore, and the reform of which ought not to be delayed. Depend upon it, if we do not show that we are alive to these abuses, and determined to put an end to them, they will very speedily put an end to us. We must not live in a dreamland, and flatter ourselves on the perfection of our own system, and think that all are enemies who presume to probe our wounds and sores. "The best friends of religion," says an eminent Nonconformist minister in London, Mr. Statham, "are those who see that the Church needs reform, and not disestablishment, and who realize that in her service there might be a glorious sphere for the permanent preservation of the Christian faith in an orderly and beautiful service, which would preserve alike the verities of the Christian faith and the sanctities of spiritual and social life."

By the people of England I understand not one section of the community, nor the new electorate of which we hear so much, nor those who are commonly described as "the masses"—meaning thereby our working population—but all classes of the nation, and, I will add, all members of other Churches and denominations, for I believe that all classes and all Churches have an interest in the maintenance of the National Church, as the one great conspicuous witness against ungodliness and vice, against the immorality and the scepticism, the wide-spread existence of which we all confess and all alike deplore.

So much, my Lord, by way of definition. And now I venture to say that this subject is one the importance of which at the present moment can hardly be exaggerated. It is one which we must face, whether we like it or not. We cannot be blind to the signs of the times. "Watchman, what of the night?" The Watchman said, "The night cometh, and also the morning; if ye will inquire, inquire ye." And we are driven to inquire. We cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that the tendency is all in one direction. There is a levelling tendency—a tendency to get rid of everything which wears even the semblance of privilege. Not only in our own country, but in other countries, we see a gradual but very marked progress of opinion in this respect. The wave may recede here and there for a time, but each returning tide leaves its mark higher up on the shore. All institutions are on their trial, and the Church cannot expect to escape. A little while ago we should have flattered ourselves that the question had been laid to rest. In spite of the persistent efforts of the Liberation Society, as by a grim irony it styles itself, the force of the agitation seemed spent; the subject, we were told on high authority, was not one which came within the sphere of practical politics; but this is so no longer. There is a spirit abroad which must be dealt with. In the minds of religious men it takes the form of a conviction that any and every connection between the Church and the State is wrong; and in the minds of irreligious men it takes the form of a determination to destroy that which gives to religion its chief support.

What is the language we hear from the other side of the Channel? Perhaps we may extract a little comfort from it. An eloquent and learned French Protestant divine, who is also an ardent Liberationist (M. de Pressensé, writes: "The question of the separation of Church and State has come to the front throughout the whole of this electoral campaign. It is one of the burning questions of the day, and its solution cannot be long delayed. Yet, judging from the general tenor of the electoral programme of the moderate Republican party, I conclude that immediate legislation on the subject is not to be looked for. The deputies have evidently felt that the country was not yet ready for so great a change, and that it would be dangerous to press it. The imprudence with which

the Radicals in their electoral assemblies have urged the immediate suppression of the budget of worship without any measures of transition or compensation, and with the further prospect of the confiscation of the entire property of the Church, by whatever tenure it is held, has done not a little to incline moderate Republicans to the side of patience." And he quotes the words of M. Goblet, the minister of worship in France, who, avowing his wish to see the Church separated from the State, nevertheless proposes to secure to it its churches and manses, and the offerings made for the purpose of religious worship. There we see something of a reaction, something of that large and liberal measure dealt out to the Disestablished Church, with which we on this side of the Channel have been bidden to comfort ourselves.

But whatever may be the case in France, we cannot say that there is the same disposition here. Candidates at the coming election in November have not made up their minds that "the country is not yet ready for so great a change, and that it would be dangerous to press it." Four hundred candidates have taken up the political watchword of the Liberationists, and some, at least, of them are quite prepared to deal with the subject in the next Session of Parliament. We are within measurable distance of the struggle. And what may well excite, I will not say our alarm, but our watchfulness, is this: that statesmen to whom we might once have looked for support, are now wavering and ready to desert us.

We are all familiar with the mournful spectacle which was presented to us a few years ago as the outcome of Disestablishment. It was the tragic and harrowing picture of "a bleeding and lacerated mass." But now the oil of consolation is poured into those terrible and gaping wounds, and we are invited to console ourselves with the assurance that, whatever may happen, there is such "vitality" in the National Church that it "will be found equal to all the needs of the occasion." Disestablishment will no longer leave behind it "a bleeding and lacerated mass;" it will only be "a great modification of our inherited institutions."

I think it very important to draw attention to the changed attitude of many of our leading statesmen.

What was the language of Mr. Gladstone in May, 1870, in reply to the Resolution brought forward by Mr. Watkin Williams, the then Member for Denbigh, in favour of Disestablishment in Wales? After observing that "the real question which the mover of the resolution endeavoured to raise was the Disestablishment of the Church of England," he said:

> I am bound to say my belief is that the Established Church of England is the religion of a considerable majority of the people of this country. I can only say that, independent of that which appears to establish a good *primâ facie* ground for remaining where we are, I do not envy my hon. and learned friend, or my hon. friend the Member for Merthyr Tydvil (Mr. Richard), or any other man who ventures to take in hand the business of disestablishing the Church of England. Even if it were as fit to be done as I think it unfit, there is a difficulty in the case before which the boldest man would recoil. It is all very well so long as we deal with abstract declarations put upon the notice-paper of this House of what should be done or ought to be done; but only go up to the walls and gates and look at the way in which stone is built upon stone, on the way in which the foundations have been dug, and the way they go down into the earth, and consider by what tools, what artillery, you can bring that fabric to the ground. I know the difficulties, and I am not prepared in any shape or form to encourage—by dealing with my hon. and learned friend's motion in any way except the simple mode of negative—the creation of expectation which *it would be most guilty, most unworthy, and most dishonourable on our part to entertain*, lest we should convey a virtual pledge. *We cannot go in that direction; we do not intend to do so; we deprecate it, and would regard it as a national mischief.*

That was the language of Mr. Gladstone in 1870. What is it in 1885?

We are merely encouraged to hope that Disestablishment is in the courses of the distant future, not in the immediate future; that whenever it takes place it will be done because the people wish it, and that it will be effected with a large observance of the principles of equity and liberality. Not one word is there to imply that it would be an act of shameful wrong. Events we know move quickly. Changes are made by leaps and bounds. Opinions which are only opinions, and not principles, go down like corn before the sickle, though they may have been expressed with a vigour which gave them some show of consistency. Saddest of all, political expediency seems in the case of some of our most eminent statesmen to have taken the place of principle. Each politician sets his sail to catch the *popularis aura*, and never considers on what rocks or quicksands the vessel of the State will be driven. And so one politician—a man of whom we might have hoped better things—tells the people of Scotland that it is for them to settle the question for themselves; and another and a more eminent statesman, whose strong attachment to the Church of England was once the very foundation of his political creed, has told the people of England that this is a question which they must settle for themselves. I have heard, my Lord, of following a multitude to do evil; I never heard of following a multitude to do good, though I can quite conceive it possible that you may *lead* a multitude to do good. Of course this is a question which will be settled by a Parliamentary majority! What are we to think of statesmen who deal in this easy fashion with one of the gravest of all problems—with a problem which affects the deepest interests of the nation, because it touches the very core of the religious life of the nation. What are we to think of statesmen who on such a question as this have no convictions—who treat it simply as a question of the hour; with whom the first and last article of their political creed is *Vox populi, vox Dei;* who, instead of leading, are willing to be led; who have not the courage to say, "This is a wrong; and therefore, if it is to be done, it shall be done by other hands, and not by ours;" but are willing to do anything at the dictation of a majority—it may be a very blind and a very ignorant majority? Happily we have listened within the last few days to very different language. We may differ much in our political creed, but I think we shall agree in this.

You will stop me, my Lord, if you think I am becoming too political, but I am speaking from a Church point of view, and not from the point of view of a political party. I cannot help it if one political party chooses to write upon its banner, *Delenda est Ecclesia;* if it so happens that the leaders of one political party are pledged to uphold the National Church, whilst the leaders of another are either avowedly hostile or avowedly indifferent. I think we are bound, as you told us yesterday, my Lord, to be Churchmen first and politicians afterwards; and one statesman has told us in language worthy of himself and of the great position which he occupies that he and those who follow him "can hold no ambiguous language" on this question; that to them "it is a matter of life and death; that they can admit on these matters no compromise, no hope that they will support any proposal for the overthrow or for the injury of that which they hold dear;" that the support of that "sacred institution," the Church ("its support by ancient endowments and by the recognition of the authority of the State") which now for generation after generation in Scotland and in England has held up the power of truth, and has maintained the truths of Christianity before the world—to that," not only "as a party," but as honest men and as Christians, they are irrevocably bound." There is the true ring in words like these. And I hope and believe that, whatever may be our political creed, we shall feel that the National Church, which in the hand of God has been the greatest instrument of blessing to this nation—to all classes of the

nation—and I will add to all the various religious bodies which lie outside of her pale, ought not to be sacrificed on the altar of expediency at the bidding of popular clamour. My Lord, I could not plead for the Church if I did not feel that in pleading for the Church I am pleading for the nation. But it is my deepest conviction that to do away with the National Church would be to inflict a terrible blow on the religious life, and therefore also on the prosperity and welfare of the nation. I am glad, therefore, that the subject which has been brought before us for our discussion has been proposed in this *positive* form, and that we are invited to consider "the interest which the people of England have in the maintenance of the National Church."

And, first of all, they have an interest in its maintenance—because it is the National Church, because it has struck its roots deep into the national life, and is entwined with all its history. I shall be told this is an appeal to sentiment; but there are sentiments which are not weak or visionary, but which are sacred and enduring. The sentiment of national unity, the sentiment of family life, are among the most powerful of human motives. I am sorry for the man who cannot appreciate the force of such sentiments; and for those, at least, who have grown up under the shadow of the Church, who have found her consecrating all their life, and who have sucked the breast of her consolations—to them, the church of their forefathers is something more than a sentiment; it is a sacred and ennobling passion.

There was a time when, in the midst of the throes of the French Revolution, that great orator, philosopher, and statesman, Edmund Burke, could write:

> The majority of the English people, far from thinking a religious national Establishment unlawful, hardly think it lawful to be without one. . . This principle runs through the whole system of their polity. They do not consider their church establishment as convenient, but as essential to their State; not as a thing heterogeneous and separable; something added for accommodation; what they may either keep or lay aside according to their temporary ideas of convenience. They consider it as the foundation of their whole constitution, with which, and with every part of which it holds an indissoluble union. Church and State are ideas inseparable in their minds, and scarcely is the one ever mentioned without mentioning the other. ("Reflections on Revolution in France," Works, vol. iv., pp. 231, 232.)

But besides this we have, in a National Church, a national recognition of God. Is that also a visionary conception? Mr. Henry Richard, in his address to the Congregational Union, in October, 1877, said: "I do not wish to treat this idea with ridicule or scorn. There are many good men who cherish it with great sincerity, and there can be no doubt that in some shadowy indefinable way it appeals strongly to their religious sentiments and feelings. But if they were asked to analyze or define with any precision the vague language in which they were wont to express their convictions on this subject, I believe they would be very much puzzled." Yes, and I dare say we should most of us be a good deal puzzled if we were asked to define with any precision what we mean by the sentiment of loyalty, or the sentiment of patriotism, or the sentiment of the family; and yet these are some of the strongest of human sentiments, and men have cheerfully given their hearts' blood rather than deny these sentiments.

But in the next place I plead for the National Church—not only as a great ideal, but as doing a great work in the midst of the nation, and such as no other religious body has done or can do; and that she is doing this by virtue of her union with the State. The people have an interest in the Church because it is the greatest instrument for the evangelization of the multitude, and especially of the poor.

We have lately been reminded very frequently of the condition in which our rural parishes would be left by the Act of Disestablishment. Let us try to look calmly at the facts. What is the state of things at present? The clergyman is often the only resident gentleman in the parish. This is far more commonly the case than it once was. In very many instances there is no resident squire; in others the country gentleman does not reside on his estate, or comes down only for the shooting season. The clergyman then is the centre of benevolence and the centre of civilization; he is the one person to whom the poor can look, to whom they have a right to look, and to whom they do look for assistance. Does a labourer wish to send his child to service or to find him employment? He goes to the clergyman. Does he want to write a letter to a son or daughter who is gone to the Colonies or to America? He is no "scholard," and he asks the clergyman to write it. Does he want assistance in sickness? It is at the Parsonage he finds the medicine and the port wine and the blankets which he needs, and which have often saved the lives of his wife and his children. Does he need advice in his temporal affairs? Who so sure to sympathise with him as his parson? Does he desire the ministrations of religion in spiritual distress or in the hour of death? There is one man whose duty it is to give him the instruction, and the warnings, and the consolations of our most holy faith. And we, many of us, hardly know how entirely a parish is dependent upon the clergyman in this respect. Even in parishes where there are Dissenting chapels the Nonconformist minister is often not resident: he only comes for the Sunday service, and he exercises no pastoral care even over his own congregation. Several instances have recently come under my own observation in which persons who have attended the chapel all their lives have sent for the clergyman in illness, because their own minister had refused or was unable to visit them. Indeed, it is a frequent complaint among Nonconformists that their village congregations are not ministered to, the whole strength of their efforts being concentrated on the towns where they naturally find most support. Nor must we forget, when we speak of the resident clergyman, that he is for the most part a family man; that he has a wife and perhaps daughters who help him in his labour of love. They know the history of every man, woman, and child in the parish, and feel the liveliest interest in all that concerns them. The clothing-clubs and the coal-clubs are their charitable work; they teach in the Sunday school; they visit in the homes; they are the friends of their poorer neighbours, never judging them harshly nor turning a deaf ear to their complaints. Who can calculate the mischief that would follow from the destruction of such a ministry of blessing? For it must be destroyed with the disestablishment of the Church. The Liberationist programme would either secularise the churches, or let rival sects scramble for their possession. The Parsonage, of course, would disappear; and, as the Bishop of Rochester said, "Paganism" would soon recover its ancient and sinister significance. The Church's work would have to be done from missionary centres of celibate clergy, who, if they could supply in some degree the public ministrations of the Church, would in no sense be the pastors of the people. The sick would be left to die without consolation; the poor and afflicted would no longer have the power of claiming or receiving the tender sympathy and personal instruction of their own authorised clergymen; the best and cheapest kind of police for the masses would be suddenly dismissed about their business, and it is no exaggeration to say that the entire country would suffer.

Nor is it only the rural districts which would be deprived of the means of grace. In large towns where unhappily a great separation of classes has taking place, where the gentry for the most part live on the outskirts,

and the poor and labouring population are massed together, in the great centres of labour (to quote again the Bishop of Rochester's words), such as Liverpool, or Leeds, or Leicester, or Bristol, the Church's framework would be utterly submerged; and just at the moment when she was beginning to overtake the neglect of a past generation, and was earning the gratitude of all good Christian souls by her sacrifices and her devotion, she would be struck down with paralysis." The Bishop then gives instances of what must happen in his own diocese if Disestablishment were to take place, and probably every other Bishop might adduce similar testimony. For it must be remembered that Disestablishment in the mouths of the liberationists means disendowment, means shameless robbery, and the confiscation of Church property to secular uses. No vestige of her ancient revenues is to be left. She must be turned out naked into the streets; she must start afresh despoiled of all, and rely exclusively on the voluntary contributions of her members to carry on the work which she finds it difficult enough to do now under her present more favourable circumstances. How will it be possible to meet the spiritual destitution or to mitigate the material wretchedness and poverty of our overgrown town populations? Do those who are banded together for the overthrow of the National Church, do the religious men among them ever reflect seriously on the consequences of the measure they advocate so earnestly? Do they consider that it means not the getting rid of a dominant church or the assertion of religious equality as they flatter themselves, but the very destruction of religion itself?

How absolutely Nonconformity fails to meet and provide for the spiritual destitution of the poorer part of the population in large towns has been strikingly illustrated of late. Mr. Spurgeon, in a sermon preached in 1861, said: "There is growing up even in our Dissenting churches, an evil which I greatly deplore—a despising of the poor. You know that in the city of London itself there is now scarce a Dissenting place of worship. The reason for giving most of them up, and moving into the suburbs, is that all the respectable people live out of town, and *of course they are the people to look after.* They will not stop in London, they will go out and take villas, and live in the suburbs, and therefore the best thing is to take the endowment which belonged to the old chapel and go and build a new chapel somewhere in the suburbs, where it may be maintained." "This witness," says Mr. Odom, a Sheffield clergyman, who quotes it, "is true, and applies to almost every large town." And he then proceeds to tell us that the fact that the Church of his own parish of 6,000 poor was once a Baptist chapel, led him to make inquiries, with the result that in a short time he had compiled a list of no fewer than 76 Dissenting chapels, not merely given up by their former owners, but purchased by Churchmen, and now used for Church purposes. He then mentions the sums that have been expended in rebuilding or adapting these chapels, and adds that nearly all are in very poor districts and that in nearly every case an active Church work is now carried on. And he quotes Bishop Lightfoot's remarks with regard to localities in the Diocese of Durham: "As the neighbourhood deteriorated, the congregation migrated to the more respectable localities, and the chapel was obliged to migrate also. The Church of England, therefore, stepped in and vindicated her proud title as the evangelist of the poorest." Who that have ever visited these densely populated parishes, inhabited only by the very poor, seen the noble work that the clergy are doing there—a perpetual example of self-sacrifice for the sake of Christ—who, I say, who have ever seen and sympathised with their work but must tremble lest any step should be taken which should have the effect of weakening their hands and making their hearts sore. Who can have the courage to increase their burden, making them weary and sad, and crippling their energies, and even destroy-

ing, it may be, their work, on the glaring false pleas that a Church in connection with the State is in hideous bondage, and cannot rightly fulfil her mission as a spiritual society. She, above all, is a ministering angel to the poor. She, above all, can say of her mission as her Master and Lord said of His own, "The poor have the Gospel preached to them."

There is one point above all on which we cannot insist too strongly We must take our choice between the parochial system and the congregational. The Church in every parish is not the Church of a congregation, it is the Church of the people; the clergyman in every parish is not the clergyman of the congregation, he is the clergyman of the people. This he is because he is the minister of the Church which has its privileges secured to it by the State, in order that they may be exercised for the benefit of the whole nation. It is for that reason, it is for the moral and spiritual and eternal welfare, and also for the temporal welfare of the nation, that the land has been parcelled out into parishes, in every one of which is resident at least one man whose business it is to see that religion is brought home to every household. All alike can claim his services; to all he is bound to offer the consolations of religion. It is no answer to this argument to say that there are clergymen who neglect their parishes. No system can ensure the fulfilment of their duties by its officers. But that system is surely best which makes the duty clear and peremptory, and therefore also makes the neglect of the duty more shameful. According to the very idea of the National Church, the sluggard and the drone is a marked man; he is a reproach to his Order; he is a deserter from the ranks. The State says to the Church, The whole population is yours, you are responsible for its well-being: go and fulfil your duty, and we will uphold you in the discharge of that duty: you are officers of the nation doing national work. And there is not a village, however secluded—there is not a hillside or woodland farm—there is not a solitary cottage—which cannot claim the services of the parish clergyman, or which he is not bound to visit. But now substitute for this the congregational system, and what then? The congregation becomes the unit instead of the nation, or the parish as representing the national idea. The persons forming the congregation will be the object of the pastor's solicitude. If he is a good man—if he is a zealous man—he may be possessed of the necessary spirit, and seek to carry evangelizing influences beyond his own immediate sphere; but, in the nature of things, this will not be common. The very persons who most need to be looked after, the reckless and the indifferent, the sheep that has strayed into the wilderness, will be left while the shepherd is devoting all his care and attention to the ninety-and-nine who have not left the fold. This view of the evil of Disestablishment has been well stated in the Report of the Sheffield Church of England Scripture Reader's Society:

"Take away," they say, "the parochial system, which stands or falls with the Established Church, and you wrest from the working man his right to claim that help of which we have spoken. Under these new conditions, unless he has formally attached himself to a particular denomination (we know too well how many thousands are not so attached), he could not claim special help in his hour of need. Before his confused mind would pass a number of Christian sects, each with their religious formula and each with their exclusiveness, but no national Church whose ministry he might claim by right of his sonship and her motherhood. A poor waif on the wide sea of humanity, he might drift on forgotten into the outer darkness, rescued by no chance hand from the passing ark of sectarianism, that had 'enough to do in minding their own affairs.' Now our readers can declare to the people that the Church is theirs; that they may claim her services and ministry whenever they desire. It will be an evil day for England's working men—and their eyes should be opened to this fact—when along with the Established Church this claim is overthrown."

I cannot but hope that, when the national conscience has been thoroughly aroused to a sense of the enormity of the guilt, the nation will refuse to perpetrate this flagrant wrong.

There is another reason why we may well shrink from any action which would weaken the National Church. She is the great bulwark of Protestantism in England. But take away her national position, reduce her to the level of the sects, and, however great might still be her influence, the Church of Rome would become something more than a very formidable rival. "He must be a purblind politician," says Sir William Harcourt, "who does not perceive that the residuary legatee of Disestablishment will undoubtedly be the Church of Rome." This is felt and acknowledged by Roman Catholics themselves. "The English Church," says a writer in the *Westminster Review*, "by its prestige and influence, and its perversion of the true idea of a spiritual power, stands in the way of the growth and expansion of the Catholic (he means the Roman) Church. If, moreover, Catholicism is ever to regain possession of the nation, *it must be over the ruins of the Anglican Establishment.*" This is no imaginary danger. It is perfectly certain that none of the Nonconformist bodies alone or united would be a match for the Church of Rome. The bond of a common dislike to Popery is frail and ineffectual. The Church of Rome has great traditions, a vast and powerful organization. No human society has ever equalled her in this respect. She can drill her legions into the most absolute and passive obedience. The least sign of mutiny, the least effort of self-will, is instantly crushed, or directed into a harmless channel. There is a solidity, there is a compactness, there is an intensity of movement which would carry all before it. And there can be very little doubt that, in the event of Disestablishment, the forces of the Church of Rome would be largely recruited from our own ranks. I do not, indeed, believe that the Church of England as a body would be prepared to surrender her independence. It is a highly over-wrought picture, which a leading Nonconformist minister in London has drawn of us in this respect. He is arguing against Disestablishment on this ground, that it would probably throw the Church of England into the arms of the Church of Rome, and he says:

"The great and grave question concerning Disestablishment is the fact that the nation would be setting free what would probably be a large sacerdotal Church, rich and powerful, narrow and exclusive, priestly and proud. [But suppose the Liberationist theory carried out, that the churches should be handed over to the parishes, and the highest bidders secure them for use, what a picture is presented, not only of sectarian conflict, but of secularist conflict in the matter of their disposal and of their use!] A liberated Church, too, would be a Church in bondage—yes, in the worst kind of bondage known to history. It would be shut out from all the life and progress of the age, and become a narrow ecclesiastical confederacy, bound hand and foot by canon law, and governed by ecclesiastical anti-common-sense. Then without assuming the *rôle* of a prophet, but only of a "possibilist" what is to hinder such Disestablished Church from an Eirenicon with the Church of Rome? Nothing! We have seen in Dr Pusey's Eirenicon how the *rapprochement* takes place, and I for one firmly believe that within fifty years, at the least, after Disestablishment one after another of the difficulties would be quietly removed, and the English Churches be again under the control and supreme sway of the Pontiff himself. Cardinal Newman's dream would then be realised."

I say I think this is an overwrought picture, but it is well to see ourselves as others see us. And I for one cannot look upon the dangers thus forcibly described as altogether imaginary, when the president of a large and compact society within our Church has quite recently expressed his desire for "a visible unity with the great Apostolic see of the West." I

do not, indeed, think, as I have already observed, that the Church as a body will ever be found longing for that union which is only another name for absolute submission. Union with Rome on any other terms is the idlest of all dreams. But that there would be a large defection from our own Church does not appear to me by any means improbable: and that the Church of England, even if she remained one Church, and were not rather broken into two or three; weakened by her severance from the State; no longer holding a position of National dignity; no longer able to make her voice heard with authority, would yield to the aggressive force of a Church possessing a most compact organisation, presenting always an unbroken front, and claiming to exercise an exclusively Divine authority.

These then are some of the grounds—I think, perhaps, the principal grounds—though I am well aware there are others on which I would rest the claims of the National Church, and argue that the people of England have an interest in the maintenance thereof.

My lord, I have kept to one part of my resolution,[1] the first half of it exclusively; and I have so unduly taxed your patience and that of the Conference, that I shall not attempt to deal with the second part further than to say that as I cannot regard Mr. Monckton's resolution as a rider, but must regard it as an amendment to the latter half of my resolution, I shall reserve what I have to say on this second half for the discussion on his amendment. [It was withdrawn.—ED.]

I have therefore now to move the Resolution of which I have given notice. My Lord, we have a magnificent heritage bequeathed to us by the piety and wisdom of our ancestors through many generations. The history of the Church of England is no common history. She has her splendid roll of scholars and divines, of philosophers and statesmen, of saints and martyrs, who have enriched the field of human thought and extended its boundaries. She has been the home of freedom and the nursing mother of high and holy lives. She has been the champion of the oppressed, she has cherished the sense of justice, she has sanctified the family and given dignity to the national ideal. Without her the national life would have been poor and mean and ignoble. The nation has been great because the Church and the nation have been one. Strip her of these her proud prerogative, and just in proportion as she becomes enfeebled and degraded, in that proportion will the nation become enfeebled and degraded too. A national life which has lost a great ideal and great traditions has lost a great inspiration. Shall we suffer such an inheritance, so holy and so precious, to be torn from our hands? Shall the vineyard which the Lord hath planted be profaned? Shall its hedges be broken down, so that all they that go by pluck off her grapes; so that the boar out of the wood shall ravage it, and the wild beasts of the field devour it? Shall we not rather pray, Look down, we beseech Thee, O God of hosts; look down from heaven, and behold and visit this vine? Quicken Thou us, and we will call upon Thy name. Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts; cause Thy face to shine upon us, and we shall be saved.

---

[1] RESOLUTION.—That this Conference, sensible of the great benefit conferred upon the nation by the existence of the National Church, pledges itself to do all in its power to maintain the Church of England as a National Church.

That in view of the persistent misrepresentations which are made on the subject, it is desirable that accurate information respecting the Church, its status, and its endowments, be disseminated by means of publications, lectures, etc., in the various parishes of the diocese, that the Bishop be respectfully requested to take such steps to this end as he, after consultation at his archdeacons, rural deans, and lay members of Conference, shall think best.

DEATH OF THE EARL OF SHAFTESBURY.

THE death of the Earl of Shaftesbury was announced in the journals of the 2nd everywhere, throughout the country, with expressions of deep regret and the greatest respect.

Lord Shaftesbury, weakened by a troublesome attack of illness, had gone to stay at Folkestone. A chill, caught in the north-east wind, brought on inflammation, and he gradually became weaker. In the afternoon of Thursday, the 1st, he quietly breathed his last. According to the *Record*, he suffered comparatively little during the later stages of his illness; and his last moments were of the most peaceful character:

> The night nurse had been with him until an early part of the morning, when his valet resumed duty by the bedside. During the morning his Lordship dictated two letters to his daughters. Three members of his family—Lady Templemore, Lady Edith Ashley, and the Hon. Cecil Ashley—were in constant attendance upon him, and he conversed with them in the most affectionate and cheerful manner. Up to the last he retained consciousness, and conversed with the utmost sensibility. He expected death, and his gentleness with his children in the last hour was most touching.

Antony Ashley-Cooper was born on April 28, 1801. He was therefore in his eighty-fifth year when he entered into rest.

The *Times* said:

> The death of Lord Shaftesbury, which all the English race is to-day deploring, removes one of the most honoured figures of our contemporary history. He is the most conspicuous recent instance of a man who, born to a great station and ample fortune, has deliberately devoted a long life neither to pleasure, nor to personal advancement, nor to political power, but to furthering the material, moral, and religious well-being of his countrymen.

The *Telegraph* said:

> A long life, rich in deeds of piety and benevolence, and unwearied until the last in well-doing, reached, yesterday, its peaceful close. The passing of the Factory Acts, great as it was, was only a glorious episode in a consistently noble career. Whenever there was mitigable suffering or remediable wrong, wherever there seemed hope of cheering lowly lots, of brightening dismal lives, of purging physical or moral uncleanness away, there the hand which will labour no more in good works was quick to help and indefatigable to sustain.

No one in modern times, said the *Post*, has left behind him the record of so much excellent work accomplished as Lord Shaftesbury.

Lord Shaftesbury won the hearts of the people as well as their respect, said the *Chronicle*, and by no section of the

community will he be more sincerely or deeply mourned than by the toiling millions to whose welfare he devoted his life.

The *Record* (Oct. 2) said:

> We feel that on this occasion the ordinary expressions of regret are entirely out of place. The noble career that is now closed leaves an indelible mark on the history of the nation and on the condition of its people. It has made men glorify our Father in heaven, and will doubtless be even more influential for good as its features come out more grandly, if less vividly, in the sober light of history. One of the first impressions produced by the perusal of the Memoir we present this day will be that of thankfulness to Almighty God for a life so signally illustrating the power of His grace, and consequently of such wide and enduring usefulness to mankind.

The Memoir of the *Record*, after touching upon the Harrow and Oxford career of Lord Ashley, gives the chief stages of his career in the House of Commons and in the Upper House, in connection with Social Reforms. The story of the Ten Hours Bill is admirably told, as is also the course of the illustrious philanthropist's efforts in regard to agricultural gangs, workshops, colliery children, and chimney-sweeps. The work which he did in regard to the Lunacy Laws, it is well said, is comparatively little known. In the year 1843, he moved:

> That an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that her Majesty will be graciously pleased to take into her instant and serious consideration the best means of diffusing the benefits and blessings of a moral and religious education amongst the working classes of her people.

In the year 1870, when the question of Religious Education was debated, Lord Shaftesbury was in the forefront of the contest, stoutly opposing the demands of the Secularists and those who from one or other cause were inclined to aid them. Largely by his aid, the Vice-President, Mr. Forster, that distinguished statesman to whose honesty and decision the venerated Earl, in private and in public, at the time, gave warm testimony, carried the Bill.

Upon Ragged Schools, Dwellings of the Poor, Early Closing, and other philanthropic movements; upon the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Church Pastoral Aid Society, London City Mission, Young Men's Christian Association, and other Societies and religious movements, a biography of the great and good man soon to be issued will enable us to touch.

The remains of the noble Earl were interred on the 9th in the family vault at St. Giles', in Dorsetshire.